

**AN EVALUATION OF
IDRC / CIDA COLLABORATION**

September 1991

Undertaken by

**Kevin Clark & Joe Bolger for
the Audit and Evaluation Division of CIDA
and the Office of Planning and Evaluation of IDRC**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to recognize the assistance of various people involved in this evaluation. Members of the Advisory Committee offered guidance on the review process and feedback on a draft of the evaluation paper which was greatly appreciated.

Special thanks is also extended to Paul Vitta and Mary Backman who organized itineraries in Nairobi and Harare respectively, and Andrea Young whose patient support throughout was appreciated. Last but not least, thanks to Eunice Egan whose word processing skills helped give shape to the final product.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONDENSÉ ET RECOMMANDATIONS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	BACKGROUND	1
1.2	EVALUATION PURPOSE	2
2	METHODOLOGY	4
2.1	DOCUMENT AND FILE RESEARCH	4
2.2	INTERVIEWS	5
2.3	SURVEY	5
2.4	CASE STUDIES	6
2.5	DATA ANALYSIS	6
3	EVALUATION FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	7
3.1	RATIONALE FOR COLLABORATION	7
	3.1.1 Findings	7
	3.1.2 Analysis	9
	3.1.3 Conclusions	10
3.2	TYPES OF COLLABORATION: EFFECTIVENESS & OBSTACLES ..	11
	3.2.1 Findings : Types of Collaboration & Their Effectiveness ..	11
	3.2.2 Findings: Obstacles to Collaboration	18
	3.2.3 Analysis	19
	3.2.4 Conclusions	23
3.3	SPECIFIC MECHANISMS TO SUPPORT COLLABORATION	25
	3.3.1 Findings	25
	3.3.2 Analysis	29
	3.3.3 Conclusions	31
3.4	CIDA/IDRC LIAISON FUNCTION	32
	3.4.1 Findings	32
	3.4.2 Analysis	34
	3.4.3 Conclusions	36
3.5	IMPACTS OF COLLABORATION	37
	3.5.1 Findings	37
	3.5.2 Analysis	38
	3.5.3 Conclusions	40
3.6	CONTEXT & OPPORTUNITIES FOR FUTURE COLLABORATION ..	40
	3.6.1 Findings	40
	3.6.2 Analysis	42
	3.6.3 Conclusions	42
	3.6.4 Uncertain Future	43

4	SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	45
4.1	<i>RATIONALE FOR COLLABORATION</i>	45
4.2	<i>TYPES OF COLLABORATION: EFFECTIVENESS & OBSTACLES</i>	46
4.3	<i>SPECIFIC MECHANISMS TO SUPPORT COLLABORATION</i>	47
4.4	<i>CIDA/IDRC LIAISON FUNCTION</i>	51
4.5	<i>IMPACTS OF COLLABORATION</i>	52
4.6	<i>CONTEXT & OPPORTUNITIES FOR FUTURE COLLABORATION</i>	53

Appendices

A	Terms of Reference
B	List of Persons Interviewed
C	Survey Questionnaire and Summary of Responses
D	List of Reference Material
E	Case Studies

ACRONYMS

APD	Aide publique au développement
BAIF	BAIF Development Research Foundation (previously Bharatiya Agro Industries Foundation)
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
GTZ	German Agency for Technical Cooperation
IAR	Institute of Agricultural Research
ICOD	International Centre for Ocean Development
ICRISAT	International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics
MCA	Model Contribution Agreement
ODA	Official Development Assistance
SADCC	Southern African Development Coordination Committee
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

IDRC

AFNS	Agriculture, Food, and Nutrition Sciences Division
EES	Earth and Engineering Sciences Division
FAD	Fellowships and Awards Division
HS	Health Sciences Division
IS	Information Sciences Division
SS	Social Sciences Division

IDRC Regional Offices

ASRO	Regional Office for Southeast and East Asia
EARO	Regional Office for Eastern and Southern Africa
LARO	Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
MERO	Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa
WARO	Regional Office for West and Central Africa

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation was to review the rationale, extent and effectiveness of collaboration between CIDA/IDRC, to assess the mechanisms developed to promote it, and identify opportunities for, and appropriate ways to encourage collaboration in the future. One specific objective of the study was to assess the ongoing need for the CIDA/IDRC Liaison Officer position.

Evaluation Issues

These include:

- the changing context within which CIDA and IDRC operate and how this has affected collaboration between them;
- the rationale for collaboration and whether it is still valid or needs to be redefined;
- the effectiveness of the mechanisms developed to promote collaboration, including the Liaison Officer position;
- constraints on effective collaboration between CIDA and IDRC;
- the impacts of collaboration with respect to rationale use of Canadian Official Development Assistance (ODA) and both organizations' objectives.
- opportunities and constraints on collaboration in the future.

Methodology

A variety of sources of data and analytical methods were used in the course of the evaluation, enabling a comprehensive analysis of the evaluation issues identified for study. These included document and file research, interviews, surveys and case studies. As well as the many documents on collaboration available for study, 72 key informants were interviewed, representing staff at all levels and from different parts of the agencies. A survey, primarily of overseas staff, was also undertaken. In total 232 questionnaires were distributed and 94 were completed (40%). A small number of case studies were identified and documented to shed some light on specific evaluation questions.

Findings

Rationale Collaboration between CIDA and IDRC has resulted from a significant degree of intersection of interests between the two organizations and their overseas partners. It also reflects a willingness to put resources into identifying areas of common interest and finding ways to cooperate for their mutual benefit.

Both are concerned with Third World development and have an interest in research for development, building up of local capacity and exploring the relevance of topical issues in development theory and practice, such as women in development, the environment, structural adjustment and sustainability.

Types of Collaboration A substantial investment has been made in the last six or seven years in exploring opportunities and developing mechanisms to assist collaboration, including the appointment of a CIDA/IDRC Liaison Officer. Despite different mandates, policies, structures, regulatory requirements and cultures, a high and increasing level of collaboration between CIDA and IDRC has taken place. Collaboration now occurs at virtually all levels in CIDA and IDRC and in many different ways in Ottawa/Hull and in the field.

While by no means perfect nor widely understood, the process has to a large extent been institutionalized to the point that each organization is aware of the policies, programs, directions and interests of the other. In addition to a substantial level of informal contact between individuals, formal collaboration takes place through a system of regular exchange of information, cross representation on various committees, collaboration in project funding and support, joint participation in international fora and involvement in program and sectoral policy development.

The study has shown that while each of these types of collaboration has potential benefits, they are not always realized. There are examples of both effective and unsuccessful collaboration in each of these areas. A number of key factors were identified as important in influencing the outcome of any kind of collaborative activity. At the individual level, these included motivation, initiative and good personal relationships. At the institutional level, they included common priorities and interests, a willingness to overcome structural differences and the availability of resources.

The evaluation has found that collaboration between the two organizations will be most effective if three conditions are met:

- personal contacts continue to be encouraged;
- information exchange systems are sustained; and
- a baseline of institutionalized contact exists.

One weakness appeared to be that many staff were uncertain of their agencies commitment to collaboration. This could be remedied by clearer direction from senior management.

Mechanisms to Support Collaboration A number of mechanisms have been developed to promote and support collaboration, including a system of information exchange, a handbook on collaboration, focal or contact points for collaborative activities, the Model Contribution Agreement and participation in meetings.

While each of these mechanisms is important, the evaluation notes a need to improve the effectiveness of key mechanisms of collaboration. They must be clearly defined and targeted to respond to real needs, otherwise there is a danger that they become costly, inefficient and ineffective.

The Liaison Function Most of the mechanisms noted above have been established or encouraged by the IDRC/CIDA Liaison Officer. The evaluation has concluded that there are now sufficient structural linkages and mechanisms in place to support collaboration and that if properly managed and maintained, a Liaison Officer will not be essential. If the Liaison Officer position is made redundant, some responsibilities would need to be undertaken by other staff in each agency. However, in general, it is suggested that those kinds of collaboration or mechanisms that people in CIDA and IDRC find useful will be retained and those that are not will disappear.

Impact There is sufficient evidence from this evaluation and the examples of collaborative projects and other activities studied to demonstrate that in many areas, IDRC and CIDA can gain more by working together than they would independently, both in terms of their own mandates and in terms of developmental impact.

Context and Future Opportunities Many of the present types of collaboration and mechanisms to support them will likely be appropriate for the foreseeable future. Other mechanisms which appear to have some potential have also been identified in this study. However, the relevance of all of these will need to be monitored periodically. The needs of people and institutions in developing countries are changing in various ways. These changes will be an important determinant of future collaborative action.

Canadian government policy on overseas development and resources allocated to ODA will be another factor affecting the nature and level of collaboration. A further uncertainty is the outcome of current reviews being undertaken by both CIDA and IDRC. These may well result in new directions and priorities and some degree of internal restructuring.

Conclusions

There is a clear rationale for collaboration between CIDA and IDRC. The two organizations have complementary mandates as parts of Canadian ODA. There are also benefits to be gained through cooperation in terms of effective use of Canadian 'aid' money and the developmental impact of overseas activities.

That both are resourced from Canadian ODA is neither a necessary nor a sufficient reason for them to collaborate. However, this, combined with the potential benefits to be gained, provide a compelling argument for collaboration.

Collaboration is neither possible nor desirable in all areas. It should be selective and emerge from an assessment of mutual interests and likely benefits and developmental impacts.

Collaboration is most likely to take place if there is an open and professional working relationship between officers at all levels of CIDA and IDRC. While much of this can be informal, there is a need for some institutional mechanisms which ensure exchange of information, discussion of future opportunities for collaboration and resolution of problems.

However, there is a fine line between putting too many resources into collaboration such that the benefits don't justify the cost and not putting enough with the possibility that opportunities are lost. There is also a tension between institutionalizing the process and allowing it to develop organically as individuals in each organization recognize the advantages to be gained.

There is a need for leadership from the top on this issue. Staff need to know how committed their organization is to collaboration, where management places the priority for action and what resources they are willing to apply to it. Such direction should provide the motivation for initiatives within the organizations.

With respect to the future, each organization needs to decide if it wants to put more, the same or less resources into collaboration with the other and how formal the relationship should be. Such a decision will need to be taken in light of changes in structures, directions and priorities which emerge from current strategic reviews of both organizations.

However, it is the conclusion of this evaluation that collaboration is likely to be just as important in the future, if not more so. Its emphasis might change but collaboration at all levels should help each agency achieve its objectives more effectively and with greater impact. By and large, the systems and mechanisms needed to support collaboration have been put in place over the last 5 years. While particular liaison functions remain important and should be continued, the same level of resources in the form of a Liaison Officer should no longer be required.

Recommendations

- 1** That CIDA and IDRC agree on a statement of rationale for collaboration in the 1990s, taking into account, among other things, their respective mandates and priorities, organizational changes in both organizations and the changing needs of overseas partners (refer 4.1).
- 2** That CIDA and IDRC review collaboration at a senior level on an annual basis (refer 4.2).
- 3** That information exchange systems already in place should be reviewed to ensure the information being exchanged is appropriate and well targeted (refer 4.3).
- 4** That a joint working group be established to look at development of compatible information data bases in each agency and the question of access to these by staff of the other (refer 4.3).
- 5** That the system of focal points in CIDA and IDRC field offices be consolidated in order to support and promote collaborative activities and that both organizations make available, in regional/decentralized office budgets, sufficient financial resources for the designated officers to undertake their roles (refer 4.3).
- 6** That the issue of collaboration be made a regular item on the agendas of regional meetings of both organizations. Discussions on this agenda item should be aimed not only at exchange of information but also systematic exploration of prospects for collaboration in the region (refer 4.3).
- 7** That seminars and information sessions in Ottawa/Hull and the field be organized periodically as a means of increasing understanding of the other organization, presenting opportunities for networking and professional exchange, and identifying prospective areas for future cooperation (refer 4.3).
- 8** That the CIDA/IDRC Liaison Officer position be disestablished (refer 4.4).
- 9** That the Liaison Officer position be phased out over a six month period from acceptance of these recommendations (refer 4.4).

CONDENSÉ ET RECOMMANDATIONS

Objet

Cette évaluation a pour but d'examiner la raison d'être, l'étendue et l'efficacité de la collaboration entre l'ACDI et le CRDI, d'évaluer les mécanismes mis au point pour la promouvoir et de déterminer des possibilités et des moyens adéquats de la favoriser à l'avenir. L'un des objectifs plus précis de l'étude était d'évaluer s'il était nécessaire d'avoir un poste permanent d'agent de liaison ACDI-CRDI.

Questions examinées lors de l'évaluation

Il s'agit notamment :

- . de l'évolution du contexte au sein duquel s'effectuent les activités de l'ACDI et du CRDI, et de ses effets sur la collaboration entre les deux organismes;
- . de la raison d'être d'une telle collaboration et de la nécessité ou non de la redéfinir;
- . de l'efficacité des mécanismes mis au point pour promouvoir la collaboration, parmi lesquels le poste d'agent de liaison;
- . des contraintes qui empêchent une collaboration efficace entre l'ACDI et le CRDI;
- . des répercussions de cette collaboration en ce qui concerne une utilisation rationnelle de l'APD (Aide publique au développement) canadienne et les objectifs des deux organismes; et
- . des possibilités et contraintes futures en matière de collaboration.

Méthodologie

On a eu recours à un vaste éventail de données et de méthodes analytiques tout au long de l'évaluation, ce qui a permis d'analyser de façon exhaustive les questions retenues pour fins d'évaluation. On a entre autres procédé à des recherches dans les documents et les dossiers pertinents, à des interviews, des enquêtes et des études de cas. Outre la consultation des nombreux documents sur la collaboration qui étaient disponibles, 72 répondants clés ont été interrogés, lesquels étaient représentatifs de toutes les catégories d'employés ainsi que des différents secteurs des deux organismes. Une enquête a aussi été effectuée, surtout auprès des employés à l'étranger. En tout, 232 questionnaires ont été distribués et 94 ont été remplis (soit 40 %). Quelques études de cas ont été recensées pour éclairer certaines questions en matière d'évaluation.

Constatations de l'évaluation

Raison d'être La collaboration entre l'ACDI et le CRDI a découlé des nombreux recoupements entre les intérêts des deux organismes et leurs partenaires à l'étranger, ainsi que d'une volonté d'affecter des ressources à la détermination de secteurs d'intérêt commun et à la définition de modes de collaboration mutuellement avantageux.

Tous deux se préoccupent du développement du Tiers-Monde et s'intéressent à la recherche au service du développement, à la création de capacités locales et à l'examen de la pertinence de certaines questions d'actualité dans la théorie et la pratique du développement, comme les femmes et le développement, l'environnement, l'ajustement structurel et la durabilité.

Types de collaboration On a beaucoup investi, ces six ou sept dernières années, dans l'examen des possibilités et la mise au point des mécanismes susceptibles d'appuyer la collaboration, notamment la nomination d'un agent de liaison ACDI-CRDI. Malgré des mandats, des politiques, des structures, des exigences réglementaires et des cultures organisationnelles qui diffèrent, les deux organismes ont beaucoup collaboré et le font de plus en plus. Il y a maintenant collaboration à pratiquement tous les échelons de l'ACDI et du CRDI, et celle-ci prend toutes sortes de formes différentes, à Ottawa-Hull et sur le terrain.

Bien qu'il ne soit ni parfait, ni bien compris, le processus a été en bonne partie institutionnalisé et ce, au point où chacun des deux organismes connaît les politiques, les programmes, les orientations et les intérêts de l'autre. En plus des nombreux échanges informels entre les employés des deux organismes, il y a une collaboration officielle qui s'effectue par le biais d'un système d'échange régulier de l'information, de la présence aux réunions de divers comités, du soutien et du financement en collaboration de certains projets, de la participation conjointe à des tribunes internationales et de la participation à l'élaboration de programmes et de politiques sectorielles.

L'étude a démontré que, si chacun de ces types de collaboration peut se traduire par des avantages éventuels, ceux-ci ne se concrétisent pas toujours. On trouve des exemples tant de réussites que d'échecs dans chacun de ces domaines. On a découvert qu'un certain nombre de facteurs clés avaient une influence importante sur les résultats obtenus. Mentionnons, au niveau individuel, la motivation, le sens de l'initiative et les bonnes relations interpersonnelles et, au niveau institutionnel, les priorités et les intérêts communs, la volonté de surmonter les différences structurelles et la disponibilité des ressources.

Selon l'évaluation, il faudra que trois conditions soient remplies pour que la collaboration entre les deux organismes soit des plus efficaces :

- . continuer d'encourager les contacts interpersonnels,
- . maintenir les systèmes d'échange de l'information, et
- . faire en sorte qu'existe un niveau de base de contacts institutionnalisés.

L'une des faiblesses observées tenait au fait que bon nombre d'employés n'étaient pas certains de l'engagement de leur organisme à l'égard de la collaboration. Les directions des deux organismes pourraient remédier à cela en communiquant des orientations plus claires à ce sujet.

Mécanismes de soutien de la collaboration Un certain nombre de mécanismes ont été mis au point en vue de promouvoir et d'appuyer la collaboration, dont un système d'échange de l'information, un guide pour la collaboration, des points de convergence ou de contact pour les activités exécutées en collaboration, l'accord-type de financement et la participation aux réunions.

Chacun de ces mécanismes est important, selon l'évaluation, mais il y aurait lieu d'améliorer l'efficacité des mécanismes clés. Ces derniers doivent être clairement définis et très bien ciblés de façon à répondre à des besoins réels, sans quoi ils pourraient devenir coûteux et inefficaces.

La fonction de liaison La plupart des mécanismes susmentionnés ont été créés ou favorisés par l'agent de liaison CRDI-ACDI. L'évaluation en arrive à la conclusion qu'un nombre suffisant de mécanismes et de liens structurels sont désormais en place pour soutenir la collaboration et que, s'ils sont bien administrés et maintenus, le poste d'agent de liaison ne sera plus essentiel. Si ce poste devait être éliminé, il faudrait que certaines des responsabilités qui y sont rattachées soient confiées à d'autres employés dans chacun des deux organismes. On laisse entendre toutefois que les types de collaboration et les mécanismes que le personnel de l'ACDI et du CRDI trouve utiles pourraient être conservés et que les autres pourraient disparaître.

Répercussions Cette évaluation et maints exemples de projets et d'autres activités exécutés en collaboration qui ont été étudiés fournissent suffisamment de preuves que, dans bien des domaines, le CRDI et l'ACDI ont beaucoup plus à gagner en travaillant ensemble plutôt que séparément et ce, tant en ce qui concerne leur mandat que les répercussions en matière de développement.

Contexte et possibilités futures Bon nombre des mécanismes et des types de collaboration qui existent à l'heure actuelle continueront sans doute de s'avérer appropriés pendant un certain temps encore. Cette étude a également permis de déterminer d'autres mécanismes qui semblent offrir certaines possibilités. Il faudra toutefois examiner périodiquement la pertinence de tous ces mécanismes. Les besoins des individus et des institutions des pays en développement sont en train de changer de bien des façons, et ces changements seront un important facteur déterminant des futures mesures prises en matière de collaboration.

La politique du gouvernement canadien sur le développement outre-mer et les ressources affectées à l'APD influenceront également sur la nature et l'étendue de la collaboration. Un autre facteur d'incertitude tient aux conclusions des examens qu'effectuent actuellement l'ACDI et le CRDI, qui pourraient se traduire par de nouvelles priorités et orientations ainsi que par certaines restructurations internes.

Conclusions

Il est évident que la collaboration entre l'ACDI et le CRDI a sa raison d'être. Les mandats des deux organismes, à titre d'éléments constitutifs de l'APD canadienne, sont complémentaires. Certains avantages peuvent également être tirés de la collaboration du point de vue d'une utilisation efficace des sommes que le Canada consacre à l'«aide» et des répercussions qu'ont sur le développement les activités à l'étranger.

Le fait que tous deux soient financés à même l'APD canadienne ne constitue pas une raison nécessaire ni suffisante pour qu'ils collaborent. Cependant, ce fait, conjugué aux avantages éventuels qui peuvent en résulter, constitue un argument de poids en faveur de la collaboration.

La collaboration n'est ni possible ni souhaitable dans tous les domaines. Elle doit être sélective et doit découler d'une évaluation des intérêts mutuels et des avantages probables, ainsi que des répercussions en matière de développement.

Les possibilités de collaboration seront plus grandes s'il existe des relations de travail ouvertes et professionnelles entre les employés de tous les échelons de l'ACDI et du CRDI. Si cela peut se faire en bonne partie de façon informelle, il est nécessaire de pouvoir disposer de certains mécanismes institutionnels permettant d'assurer l'échange de l'information, la discussion des futures possibilités de collaboration et la résolution des problèmes.

Cependant, il y a un équilibre à rechercher entre une trop grande affectation de ressources à la collaboration, qui pourrait faire en sorte que la fin ne justifie pas les moyens, et une affectation insuffisante, qui risquerait de faire rater des occasions. Il y a également un certain équilibre à maintenir entre l'institutionnalisation du processus et son développement organique, c'est-à-dire au fur et à mesure que les employés des deux organismes reconnaissent les avantages à en tirer.

Il faut que le leadership sur cette question vienne d'en haut. Les employés ont besoin de savoir jusqu'à quel point leur organisme est en faveur de la collaboration, quelles sont les priorités du point de vue de la direction et quelles ressources cette dernière est prête à y consacrer. Une telle orientation devrait donner la motivation nécessaire à l'exécution d'initiatives au sein des deux organismes.

En ce qui concerne l'avenir, chacun des deux organismes doit décider s'il souhaite affecter des ressources supérieures, égales ou inférieures à la collaboration et il doit se demander dans quelle mesure cette collaboration se doit d'être officielle. Cette décision devra être prise à la lumière des changements qui se produiront dans la structure, les orientations et les priorités des deux organismes une fois connues les conclusions de leurs examens stratégiques.

Nous en sommes toutefois arrivés à la conclusion que la collaboration sera sans doute tout aussi importante à l'avenir, sinon plus. L'accent sera peut-être mis sur d'autres aspects, mais la collaboration à tous les échelons devrait aider chacun des deux organismes à atteindre ses objectifs d'une manière plus efficace et à accroître les répercussions de ses activités. Les systèmes et mécanismes visant à appuyer la collaboration ont été mis en place ces cinq dernières années. Si les fonctions de liaison demeurent importantes et doivent continuer, il ne devrait plus être nécessaire d'y consacrer les mêmes ressources sous la forme d'un agent de liaison.

Recommandations

- 1 L'ACDI et le CRDI devraient convenir d'un énoncé exposant la raison d'être de leur collaboration dans les années 1990, lequel tiendrait compte, entre autres choses, du mandat et des priorités des deux organismes, des changements organisationnels qui les touchent et de l'évolution des besoins de leurs partenaires à l'étranger (point 4.1).
- 2 Chaque année, l'ACDI et le CRDI devraient examiner leur collaboration à un échelon supérieur (point 4.2).
- 3 Il faudrait examiner les systèmes d'échange de l'information qui sont déjà en place pour s'assurer que l'information échangée est appropriée et bien ciblée (point 4.3).
- 4 Il faudrait créer un groupe de travail conjoint qui serait chargé de se pencher sur l'élaboration de bases de données contenant des informations compatibles dans chacun des deux organismes et d'étudier les possibilités d'accès du personnel de l'autre organisme (point 4.3).
- 5 Il faudrait déterminer des points de convergence dans les bureaux de l'ACDI et du CRDI sur le terrain pour le soutien et la promotion d'activités en collaboration et il faudrait que les deux organismes prévoient, dans les budgets des bureaux régionaux et décentralisés, des ressources financières suffisantes pour que les employés désignés puissent remplir leur rôle (point 4.3).
- 6 La question de la collaboration devrait figurer régulièrement à l'ordre du jour des réunions régionales des deux organismes. Les discussions à ce sujet devraient porter non seulement sur l'échange de l'information mais également sur l'examen systématique des possibilités de collaboration dans la région (point 4.3).
- 7 Des colloques et des séances d'information devraient être organisés périodiquement à Ottawa-Hull et sur le terrain pour permettre une meilleure compréhension de l'autre organisme, soulever des possibilités de réseautage et d'échanges professionnels, et déterminer les domaines susceptibles de faire l'objet d'une collaboration à l'avenir (point 4.3).
- 8 Le poste d'agent de liaison ACDI-CRDI devrait être aboli (point 4.4).
- 9 Il faudrait éliminer progressivement le poste d'agent de liaison sur une période de six mois à compter de l'acceptation de ces recommandations (point 4.4).

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

CIDA was established in 1968 to provide a more adequate administrative framework for Canada's Official Development Assistance and to highlight the priority given by the Government of Canada to international cooperation as a key part of foreign policy. It currently disburses around 75% of Canada's ODA.

IDRC was established by an Act of Parliament as a crown corporation in 1970 "to initiate, encourage, support and conduct research into the problems of the developing regions of the world and into the means of applying and adapting scientific, technical and other knowledge to the economic and social advancement of those regions" (Government of Canada, 1970).

Through the first ten years of their existence, there were some linkages between the two agencies, the most notable being the appointment of the President of CIDA to IDRC's Board of Governors. However, in general, collaboration between the agencies was sporadic and ad hoc as the priority for each organization was to establish their own structure and style in accordance with their respective mandates.

In 1981, the Presidents of CIDA and IDRC initiated a review of collaboration between the two organizations to identify practical ways to promote it. The review was undertaken by CIDA's Policy Branch. A joint CIDA/IDRC paper (September 1982) was approved by the senior management of both organizations following the review. In late 1983, the Presidents of IDRC and CIDA decided a more concerted effort was required to promote collaboration and the IDRC/CIDA liaison function was born.

In 1987, the Winegard Report, 'For Whose Benefit', called for increased collaboration between CIDA and IDRC through staff exchanges, joint projects and making greater use of IDRC research in CIDA's human resource development projects. The two organizations have sought to implement these recommendations in the context of the Government's response to Winegard, 'Sharing Our Future'.

The implementation of the Government's 1987 aid strategy, which included the decentralization of CIDA's operations to Canadian Embassies and High Commissions together with IDRC's decision to further decentralize program positions to Regional Offices, has led to a new emphasis on collaborative efforts in the field and the mechanisms needed to facilitate cooperation between IDRC and CIDA at this level. Previous efforts had generally been focused on the head offices in Ottawa/Hull.

There are many examples of collaboration between IDRC and CIDA. These can be divided into six main categories:

- cross-representation and participation in committees;
- collaboration on projects;
- joint participation in international fora;
- collaboration in planning;
- information exchange; and
- informal collaboration.

1.2 EVALUATION PURPOSE

In reconfirming the Liaison Officer position in 1988, IDRC recommended that it be evaluated after three years and that an assessment of future strategies to support collaboration be made at that time.

Meetings in early 1991 between the Evaluation and Audit Division of CIDA and the Office of Planning and Evaluation of IDRC discussed two different approaches; the first focusing only on the liaison officer position, the second looking more broadly at the question of collaboration between the agencies. Given the nature of institutional change in recent years and current strategic reviews being undertaken by both agencies, it was agreed that the latter approach would be more useful and that the utility of the liaison officer position could be considered in this broader context.

The purpose of this evaluation is to review the rationale, extent and effectiveness of collaboration between CIDA/IDRC, to assess the mechanisms developed to promote it, and to identify opportunities for, and appropriate ways to encourage collaboration in the future.

The study does not seek to list the instances of collaboration between CIDA and IDRC. Much of this is already documented in various reports listed in Appendix D or is informal and difficult to identify. Nor does this study attempt to quantify the impact of collaboration on the agencies themselves, or on partner countries or institutions, although qualitative assessments are made of some of the benefits and costs of collaboration.

Specific evaluation issues addressed by the study include the following:

- the changing context within which CIDA and IDRC operate and how this has affected collaboration between them;
- the rationale for collaboration and whether it is still valid or needs to be redefined;

-
- the effectiveness of the mechanisms developed to promote collaboration, including the Liaison Officer position;
 - constraints on effective collaboration between CIDA and IDRC;
 - the impacts of collaboration with respect to rationale use of Canadian ODA and both organizations' objectives.
 - opportunities and constraints on collaboration in the future.

2 METHODOLOGY

A variety of sources of data and analytical methods were used in the course of the evaluation. The four main sources of information were :

- documents and files of both organizations (see Appendix D);
- interviews with key individuals in CIDA and IDRC (see Appendix B);
- a survey of headquarters and regional staff of both organizations (see Appendix C); and
- case studies (see Appendix E).

The document and file research identified the rationale for collaboration, its extent and different dimensions and issues that have emerged as important through the 1980s. The interviews, surveys and case studies provided perspectives on the impacts and effects of collaborative efforts from CIDA and IDRC staff. They also explored issues of rationale, problems associated with collaboration and future needs and opportunities for collaboration.

This study did not systematically seek the views of beneficiaries of CIDA/IDRC joint projects, although the opportunity was taken by one of the authors during a visit to Africa to meet and talk with staff in two organizations which have received assistance from both CIDA and IDRC.

2.1 DOCUMENT AND FILE RESEARCH

There was a substantial amount of information available on collaboration between IDRC and CIDA. Main sources included:

- a 1981 report by the CIDA Policy Branch and the 1982 CIDA/IDRC document on Cooperation;
- minutes of CIDA and IDRC meetings which have discussed collaboration;
- travel reports, annual reports and policy papers prepared by different IDRC/CIDA liaison officers;
- special reports on IDRC/CIDA collaboration;
- project and general files; and
- other documents (e.g. IDRC Regional Annual Reports).

2.2 INTERVIEWS

It was considered important to interview CIDA and IDRC staff both in Ottawa and in the field who have:

- had a role in promoting collaboration (liaison officers, regional focal points);
- participated in or attempted to implement collaborative activities; and
- an interest in or could potentially benefit from collaborative activities.

An interview guide was prepared to ensure coverage of key questions with all interviewees. This was used to interview staff of both organizations in Ottawa/Hull. It was also used during a field visit to Eastern and Southern Africa, during which interviews were held with IDRC Regional office staff in Nairobi, CIDA staff in Harare and a number of recipients of IDRC/CIDA collaborative projects.

In all seventy-two people were interviewed (see Appendix B) during the evaluation. While an attempt was made to identify key informants; that is, people who had relevant experience to share, the sample of people interviewed was also selected to ensure a representation of people at different levels in CIDA and IDRC, from different branches/divisions and with field and headquarters experience. When the opportunity permitted, field staff visiting Ottawa/Hull were interviewed to improve the regional coverage. This included all six IDRC Regional Directors.

2.3 SURVEY

A survey was undertaken to assess the extent to which various instruments for collaboration (such as the Handbook for IDRC/CIDA Collaboration, the Model Contribution Agreement and the Liaison Officer position) were known and used in IDRC and CIDA and to give a wider group of people across CIDA and IDRC the opportunity to express their views on the benefits and costs, constraints on, and possibilities of, collaboration. In particular, this provided regional staff with an opportunity to contribute to the evaluation.

A questionnaire (see Appendix C) was prepared and administered by LAN to IDRC field staff and by fax to CIDA field staff. The questionnaire was also administered by telephone to a small sample of headquarters staff of both organizations, covering a cross section of levels and divisions/branches. In total 232 questionnaires were distributed and 94 were

completed, that is, a forty percent response rate. A detailed breakdown of responses is included in Appendix C.

2.4 CASE STUDIES

A small number of case studies were identified in the course of the evaluation to help shed some light on specific evaluation questions. The primary aim of the case studies is to identify key factors which have either promoted or hindered collaboration between CIDA and IDRC.

Information for the case studies was obtained from files and reports, interviews, and in one case a field visit, the SADCC/ICRISAT Sorghum and Millet Improvement Project in Bulawayo, Zimbabwe.

These are not intended to be detailed case studies nor necessarily typical of particular kinds of collaboration, but rather sketches to help illustrate key issues more clearly and provide some lessons from experience. Four case studies are included in this report.

2.5 DATA ANALYSIS

The aim of the study was to provide a credible analysis of the reasons for, and the costs and benefits of collaboration. No attempt was made to analyze the survey data statistically as the main purpose of these was to gather the views of a representative rather than a random sample of staff of both agencies in Ottawa/ Hull.

The analysis has given equal weight to the qualitative and quantitative information obtained from documents, interviews, surveys and case studies.

Use of these multiple lines of enquiry enabled a comprehensive analysis of the evaluation issues identified for study. The different methods used not only provided a range of perspectives on the evaluation questions being asked but also enabled them to be discussed in an interactive way with staff from both organizations.

3 EVALUATION FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

This section of the report highlights key findings of the evaluation. The information is presented in six sections:

- 1) The Rationale for Collaboration
- 2) Types of Collaboration : Effectiveness and Obstacles
- 3) Specific Mechanisms of Collaboration
- 4) CIDA/IDRC Liaison Function
- 5) Impacts of Collaboration
- 6) Context and Opportunities for Future Collaboration.

In each section, key findings are presented followed by an analysis of the data and conclusions.

3.1 RATIONALE FOR COLLABORATION

3.1.1 Findings

The rationale for collaboration between CIDA and IDRC has been articulated in various ways since the early 1980s. Among the key statements on the topic are the following :

- as integral elements of Canadian Official Development Assistance (ODA), the nature of the operations of CIDA and IDRC are complementary in many areas, and effective consultation between the two agencies could serve to maximise the impact of the work of both institutions for the benefit of each and for the benefit of the development process (CIDA, 1981:2);
- through collaboration, both organizations could improve the efficiency of utilization of the human, fiscal and information resources of each and thereby enhance the effectiveness of their efforts to assist the developing countries (CIDA/IDRC, 1982:16);
- as both organizations' programs have expanded, it is important that the respective actions of each organization are complementary (Memo from CIDA President to President's Committee, Sept. 13, 1984);

- experience of collaboration during the 1970's indicates that this could have positive results and be mutually beneficial (Coupal, 1989:4); and
- the act of working or operating together could translate into more effective development efforts in developing countries and in a more unified Canadian approach to supporting development activities (Coupal, 1989:4).

To explore the question of how staff of both organizations view the rationale for collaboration, individuals interviewed during the evaluation were asked 'What is the rationale for collaboration with CIDA/IDRC?'. A number of respondents were also asked if they thought the rationale has changed over time.

The most frequently offered answers (more than 20% of respondents) were as follows:

- collaboration is important to 'complement each other's strengths and to avoid duplication';
- collaboration makes effective use of Canada's ODA resources and there is a 'political' imperative to cooperate; and
- collaboration assists the implementation of research results and the sustainability of development efforts;

The third response was offered mainly, but not exclusively, by IDRC respondents. Examples under that category included pilot projects or support to strengthen research institutes.

Other explanations of the rationale for collaboration included the following:

- collaboration secures additional resources, mainly financial, (predominantly an IDRC concern); and
- collaboration responds to CIDA's limited capability in research in certain areas.

Respondents generally felt that the rationale for collaboration has not changed over time, although some noted a shift in emphasis because of the increasing complexity of development work and the associated need for greater understanding of the development process through research.

Several people suggested that the two organizations' history of working together had led to a greater appreciation of the rationale for collaboration. On the other hand, some respondents offered the view that there was no consensus on the rationale for collaboration between the two agencies nor was there a sense that it was encouraged by senior management.

Others pointed out that CIDA and IDRC work with a variety of other Canadian and non-Canadian organizations and that it is sometimes easier and just as productive to cooperate with these other groups.

Overall, however, most respondents believed that there was a rationale for CIDA and IDRC to work together where possible.

A specific issue which arose in the review was the role of each organization in the field of research. CIDA has, by one account, spent \$25-50 million per year on research. IDRC, on the other hand, whose fundamental mandate is research, first exceeded CIDA's annual spending on research only 2-3 years ago.

For some, this raises two issues; duplication of effort and not giving adequate recognition to IDRC's comparative advantage in research. By and large the first was not seen as a major problem. A common view expressed was that the research needs of developing countries are so great that the expertise and resources of both CIDA and IDRC are needed.

With respect to the second point, it was noted that some efforts have been made to clarify roles and responsibilities in the field of research. One example was the working group on agricultural research which sought to define how the two agencies should relate on this issue. While a paper was drafted by the working group, it was never approved at the senior management level. Some officers felt the absence of an agreed policy on roles and responsibilities inhibited greater collaboration. Others appeared to be cooperating with their counterparts as if the paper had been approved. For them it provided an informal framework for collaboration in this area.

3.1.2 Analysis

Four main points arise out of the findings on the rationale for collaboration :

- there is a broad consensus among staff on the fundamental rationale for collaboration between the two organizations based on common interests/areas of work and perceived benefits;

- it is generally accepted that both organizations have a role in what might broadly be called 'development research';
- individuals' perceptions regarding rationale are consistent with declarations made by both organizations over the years on this issue; and
- while consensus on rationale exists at the staff level, a number of people feel that commitment to collaboration at the senior levels has been equivocal.

The rationale for collaboration would seem to be expressed best by the first two statements outlined in the 'Findings' section. The first includes the fact that both organizations are part of Canada's ODA efforts. While this suggests a 'special relationship' between CIDA and IDRC, it is at best a partial rationale. It may provide a 'political imperative' to cooperate, but there is still a need to recognize the differences between CIDA and IDRC in considering when, where and how collaboration can effectively take place. There needs to be some common interest and benefits for each with respect to their own mandates.

Underlying the statements of rationale mentioned above is the fact that the mandates of the two organizations overlap. A major area of overlap is support for and involvement in research. Both conduct or support research of various kinds, seek to apply this to development problems and enhance developing country capacity in research.

There are many examples of the two organizations playing effective and complementary roles in research, for example, collaboration in the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (see Appendix E). Some of the examples of collaborative projects mentioned elsewhere in this report, describe cooperation in research where neither CIDA nor IDRC could implement a particular activity on their own.

The evidence suggests therefore that there is room for both agencies in the area of research. There is, however, a need to ensure that efforts are not duplicated and that the respective mandates of each agency are recognized. This can best be achieved through regular consultation on research priorities and approaches.

3.1.3 Conclusions

There is a clear rationale for collaboration between CIDA and IDRC. A possible statement of this might be : "As integral parts of Canadian Official Development Assistance, the mandates of CIDA and IDRC are complementary in many ways. Collaboration between

the two agencies will maximize the impact of both organizations in their efforts to assist people and institutions in developing countries."

Strategic reviews currently underway in CIDA and IDRC may well lead to new priorities and approaches and organizational changes. Following completion of these reviews, there will be a need to reconfirm the rationale for collaboration and reassess the methods to be used to achieve objectives in areas of common interest.

This rationale would not be intended to place collaboration between CIDA and IDRC on a higher plain than collaboration with other agencies. Rather it would recognize the 'special relationship' that exists between the two organizations. A joint policy on collaboration would provide some direction and incentive for staff to explore opportunities for effective collaboration in the future.

3.2 TYPES OF COLLABORATION : EFFECTIVENESS AND OBSTACLES

The evaluation sought to identify the main types of collaboration between CIDA and IDRC, those which have been effective and the main obstacles to collaboration.

3.2.1 Findings : Types of Collaboration & Their Effectiveness

Interview and survey respondents identified a variety of ways in which they collaborate or interact with their colleagues at CIDA or IDRC, both formally and informally. The main types of formal collaboration noted by respondents can be divided into five types: collaboration on projects, cross-representation on committees, joint participation in international fora, cooperation in strategic planning and information exchange. In addition informal exchanges were highlighted as very important. Findings on each of these categories are detailed below.

Informal Exchanges

Much of the collaboration between CIDA and IDRC is informal and therefore not easy to document. A great deal is based on professional relations which have been built up between colleagues in both organizations over the years.

Such relations are valued for the exchange of ideas and perspectives on a range of topics. Occasionally 'informal exchanges' are in response to a specific request, e.g. feedback on draft legislation or a project proposal.

Eighty percent of survey respondents and a large percentage of interviewees indicated that they had informal links with CIDA or IDRC colleagues. Over sixty percent saw this as an effective way to collaborate with their counterparts.

In a number of cases, informal exchanges between officers has led to the establishment of working groups or invitations to work on special committees.

Collaboration on Projects

Reports by the Liaison Officer point to more than 93 joint and parallel projects between the two organizations since 1971 and approximately the same number of complementary projects¹. The average size of these projects was estimated in 1989 to be \$1.9 million.

There have been more collaborative projects since 1985 than in the early 1980s or 1970s. However, there has been a decrease over the last few years. The 1990 Annual Report by the Liaison Officer attributes the recent decrease to "the mixed experience with this type of collaboration", in particular, the concern among IDRC Program Officers that such projects are very "labour intensive".

Over a quarter of persons interviewed indicated that they had discussed or worked with the other agency on collaborative projects. Forty percent of survey respondents indicated that they had worked on collaborative projects, while two thirds said that they had discussed the possibility.

Possibly the most typical kind of collaboration on projects is when CIDA project funding follows IDRC-sponsored research (defined as complementary projects). Some examples include:

- IDRC research in Senegal on the use of peat as a source of energy. This led to a request from the Senegalese government for follow up support from CIDA in the form of project funding.
- In Tanzania, decisions on a CIDA project were held up until the results of IDRC research on the use of phosphates in agriculture was completed. The research results provided a basis for CIDA to proceed with the project.
- In the Snow and Ice project in Pakistan, IDRC successfully undertook a pilot project to develop technology for hydrological forecasting in high glacial areas. CIDA supported wider application of this technology at a scale beyond the resources of IDRC.

¹

Joint projects are those projects whereby one of the organizations administers money on the other's behalf. In most instances, IDRC is administering CIDA's contribution to a project.

Parallel projects are those where IDRC and CIDA fund the same project or recipient separately.

Complementary projects are developed by one organization as a result of an activity or project supported by the other organization.

- The design for the Flying Fish Project in the Caribbean was based on IDRC research. It was supported by CIDA and implemented by ICOD.

Other examples of collaborative project involvement include:

- A number of initiatives relating to information systems, including TECHNUNET in Asia and work on debt management systems in Africa. In the case of TECHNUNET, CIDA involvement followed an IDRC initiative while in the other example, CIDA provided money to IDRC 'up front'.
- Hand pump technology in Sri Lanka.
- A drought and resettlement research project in Ethiopia.
- Support of economic research consortia in Africa and Latin America.
- Post harvest technology implementation systems for grains in Asia.
- Research on slope stability in Brazil.

Appendix E details four specific case studies of different kinds of project collaboration, some of the issues that emerged in these and lessons learned.

With respect to effectiveness, interviewees and survey respondents were asked to comment on the three different types of project collaboration (joint, parallel and complementary), as well as collaboration in strategic planning and informal exchanges. Complementary projects were identified as effective most often by survey respondents and rated second by interviewees. They were given a particularly high rating by IDRC staff who emphasized their value in supporting utilization of research results or making an impact in strengthening developing country institutions. One respondent described CIDA involvement in implementation of research results as "a huge benefit".

Parallel and joint projects were mentioned often as effective mechanisms by both groups of respondents but less frequently than complementary projects. IDRC staff, in particular, were critical of joint projects as a type of collaboration. CIDA's administrative, monitoring and reporting requirements were seen as the greatest obstacles. Several respondents pointed to the new 'Model Contribution Agreement' as a mechanism which should help to ameliorate this concern.

Cross Representation on Committees

Cross representation on committees and the less formal invitation of staff of one agency to attend meetings of the other are undertaken at different levels

and for different reasons. It may be for no other purpose than to ensure information is shared. Or it may be to assist in policy development at the agency, program or project level.

Much of this cross representation exists at a working level between staff in CIDA Branches and IDRC Divisions in Ottawa/Hull. It is increasing between CIDA staff in field offices and their counterparts in IDRC regional offices. However, it also occurs at a senior level. For example the President of CIDA is a member of the Board of IDRC and IDRC's Vice President, Programs is officially a member of CIDA's President's Committee.

Examples of cross representation between CIDA and IDRC include:

- the AIDS committees of both organizations; and
- working groups on the environment, health, education and agriculture.

Some of these committees have focused on internal policy development (e.g. IDRC's participation in the development of CIDA's environment policy). In some areas, such as forestry, CIDA and IDRC staff often attend each other's staff meetings as a way of keeping in touch on each other's activities and sharing information and strategies.

Other committees have involved the development of Canadian positions for international fora (e.g. for the 1992 UN Conference on the Environment and Development) or follow up work from international meetings. An example of the latter is the work of CIDA and IDRC staff on a \$5 million Canadian 'micro-nutrients' initiative which came out of the 1990 United Nation's sponsored 'World Summit for Children'. IDRC's efforts are focused on the research component of this nutrition project.

Another example is the formation of special working committees to address particular issues. Two examples include efforts to define roles and responsibilities in agricultural research and development of a Model Contribution Agreement to facilitate joint projects.

A quarter of the persons interviewed and thirty percent of survey respondents indicated that they had been involved in this kind of formal institutional linkage.

A number of respondents spoke of the importance of collaboration being focused in the field. Decentralization within both organizations was seen as a factor which has helped advance collaboration at this level. Efforts to enhance collaboration in the field have

included IDRC staff attending **CIDA Field Representatives Meetings** and CIDA staff attending **IDRC Annual Regional Meetings**.

Those who commented on these meetings saw them as mainly having been used to exchange information. Cross-representation was described as less institutionalized or regular in some regions than others. Several individuals said that a more systematic discussion of potential collaboration at these meetings would yield greater benefits.

Comments were made during the review on a number of mechanisms associated with the headquarters of both organizations. One such mechanism is the **Project Review Committee** (PRC) of both organizations. Prior to the IDRC PRC meetings, the responsible staff member from CIDA circulates information on IDRC projects to relevant CIDA program staff for comment.

Several respondents commented that CIDA's input to the PRC was valuable as a means of information sharing. However, it was also pointed out that there are problems in getting input from the CIDA Desks, and in particular the decentralized offices in time for the meetings.

The Liaison Officer attends CIDA's PRC meetings when relevant and circulates documents in advance to appropriate IDRC staff. IDRC representation is intended to ensure that there is no overlap between organizations. Where interests do intersect, the Liaison Officer seeks to ensure that consultation takes place and options for collaboration are considered.

In general, participation in the PRCs was not given a high priority nor seen as a particularly valuable or effective mechanism for collaboration by most people.

A number of respondents commented on the senior management committees/boards of the two organizations. Those who commented on **CIDA's President's Committee** felt that IDRC should be represented on the committee at a senior level. (The Liaison Officer usually attends on IDRC's behalf.) Generally speaking, the committee was not seen as being used in an effective manner as a mechanism for collaboration. Similarly, **IDRC's Board of Governors** was not seen as having played a significant role in advancing discussions on collaboration.

Joint Participation in International Fora

CIDA and IDRC staff often participate in international fora and frequently find themselves at the same conferences or seminars. Recent examples include:

- the 'Education for All' conference in Thailand (1990);

- also in the area of education, CIDA and IDRC are members of a Canadian Task Force which is developing a position on international higher education for an upcoming World Bank meeting; and
- CIDA and IDRC staff are both involved in planning for the UN conference on the environment and development which will be held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992.

Staff from both organizations also participate regularly in the meetings of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (see Appendix E).

Those who have participated in such fora give them a high rating in terms of benefits from collaboration. Joint participation is seen as a valuable opportunity for cooperation between CIDA and IDRC as well as enhancing the quality of Canadian representation at such meetings.

Strategic Planning

This type of collaboration has two different aspects. The first is collaboration of one agency in the strategic planning of the other. The second is strategic planning related to collaboration itself.

With respect to the first, instances of collaboration between CIDA and IDRC at a strategic planning and policy level are not very common. Membership of the President of CIDA on IDRC's Board and senior level representation of IDRC on CIDA's President's Committee are points at which each can contribute to the policy development of the other. However, the extent to which this occurs is not obvious.

There are more examples of collaboration between IDRC Divisions and CIDA Branches on strategic planning related to programming or policy development. They include:

- IDRC involvement in the development of CIDA's policy on the environment; and
- participation of an IDRC officer in the Philippines Country Program Review (CPR).

This type of collaboration recognizes and allows each organization to draw on the specialized expertise, experience and contacts of the other. A number of respondents saw that IDRC could play a useful resourcing role for CIDA in this area. Particular sectors mentioned were health, education and the environment, where IDRC had particular expertise, a more detailed involvement and a better corporate memory and information resource base.

The second type of collaboration in strategic planning relates to planning of collaboration itself. This issue has emerged at different times as important. A number of efforts in this regard include:

- the review of opportunities for collaboration in the early 1980s;
- follow up to the 1987 Winegard Report which highlighted a need for further effort in a number of areas;
- the annual 'State of Collaboration' report by the Liaison Officer which provides another opportunity to identify new directions;
- the 1990 'Working Luncheon' of senior executives which explored different dimensions of collaboration;
- the current evaluation of collaboration; and
- at a regional level, establishment of focal points and cross representation in meetings have the potential for a closer planning of efforts in particular regions and countries.

Most of these examples are ad hoc and require someone to be taking an initiative to ensure discussion of collaboration takes place.

Strategic planning was given the lowest rating by interviewees among the types of collaboration in terms of its 'effectiveness', although over half of survey respondents considered it an effective form of collaboration. For many, the low rating was not a criticism of the concept of collaboration in strategic planning exercises, but rather, it reflected a sense that not enough had been done in this area.

A large number of respondents stated that if CIDA and IDRC wish to collaborate more effectively, there is a need for greater involvement at some point in each other's strategic planning processes. Such involvement was seen as an important means of identifying specific prospects for collaboration.

On a more cautionary note, several respondents, from CIDA and IDRC, expressed the view that closer collaboration in strategic planning exercises could jeopardize IDRC autonomy. This view was rejected by an equal number of respondents.

A number of respondents suggested that, in the future **IDRC involvement in CIDA's Country Policy Framework** (CPF) would be an appropriate 'point of entry' for discussions on possible collaboration. The type of collaboration proposed would go beyond IDRC staff simply consulting on development of a CIDA CPF. Discussions at this

stage would include active consideration of prospects for collaboration between CIDA and IDRC within a specific country program.

Information Exchange

Information exchange takes place at many levels and may be formal or informal. All collaboration rests on an understanding by each organization of what the other is doing, where there might be common or overlapping interests and potential benefits from working more closely together. Many of the mechanisms to support collaboration (these are discussed in more detail in section 3.4) have been put in place to promote regular communication and systematic exchange of information.

Information exchange between CIDA and IDRC takes many forms including the exchange of documents, participation in meetings, discussions between colleagues and special events.

The importance of effective information exchange was highlighted in the comments received in the survey. Nearly half the respondents indicated that there was a need for more meetings, discussion and communication, while thirty percent suggested better distribution and targeting of information. The survey also highlighted that distribution systems for information, particularly within some parts of CIDA may need improvement.

3.2.2 Findings: Obstacles to Collaboration

Interview and survey respondents were asked to identify the main obstacles to collaboration between CIDA and IDRC. Among the main obstacles noted by persons interviewed were the following (listed in order of importance):

- different organizational structures/processes (e.g. differences in planning cycles, time frames for projects, methods of project management.);
- CIDA's geographic orientation versus IDRC's sectoral orientation;
- differences in types of personnel, professional interests, and attitudes;
- the workload/commitments of officers in both organizations;
- limited understanding of the other organization;
- differences in the scale of operations; and
- frequency of turnover in CIDA staff.

Other obstacles identified included budgetary shifts in CIDA, inadequate information exchange, CIDA's 'political agenda', IDRC fear of CIDA control and differences in relationships with overseas partners (IDRC being seen as more hands off and CIDA more hands on in their respective approaches).

Two other factors were identified as important determinants of effectiveness of collaborative efforts. One mentioned in various ways by a significant number of people was the views of the Presidents of both CIDA and IDRC with respect to collaboration. Those who commented saw this as key in setting the tone for the relationship between the organizations.

The other factor noted was the quality of personal relations between CIDA and IDRC staff. These were seen to vary across the two organizations with strongest links being between sectoral specialists (e.g. Professional Services Branch (PSB) staff in CIDA and their Divisional counterparts in IDRC). Some strong links were noted in the field but these seemed to vary by region and in response to various factors such as proximity of the IDRC and CIDA offices, quality of personal relationships and history of involvement in collaborative initiatives.

The weakest links were seen to be between IDRC Program Officers and CIDA's bilateral desks. According to respondents, the main reasons are differences in 'types of personnel' and their management responsibilities, and the frustrations IDRC officers encounter in trying to access the CIDA bilateral pipeline.

Survey respondents noted a similar range of obstacles. 'Differences in structures and organizational approaches' was mentioned by 79% of respondents, including all IDRC respondents. The second most frequently mentioned obstacle among survey respondents was 'different philosophies, mandates and priorities'. Once again, this was referred to more frequently by individuals in IDRC.

Other obstacles reported in the surveys, in order of importance, were: lack of knowledge or understanding about the other organization, personal attitudes or relationships, resource constraints and insufficient joint planning.

3.2.3 Analysis

Available documentation, interviews and survey findings indicate that there is a long history of collaboration between CIDA and IDRC. There are many examples of collaboration between the two organizations across the different 'types' of collaboration. The following analysis identifies some of the key issues associated with different types of collaboration.

Informal Exchanges

Informal exchanges are described as the most successful collaborative mechanism, particularly at headquarters level where there is a greater history of contact. The high ranking of 'informal exchanges' can be attributed, in part, to the fact that they are frequently rooted in long standing personal or professional relationships.

They are minimally demanding and can bear fruit in various ways, including development of project ideas, identification of funding sources, exchange of information on sectoral or regional matters and provision of expert opinion. They can also help in dealing with bureaucratic procedures or smoothing the waters when official approval is required for a particular initiative.

Collaboration on Projects

Joint projects can be difficult to negotiate because of the different structures, procedures and requirements of both parties. They may be complex and time consuming. However, the history of joint projects, for example BAIF (see Appendix E) or the Economic Research Consortium in Peru, suggests that they can be successful and fashioned for the benefit of both organizations and developing country partners. Efforts have been made to overcome difficulties through the Model Contribution Agreement which should help to assure that the benefits of collaborating in this manner will continue.

Recent reports by the Liaison Officer suggest that **parallel projects** are the preferred form of project collaboration between CIDA and IDRC. One of the main reasons for this appears to be that they allow both organizations to fund the same project or organization with a minimum of negotiation or reporting. However, the effort required will depend on the nature of the project and the form of collaboration.

In the case studies in Appendix E, the SADCC/ICRISAT Small Grains Improvement Program does not require a lot of effort; the funding of the CGIAR and the International Agricultural Research Centres requires more. It is important that in such projects, there is an adequate level of consultation and information exchange, as a change in commitment of one may affect the sustainability of the project and the contribution of the other.

The analysis of this evaluation would suggest that **complementary projects** are the preferred form of project collaboration. They are particularly valued by IDRC staff when CIDA support follows an IDRC-sponsored research project. Such support can be directed towards implementation of research results or support to enhance the capacity of a local institution. Other variants of complementary projects include IDRC research in advance of a CIDA initiative or CIDA capital investment preceding an IDRC project.

However, there are examples of successful ventures in all three categories which suggest that each has a role to play in promoting the individual and joint interests of CIDA and IDRC. This success is based on many factors, from individual persistence, to organizational flexibility and coincidence of interests.

Cross Representation on Committees

Working groups and special committees seem to represent some of the most positive exchanges between staff of the two organizations. They

often emerge out of informal contacts between staff or in response to a particular need. They are likely to continue to come into existence as need arises and do not require any greater formalization or institutionalization.

Increasing use has been made of **Regional Meetings** (CIDA Field Representatives Meetings/IDRC Annual Regional Meetings) as fora for cooperation between CIDA and IDRC in the field. The experience to date has been generally positive although uneven across regions. Nevertheless, it can be said that the basis has been set for further development.

However, if CIDA and IDRC wish to focus their collaboration in the field, it may be worthwhile to reassess the role regional meetings can play in this respect. Questions which should be addressed include: the desired output of such fora (e.g. information exchange or identification of prospective collaborative undertakings) and the relationship of such discussions to other decision-making or consultative processes (e.g. CIDA's 'Country Policy Framework' process).

Participation in **Project Review Committees** is another example of cross-representation. It is not seen as an effective mechanism possibly because expectations are greater than is realistic or because most staff of the agencies are not actively involved in it. In theory, CIDA input into IDRC project planning at this stage could be valuable in identifying possibilities for follow up to IDRC research. Shortcomings reflect problems in information flow but may as well indicate limited commitment to these committees as a mechanism for collaboration.

CIDA' President's Committee and **IDRC's Board of Governors** are examples of cross-representation at the highest levels of both organizations. The potential for the Board, as with CIDA's President's Committee, would seem to be in the area of providing policy direction with respect to collaboration. Neither seem to have been used for that purpose.

A specific concern expressed with IDRC representation on CIDA's President's Committee was that of appropriate representation. The CIDA/IDRC Liaison Officer usually sits on the committee as the designate for IDRC's Vice President, Programs and is seen by many as not at a senior enough level to be representing IDRC on the President's Committee.

Joint Participation in International Fora

CIDA and IDRC have jointly participated in a number of **international fora**. One of the common benefits in this type of collaboration is the quality of Canadian representation brought to international meetings and the status and influence that are gained as a result. Collaboration in the CGIAR is a good example of this. CIDA and IDRC staff also benefit from the exchange of views with their Canadian colleagues.

Strategic Planning

The issue of collaboration in strategic planning is one of the more difficult issues to address. Of the people surveyed and interviewed during this evaluation, some felt strongly that the organizations should work to bring their planning and policy processes together whether it be in terms of sectoral policy or country programs. They saw much greater opportunities for collaboration resulting from such actions. Others felt equally strongly that the agencies have different mandates and were established as distinct entities for good reasons. Some wanted to jealously guard their agency's independence and right to operate where and how they thought appropriate.

It is important to recognize that each agency has a different mandate and imperatives which will mean that they work in different ways, in different places and with different partners. But this does not mean that they can not work together effectively. The level of collaboration on projects and in other areas indicates that there is a substantial convergence of interests. Collaboration in these areas does not seem to have undermined the integrity of either organization so far.

A strong argument for collaboration in strategic planning and policy development is that each agency has specialist expertise that the other can use. Whether it is in agricultural development, macro economic analysis or computer technology, the demand for greater impact from the aid dollar suggests each should look to the other as a resource in terms of intellectual or practical knowledge. The question for both organizations is one of how much they are willing to offer to each other in terms of resources for strategic planning and what the 'payoff' should be.

Closer collaboration at a strategic planning level may bring greater benefits in terms of developmental, humanitarian, political or commercial objectives. IDRC Involvement in CIDA's Country Policy Framework Process could be a means of increasing effectiveness of collaboration between the two agencies at the strategic level. The advantage of bringing IDRC into CIDA's CPF process is that it could help to identify prospects for collaboration at a key stage in the CIDA planning process.

However, there are several challenges: IDRC operates regionally and focuses its planning in the field; IDRC's planning cycle operates on a shorter time frame than CIDA's, and; IDRC attempts to respond to project requests in the field.

With respect to the second type of 'strategic planning' (i.e. planning collaboration), many respondents noted that additional selective interventions in each organization's strategic planning processes would be beneficial in determining prospective areas of collaboration.

Such 'strategic planning' could take place at any of a number of levels (e.g. CIDA President's Committee, the IDRC Board of Governors, regional meetings, joint staff meetings etc.). The type of forum would, of course, determine the nature of the strategic planning which could range from policy directions regarding collaboration to strategizing on operational details.

Information Exchange

Good information exchange is fundamental to identifying and undertaking collaborative activities. The issue is one of the right people getting the information they need to enable them to pursue opportunities for collaboration.

A system of information exchange between the agencies has been put in place and various mechanisms developed to provide information on CIDA to IDRC and vice versa.

The various approaches include meetings between staff to encourage informal contacts, information seminars, dissemination of audio-visual and printed material, cross-representation on committees, establishment of focal points for information, provision of a staff person (the Liaison Officer), etc.

However, this study has identified some weaknesses, particularly in the internal dissemination of information. This suggests that it would not be wise to rely on any one information system to ensure good information exchange. Promotion of a variety of means to share and obtain information is thus important.

The question which the agencies need to address is which mechanisms are effective and how many resources they want to apply to the task. These questions will be addressed in sections 3.3 and 3.4.

3.2.4 Conclusions

In considering future directions for cooperation, CIDA and IDRC should not disregard any of the current 'types' of collaboration. Each has its own merits and can provide benefits to both agencies as well as overseas partners. There is not necessarily any single 'best' type of or approach to collaboration. Rather there are a variety of possibilities, each of which has its particular strengths and weaknesses.

However, a number of key factors have emerged as important in influencing the outcomes of any kind of collaborative activity. At the individual level, motivation, initiative, and good personal relationships are important. At the organizational level, common priorities and interests and the availability of resources have often been the key ingredients.

The effectiveness of collaboration in various projects, working groups and joint representation at international meetings attests to the potential for collaboration when the conditions noted above exist. Other examples such as participation in Project Review Committees and some of the regional meetings have been less successful either because there has not been the commitment, they have not been seen as offering particular benefits to one organization or the other, or there has not been sufficient feedback from them.

The record also shows that the long list of obstacles to collaboration (different structures, geographic vs sectoral orientations, etc.), has not precluded a significant history of cooperation on projects and exchange of expertise, experience and information. This implies that despite the existence of many obstacles, officers of both organizations see real benefits in collaboration and have found meaningful ways to cooperate.

A number of structural obstacles have been addressed through, for example, agreement on the MCA and the use of 'focal points' and regional meetings as a basis of bringing the organizations together on a common geographical basis.

Other obstacles are cultural or reflect different styles and attitudes. These can only be addressed through personal contact, information exchange and occasional 'get togethers' (e.g. seminars, luncheons, social gatherings) aimed at bringing staff from the two organizations into contact with one another.

Strategic planning exercises also have an important role to play in helping to define areas of mutual interest and potential cooperation. As the responses indicate, this type of collaboration has not been fully utilized.

The findings suggest that cooperation between CIDA and IDRC will be most effective if three conditions are met :

- personal contacts continue to be encouraged;
- information exchange systems are sustained; and
- a baseline of institutionalized contact exists.

Two other pre-conditions would help facilitate more effective collaboration. These are:

- more effective involvement by CIDA and IDRC staff in joint strategic planning exercises; and,
- articulation by senior management of a clear strategy defining the objectives of the relationship between the two agencies.

The overall objectives of collaboration should be reviewed at a senior level annually followed by a statement of direction which could articulate priorities for the following year. This could be done through any of a number of mechanisms ranging from CIDA's President's Committee and IDRC's Board, to annual meetings between the Presidents of the two organizations.

3.3 SPECIFIC MECHANISMS TO SUPPORT COLLABORATION

3.3.1 Findings

A variety of mechanisms have been established to develop and maintain collaboration between CIDA and IDRC. The main ones include a system of regular exchange of information, a handbook on collaboration, focal or contact points in the field and the Model Contribution Agreement. In addition, there have been periodic meetings, workshops and seminars organized to facilitate contact between staff and to share information.

The evaluation has also identified a number of mechanisms which could promote collaboration in the future. These include staff exchanges, further development of information technology systems, use of Canada Funds and the Umbrella Agreement.

Both current and potential mechanisms are discussed below.

Information Exchange Systems

A number of individuals commented on achievements in the area of **information exchange systems**. Mainly through the efforts of the Liaison Officer, a system for the exchange of key documents has been established between CIDA and IDRC. For example, IDRC sends to CIDA headquarters and decentralized offices a variety of documents, including : IDRC Annual Reports, IDRC Country Booklets, IDRC strategic and policy documents considered by its Board, project summaries, IDRC publications, Annual Regional Staff Meeting Reports and evaluation abstracts.

In turn, IDRC receives the following CIDA documents : CIDA's Annual Report, telephone directories for headquarters staff, project documents received by CIDA's PRC (over

\$ 5 million), strategic documents presented to the President's Committee and CIDA Country Profiles.

Survey responses indicated that information was often not getting to people for whom it was intended. In particular, many people in CIDA field offices did not know about or had not seen either the Model Contribution Agreement or the Handbook on Collaboration.

CIDA and IDRC are also both users of MINISIS, a data base management system developed by IDRC 15 years ago. Through MINISIS, both organizations can access the International Development Research Information System (IDRIS) and the Development Data Base (DDB), two data bases with a broad range of information on international development projects.

A number of people saw the potential for a greater exchange of information through computerized information systems. As long as the systems in each agency were compatible, a wide range of data could be accessed directly. Currently individuals can communicate with each other via their LAN networks using the ENVOY system.

CIDA/IDRC Contact Points in the Field

IDRC Deputy Regional Directors in Latin America and the Caribbean, Eastern and Southern Africa and Asia have been designated as the **focal points** for dealings with CIDA in the field. Similarly, senior CIDA staff members in some of the decentralized posts, usually individuals at the Director level, have been identified as the contact point for dealings with IDRC. Efforts have been made by the Liaison Officer to expand this concept.

These 'focal points' are seen as having facilitated information exchange, providing an entry point to the other organization and enhancing the quality of exchanges at regional meetings. Factors which were seen as limiting the effectiveness of these roles included: time (i.e. other commitments), the limited resources available to promote collaboration, and in some cases geography (distance between CIDA/IDRC regional offices or differences in country/regional priorities). Given these constraints, the Liaison Officer has played an important resourcing role for the 'focal points'.

This mechanism is relatively new but seems to have already borne fruit, particularly in representation at CIDA and IDRC regional meetings. In Latin America, IDRC's Deputy Director also attends CIDA's Project Review Committee meetings in Costa Rica. Other attempts, through these Officers, to systematically identify mutual areas of interest or possible collaboration have been documented.

Handbook on Collaboration

Handbooks on CIDA and IDRC Collaboration have been distributed to 550 program staff in both organizations. They provide background on both organizations (programs, organizational structures, etc.) as well as details on collaborative mechanisms and how to go about collaboration on projects. They also include a copy of the Model Contribution Agreement.

Approximately sixty percent of survey respondents had a copy or had seen one. A very high percentage of staff from IDRC had read or been exposed to the Handbooks. The levels of exposure were significantly lower for CIDA decentralized staff which suggests that there is a distribution problem within CIDA, particularly within the decentralized offices.

Although some people found the Handbooks large and cumbersome, they were generally seen as a useful base of information for those contemplating some type of collaboration or simply seeking information on the other organization. A number of suggestions were made on how they might be improved. These ranged from increasing the coverage, to addressing collaboration at a policy level in more detail, inclusion of a list of agency personnel and their positions, and putting the handbook on the LAN or diskette (see Appendix C, question 10).

Model Contribution Agreement

The Model Contribution Agreement (MCA), which was signed in 1990, is an effort to remedy some of the concerns associated with collaborative projects by simplifying the process and addressing some of the underlying tensions that often surfaced, such as how to deal with the other organization's procedures and requirements and issues of accountability and partnership.

Survey results suggest that CIDA staff, most notably those in decentralized posts and IDRC staff in Ottawa, are not well informed about the MCA. This is despite the fact that both the MCA and information about it were widely distributed.

Because it is relatively recent, few staff have had a chance to apply it. About thirty percent of survey respondents believed it would make collaboration at the project level easier, while fifty-five percent did not know.

Meetings, Seminars and Workshops

Informal exchanges have already been acknowledged as very important. More formal meetings and 'get togethers' were also acknowledged as important in the evaluation. Joint seminars, luncheons and information sessions have

been arranged periodically by the Liaison Officer for CIDA and IDRC staff as a means of enhancing mutual understanding and facilitating contacts. Recent examples include:

- the October 1990 'IDRC/CIDA Working Luncheon' involving senior managers from the two organizations;
- a seminar on 'the Peruvian Economic Crisis'; and
- a seminar held at CIDA entitled 'What is IDRC?'

Forums on collaboration have also been arranged in the regions, primarily by the Liaison Officer, during field visits.

These sessions generally elicited positive responses from staff of both organizations. In many cases, this kind of forum provided the first link which led to later collaboration at one level or another. Nevertheless, about half the survey respondents listed more meetings, discussions and communication among their suggestions on how to improve collaboration in the future.

Several respondents suggested that regular **meetings between IDRC Regional Directors and their regional counterparts at the Vice President level in CIDA** would provide an effective forum to discuss collaboration. It was suggested that such meetings could be held once a year during the IDRC Regional Directors' visits to Ottawa. Others saw problems with this proposal as they did not think the CIDA Branch Vice-Presidents were the right contacts. An alternative proposal suggested was to have the IDRC Regional Directors meet once a year with their counterpart CIDA Country Program Directors.

Staff Exchanges

The greater use of staff exchanges to promote collaboration was highlighted in the Winegard report in 1987. In response, this issue has been discussed a number of times by the Human Resources Division in IDRC and Personnel Branch in CIDA. Meetings in 1990 looked at the possibility of establishing a staff exchange or secondment scheme between both organizations. It was agreed that the two organizations would share information about job vacancies and look at prospects for secondment on a case-by-case basis.

Among the 94 survey respondents, only two IDRC staff indicated having worked for CIDA before while only one person from CIDA had previously been employed by IDRC. Five or six other examples were identified in the interviews, but none of these were 'arranged' per se or conceived as part of a strategy to improve understanding between the two organizations.

Several obstacles to greater success in exchanges can be noted. The first is the fact that, by and large, the two organizations recruit different types of personnel. A second obstacle is that very few positions have become available within CIDA over the last few years.

Canada Fund

Several respondents noted the potential for IDRC using the Canada Fund more as a support mechanism. As one individual commented, "it's everything CIDA is not ... quick, flexible." The amounts of money available through the fund are more in line with the scale of IDRC undertakings as opposed to the larger size of CIDA projects.

Umbrella Agreement

IDRC's Latin America Regional Office and CIDA's America's Branch are exploring the possibility of establishing a research and development umbrella program. The program would fund small to medium size initiatives at the pilot or demonstration stage.

While details of the proposal are still being worked out, a number of respondents spoke positively of the prospect of replicating the agreement in other regions. If successful in Latin America, this could be a valuable mechanism for collaboration between the two organizations in other regions.

3.3.2 Analysis

The range of mechanisms to support collaboration mentioned above demonstrate the attempts that have been made to overcome structural and cultural barriers between the two agencies and to facilitate collaboration where common interests exist. As a basis, each organization needs to know what the other is doing and be aware of its mandate, priorities and programs. Mechanisms which keep each organization informed are thus fundamentally important.

While indications are that the material being circulated is seen as important, there is room for improvement with respect to distribution and the form in which it is made available.

Often individuals working on program or project development, need quite specific data, not general policy or program statements. A greater exchange of raw material from the data bases of each organization would respond to this need. To date CIDA has not participated in IDRIS. If it did, this would help IDRC staff to have quicker access to information on possible areas of collaboration or common interest. It would also help ensure that duplication between the two organizations is minimized.

IDRC has been looking at options for making IDRIS available overseas via the LAN system or by diskette. At this point these discussions have not extended to the question of CIDA access overseas. Increased access by CIDA staff to IDRIS and DDB in the field might be a useful aid in deliberations on prospective projects.

IDRC has an extensive library which could be of value to CIDA staff. Development of compatible computerized information systems would make this information more accessible to CIDA staff and vice versa. There is thus a need for some collaboration in the development of information systems and data bases.

A further example where collaboration could be valuable is in the development of the MINISIS software, which is now used by a number of donor agencies as well as developing countries. It is in both CIDA's and IDRC's interests to ensure this technology continues to be used, thus contributing to greater collaboration at an international level.

But information systems are not enough. This evaluation has shown that **personal relationships** are an important means of sharing information. They are also important in initiating and facilitating collaborative ventures. While much can be achieved informally, there is a need for mechanisms to put people in touch with one another. **Seminars, luncheons and colloquia** have been a valued mechanism for sharing of information and networking. While easier to organize in Ottawa/Hull, they also have an important role to play in the regions. CIDA/IDRC regional staff meetings have served as a vehicle for this type of exchange.

This mechanism should continue to be supported as a means of keeping both organizations informed about developments of mutual interest and of promoting contact between staff of the agencies. It is relatively low cost and non labour intensive, particularly in Canada.

Given the geographical distances between CIDA and IDRC field offices, and the increasing emphasis on decentralization, efforts have been made to strengthen collaboration by the identification of **'focal' points**. This mechanism would seem to be appropriate but requires a commitment on the part of both agencies to earmark staff and financial resources in order to initiate and sustain contacts. The focal point can play a valuable role in keeping staff informed about relevant program and policy developments in the other agency, staff movements, etc. Such a role should be institutionalized to the extent that it becomes part of an individual's job description and the field office's budget.

Another potential mechanism proposed was that of **Annual Meetings of IDRC Regional Directors and CIDA Regional Vice Presidents**. Possible shortcomings with this mechanism could be the limited financial authority of IDRC Regional Directors, as compared to IDRC Divisional Directors, and the limited direct involvement of CIDA Vice-Presidents in specific programming or project decisions in their region of responsibility.

To a large extent this suggestion reflects a need expressed by some staff for a greater awareness of and commitment to collaboration at the senior management level. By and large, this evaluation did not find any notable resistance to collaboration from senior managers. In fact, most surveyed were very much in favour of it, if pursued judiciously. The sentiments expressed may thus reflect past experience.

It does however, suggest that managers need to promote collaboration among their staff. Some form of regular meetings, such as the working luncheon held in 1990 whereby senior managers of both organizations can discuss strategic directions for collaboration may thus be a useful mechanism to promote collaboration in the future, particularly in light of changes taking place in both agencies.

A number of potential mechanism have been mentioned above. Staff exchanges would seem to be useful as long as appropriate people can be placed in appropriate positions. Mechanisms for exchanges or secondments between the public and private sector exist and should be used. An alternative approach would be short term secondments to work within the other agency on a specific task. Examples could include placements in divisions dealing with planning and evaluation, social sciences and macro-economics.

New mechanisms for collaboration, such as the umbrella agreement, could promote effective collaboration. However, each should be closely monitored and evaluated to assess their worth and the usefulness of wider application.

3.3.3 Conclusions

The evaluation has found that all of the mechanisms discussed above have merit. Some have been more successful than others; some have been easier to implement than others.

In considering future directions for collaboration, it's important to avoid overloading both organizations with excessive 'mechanisms'. As one respondent in the evaluation commented, "We have the capacity to swamp one another". CIDA and IDRC should make sure that collaboration is not pushed beyond the point of utility. Both organizations will have to scrutinize which mechanisms would be most effective in ensuring its objectives are met.

Continued support for seminars and information sessions in Ottawa/Hull and in the field, for example, would seem to be important to increase understanding in both organization, present opportunities for networking and professional exchange and identifying prospective areas for future cooperation.

Staff exchanges represent another means of increasing understanding between the two organizations. They could also yield benefits in terms of professional development and filling gaps in expertise in CIDA or IDRC.

Some of the mechanisms to support collaboration which have been put in place (e.g. the focal points and the MCA) have helped relationships between CIDA and IDRC and should continue to do so. Mechanisms such as the 'umbrella agreement' in Latin America which have the potential to provide benefits to both organizations, as well as overseas partners, without making significant demands on either CIDA's or IDRC's human resources, should be encouraged.

Each mechanism has a cost in terms of time, energy and money and its value should be judged in light of these considerations and with a view to its potential benefit. Particularly in the area of information exchange, seminars and meetings, it is important to target this to a specific audience and be selective in the type and quantity of information provided. It is suggested that there is a need to review the types and distribution of material in terms of who needs to know what and how this dissemination strategy fits in with other mechanisms which provide information.

In many respects the various mechanisms provide a basis on which future collaboration can be built. Not all mechanisms will be self-sustaining and some will need continued organizational support. Both organizations now have to decide, in the context of a changing developing world, decentralization, and impending organizational change, what effort and resources need be put into the various mechanisms.

This section has not given particular regard to the role the Liaison Officers have played in helping to establish, strengthen and maintain these various mechanisms. The next section will look at the current CIDA/IDRC liaison function and future needs in this area.

3.4 CIDA/IDRC LIAISON FUNCTION

3.4.1 Findings

The liaison function has existed as a full time position since 1983. For the first five years, IDRC funded and staffed the position. In recent years there has been an IDRC staff person in the position with funding by CIDA. The officer has had offices in both IDRC and CIDA and been a key contact point for people of both agencies interested in collaboration.

Important roles have included assessing trends and identification of opportunities for collaboration, establishing mechanisms to support collaboration, monitoring collaboration

between the two organizations and being the corporate memory on collaborative issues. The task has been one of initiating, motivating and supporting.

Interviewees were asked to comment on the importance of the Liaison Officer position in promoting and encouraging collaboration, as well as the value of maintaining the role. Survey respondents were asked about frequency of contact with the Liaison Officer and how such contact had assisted them in their dealings with CIDA/IDRC.

Two thirds of those who commented on the Liaison Officer role gave a generally positive assessment. Particular note was made of the role of the Liaison Officer in providing information on CIDA and IDRC and facilitating contacts in the field. Beyond that, interview respondents offered a variety of views as to how they felt the Liaison Officer does or should act as a bridge between the two organizations.

Some spoke of a greater role at the policy or planning stages (e.g. facilitating input for CIDA's CPRs), some focused on establishing mechanisms for collaboration such as the Model Contribution Agreement while others saw the Liaison Officer as someone to explain the complexities of the other organization and help facilitate initial contacts.

The survey responses showed a lower level of contact with the Liaison Officer among CIDA staff, particularly those at headquarters. Overall two-thirds of survey respondents described their contact with the Liaison Officer as helpful. Overseas staff of both CIDA and IDRC gave higher ratings than headquarters staff as to usefulness. Responses from headquarters staff can be explained by the fact that many initiate contact with the other organization themselves.

Most respondents felt that there would be a continuing need for the position. A smaller number were either uncertain or suggested that the future of the position should be assessed in light of the organizational changes being considered by both CIDA and IDRC.

One concern voiced has been the role of the Liaison Officer as de facto representative of IDRC on CIDA's President's Committee and PRC. Some see this as going against the 'neutrality' of the position and giving credence to the view of the Liaison Officer 'belonging' to IDRC rather than CIDA and IDRC.

Many of the mechanisms discussed in the last section have come into existence largely through the efforts of the Liaison Officers (e.g. focal points, the MCA and the handbooks on collaboration). An issue for this evaluation is whether a full time Liaison Officer is needed to maintain liaison between CIDA and IDRC or whether sufficient mechanisms are now in place for collaboration to continue at its own pace.

3.4.2 Analysis

The scale and scope of collaborative ventures between CIDA and IDRC indicate a substantial commitment of time, energy and financial resources by individuals, divisions and branches of both organizations. This cannot be measured in definitive terms.

The liaison function could be defined as one of those activities which has been undertaken specifically to develop and maintain contact and information flows between the two organizations. It is expressed in the form of the Liaison Officer position which represents the personnel and financial commitment by the organizations to promote and support collaboration.

The primary issue discussed here, is what specific resources are needed in the future, both with respect to personnel and finance, to maintain collaboration at a desired level. What aspects of the liaison function are still needed and is a Liaison Officer still required to service these, or has collaboration been sufficiently institutionalized that these functions will sustain themselves?

Two main points can be drawn from the responses offered on the liaison function:

- the Liaison Officers have served a valuable role in advancing the quality and level of collaboration between the two agencies; and
- the perceptions of the function and thus the appropriate role for the Liaison Officer vary across both organizations.

The positive assessments by the majority of survey respondents reflect the wide range of activities the Liaison Officers have either initiated or been involved in. Many initiatives, such as establishing a system for exchange of information or focal points in the field, would not have got off the ground or developed without the efforts of these officers.

The spectrum of views regarding appropriate roles indicates a mandate which has been necessarily very broad in scope. While this has paid dividends, especially in the developmental stages of collaboration, the function has become more focused over time, targeting a smaller number of initiatives. Nevertheless, there is an expectation to be all things to all people and this is one of the occupational hazards of the job.

Another 'identity' problem is the question of who the Liaison Officer represents. As noted in the findings, the position has been staffed by an IDRC Officer who represents IDRC (e.g. at CIDA's President's Committee) and undertakes work which might logically be assumed by other IDRC officers. This has resulted in a lack of clarity on the role of the Liaison Officer as a **joint** CIDA/IDRC position.

Nevertheless, the Liaison Officers have played a valuable facilitative role in various areas such as projects, bringing staff of both organizations together to discuss possible collaborative efforts. The Officers have also helped to establish mechanisms, such as the MCA, which will make negotiations on future projects easier and quicker.

The effect of several of these initiatives will be a diminished need for the Liaison Officer. Others, such as the handbooks, may require occasional updating and therefore would necessitate commitment of staff within CIDA and/or IDRC for that purpose.

If a decision is made to eliminate the liaison officer position, both organizations will need to identify resources to service mechanisms they wish to retain or risk losing some of the benefits which have been gained. What areas would be affected?

An important role of the Liaison Officer has been the organization of information meetings and seminars both in Ottawa/Hull and in the field. The establishment of focal points in the regions and cross-representation at regional staff meetings would suggest a structure is in place which **could** be self-sustaining as long as there is a regular flow of relevant information from headquarters and other regional offices. However, there is no guarantee that informal or formal seminars and meetings in Ottawa/Hull will take place unless some person has the job of organizing them.

If it's considered important to have an overview of collaboration between the agencies, then such a task would need to be given to someone in the absence of a Liaison Officer. Alternatively, a review of collaboration could be undertaken every few years to assess the effectiveness of current types of collaboration and mechanisms to support it and to identify new areas where efforts might be made.

An information exchange system is in place and should continue without the need for someone monitoring the flow and distribution of information. There is however a risk that these could cease with change of staff, etc. Also, further development of this system would require relevant staff of both organizations to work together.

The absence of a Liaison Officer would not necessarily slow the pace of collaboration in the field. Decentralization, more effective use of focal points, regional meetings and other mechanisms could make up for this absence assuming a flow of necessary information from Ottawa/Hull. Systems are now in place to support collaborative projects without the assistance of a Liaison Officer.

Similarly, joint participation in international fora or involvement in committees which have grown more out of historical relationships between individuals or groups within both agencies should not be affected.

TABLE 1

THE LIAISON OFFICER : PRESENT RESPONSIBILITIES AND FUTURE ALTERNATIVES

PRESENT RESPONSIBILITIES	FUTURE ALTERNATIVES
<p>Representational</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • represents IDRC at CIDA's Project Review Committee and sits as an alternate on CIDA's President's Committee • participates in project negotiations involving both agencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not an appropriate role for a Joint Liaison Officer. Up to IDRC to decide on its representation on CIDA committees. • With various systems in place, e.g. MCA and focal points, the Liaison Officer role would be diminished.
<p>Information Exchange</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • prepares an Annual Report on the state of CIDA/IDRC collaboration • circulates CIDA PRC and President's Committee documentation to IDRC's Divisions and Regional Offices as appropriate • organizes seminars, working luncheons and information sessions in Ottawa/Hull and in the field on collaboration • maintains a data base on collaborative initiatives • publishes and circulates summaries of CIDA/IDRC initiatives • distributes various other materials, e.g. IDRC country profiles to CIDA posts, copies of the CIDA/IDRC Handbook to new employees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A valuable function which may still be wanted. If so, could be done/coordinated by another staff member or a consultant. Each focal point could report annually as could CIDA Branches and IDRC Divisions on major initiatives, successes etc.) • Not necessarily a role for a Liaison Officer. Could be divested to another IDRC Officer. • An important function to be continued. Responsibility would have to be delegated to other officers. • Useful but not essential aspect of corporate memory role. Could be assumed by regional officers or appropriate Divisions/Branches if deemed desirable. • Another corporate memory function which could be considered useful but not essential. • In Ottawa/Hull, would have to be assumed by other staff. In the field, would be a role of focal points.

PRESENT RESPONSIBILITIES	FUTURE ALTERNATIVES
<p>Logistical</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ prepares project and policy documents and briefings for submission to Project Review Committee of IDRC's Board and senior management of CIDA ▪ provides assistance in the preparation of policy studies related to the CIDA/IDRC relationship ▪ encourages and assists in development of joint projects ▪ arranges and assists in meetings between IDRC and CIDA staff in Ottawa/Hull and in the field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not necessarily the role of a Liaison Officer. Could be carried out by other Officers. ▪ If needed, could be done by policy officers with responsibility for linkages with other agencies. ▪ Role would be diminished with strengthening of other mechanisms, e.g. focal points, regional meetings. ▪ In Ottawa/Hull, would have to be assumed by other staff. In the field, would be a role of focal points.
<p>Strategic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ attempts to ensure complementarity of project work by exchanging information and facilitating contacts ▪ promotes better understanding of each organization through field visits to CIDA posts and IDRC regional offices ▪ proposes initiatives to enhance collaboration, e.g. inter-organizational communications, establishment of focal points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Systems should now be in place but may need monitoring and occasional prodding. ▪ Task was initiated by the Liaison Officers. Should now be part of the mandate of the focal points. ▪ Task is essentially completed, although monitoring and occasional support may be required. Could also be addressed by focal points or in annual meetings between Presidents and/or senior officials.
<p>Analytical</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ analyses ODA budget, policy issues and corporate review exercises for IDRC management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not appropriate role for Joint Liaison Officer. Rather the responsibility of an IDRC officer.

Overall, the above suggests that in the absence of a Liaison Officer there would still be a need to manage or oversee aspects of collaboration between the agencies. This would require the commitment of financial and human resources by CIDA and IDRC. At the same time, a number of the main activities previously undertaken by the Liaison Officer could be sustained without additional or re-allocated resources.

The table on the following page outlines the main responsibilities of the Liaison Officer and what would happen in the absence of the position.

The level of support required for any of these mechanisms depends on the output CIDA and IDRC would be seeking from them. Outputs could range from basic information sharing to regularized and in-depth consultations on project development or policy concerns. The greater the output sought the more significant the need for either a Liaison Officer or other institutionalized arrangements which could support these mechanisms.

3.4.3 Conclusions

The CIDA/IDRC Liaison Officers have played an important role in building up and strengthening the relationship between CIDA and IDRC. Largely through the efforts of these Officers, contacts in the field have been improved and mechanisms such as the Model Contribution Agreement have been put in place. These are some of the foundations upon which further collaboration can be built.

Questions remain as to how the liaison function might best be undertaken in the future and whether a Liaison Officer is needed now that some of the foundations for cooperation have been established. It is important to keep in mind that any change in the status of current types of collaboration and mechanisms to support collaboration will affect the resources needed to sustain them. To some extent, questions regarding adequate resources are difficult to answer, given the uncertainty surrounding future directions and priorities for both agencies.

It is however, concluded that a full time Liaison Officer is no longer needed. As shown in Table I, a number of functions are not considered appropriate for such a position and others are potentially redundant given the establishment of institutional mechanisms. A number of functions however, are still considered important and in the absence of a Liaison Officer would need to be carried out by other staff members in CIDA and IDRC.

3.5 IMPACTS OF COLLABORATION

3.5.1 Findings

CIDA and IDRC staff were asked, through interviews and the survey, to comment on the impact of collaboration with respect to their own organization, their personal work and for partner institutions overseas.

The most important impact of collaboration noted (32% of the responses) was the infusion of additional resources. This was seen as an important factor, especially by IDRC personnel, in increasing the impact of projects, e.g. through taking a project beyond research to implementation, strengthening of partner institutions or wider dissemination of research results.

The 'Economic Research Consortium' in Peru was pointed to by a number of respondents as an example of the potential of collaboration. IDRC came to the project with good local contacts but limited financial resources. The involvement of CIDA strengthened the consortium and helped to assure retention of a number of local researchers, many of whom have gone on to become key advisors in the Peruvian government.

For CIDA, the main organizational benefits mentioned were being able to draw on IDRC's expertise as well as the organization's good reputation and extensive network in the developing world. An example of the former is the participation of an IDRC staff person in the development of CIDA's environment and development policy. An example of the latter was the participation of an IDRC officer in the Philippines Country Program Review because of IDRC's knowledge of the country and extensive local contacts.

In the survey, over forty percent of respondents described the benefits of collaboration as either : better quality projects, increased utilization of research or improving the impact of Canadian development assistance. Twenty three percent saw the benefits in terms of increased availability of expertise and information.

Benefits associated with respondents own work were mentioned less frequently by either interviewees or survey respondents. The main ones identified included exchange of information, contact with other international development workers, being exposed to a different perspective, enhanced credibility and plugging into international networks.

The biggest cost of collaboration for both interviewees and survey respondents was 'time'. However, most commented that this 'cost' was to be expected, was not unreasonable and was a necessary investment in any form of collaboration. Others mentioned energy, travel and money as costs of collaboration.

Several negative impacts were noted by respondents. First was the time involved in trying to arrange collaborative efforts - special note was made by IDRC respondents of long negotiations and CIDA's reporting requirements on joint projects. Those who were unhappy about the costs usually had invested a substantial amount of time and energy in trying to set up a collaborative project which had not eventuated. Several respondents reported CIDA backing out of commitments to projects on which they had already been collaborating or on which they had agreed to work with IDRC.

Another concern expressed was the impact of collaboration on IDRC's flexibility or autonomy. This was raised in two different contexts. The first was the requirements demanded by CIDA when IDRC was managing CIDA contributions to a joint project; the second referred to the impact of IDRC being 'too involved' in CIDA's policy development, for example, involvement in Country Program Reviews and whether this tied IDRC to Canadian government aid policy in a particular country.

In terms of benefits for partner country institutions, the primary ones noted by interviewees were the new/additional resources and the implications of that with respect to magnitude of impact and ensuring the sustainability of project work.

A quarter of the survey respondents described the benefits to overseas partners as positive without being particularly specific. Others noted better projects and technology transfer as major impacts. A few commented that there were indirect benefits to developing country partners through improvements in their own organization resulting from collaboration.

A number of interview and survey respondents commented that while collaboration offered many potential benefits and could make a substantial impact with respect to development, these were often not realized.

Overall, most saw the benefits of collaboration outweighing the costs by a significant margin.

3.5.2 Analysis

The responses from the interviews and surveys indicated a positive sense of the impact of collaboration. Staff of both organizations recognized that they were able to achieve more through collaboration than they would have without it. A number of people spoke of the positive impact of successful projects on individuals, communities and institutions in the developing world.

Nevertheless, as noted in the previous section, collaboration is not without costs, such as staff time sitting on committees or working groups, preparation for, travel to and

participation in meetings, investigating possible joint ventures and negotiating agreements.

Joint projects, as one example, can be difficult to negotiate and consume a lot of staff time and energy. Not all negotiations come to fruition in the form of a project. And some projects fall short of objectives because of changing circumstances or shifting priorities of the sponsoring organizations.

If one were to consider all the instances of collaboration, formal and informal, and put a dollar value on it, (including the cost of a full time liaison officer) it would be substantial. The central questions stemming from this for both organizations are : 1) have CIDA and IDRC received value for money in terms of the impact of collaboration, and 2) are the impacts of collaboration greater than what would have been achieved if IDRC and CIDA had acted independently.

Although it is not possible to quantify the costs and benefits of collaboration, the general view of staff of both organizations as presented in this evaluation is that the benefits have outweighed the costs. In the area of projects, there appears to be a synergy from collaboration which ultimately provides a greater benefit for overseas partners. IDRC's involvement in these projects is made more effective by virtue of the financial, management and other resources CIDA brings to them, while CIDA benefits from IDRC's sectoral expertise, international contacts and reputation and the quality of its relationships with local institutions.

There are examples where there is a unique convergence of interests between CIDA and IDRC which could not be achieved by collaboration with other organizations e.g. the Snow and Ice Project in Pakistan and collaboration within the CGIAR. The fact that CIDA and IDRC have collaborated in so many joint, parallel and complementary projects suggests that the benefits are significant and of sufficient value to the organizations that they are willing to invest resources in the process.

The impact or benefit of non-project collaboration is harder to measure, particularly the time spent sitting on committees, working groups and at meetings. However, any collaboration between CIDA and IDRC must be based on knowledge of the mandates, policies, programs and priorities of the other and this requires an investment financially and in terms of human resources. In a time of economic constraint and efforts to be more efficient, the value of various mechanisms needs to be assessed and priority given to those most likely to yield greatest benefits for both organizations and their overseas partners.

3.5.3 Conclusions

There is sufficient evidence from this evaluation and the examples of collaborative projects and other activities studied to conclude that in some areas, IDRC and CIDA can gain more by working together than they would independently. In some cases, it may be easier and more efficient to collaborate with other agencies and both organizations should keep this option open at all times.

To identify and pursue collaborative opportunities requires an investment in terms of information, time, energy and money. The willingness of individual staff members and the organizations themselves to put in resources becomes a judgement call based on the perceived benefits and impacts likely to be achieved. There is a fine line between not enough inputs which could result in missed opportunities and too many which becomes inefficient and a luxury neither organization can afford.

A judicious mix of formal and informal contacts and mechanisms which support collaborative efforts needs to be arrived at to ensure maximum return on both organization's investment.

3.6 CONTEXT AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR FUTURE COLLABORATION

3.6.1 Findings

Respondents were asked 'in what way, if any, will the current or future international development context affect the rationale for CIDA/IDRC collaboration?' They were also asked what opportunities they saw for future collaboration between CIDA and IDRC. Three main issues were identified relating to the future international development context.

First, the reduction in Canadian and global ODA resources was seen as likely to affect the rationale for collaboration (twenty one percent of interview responses mentioned this). Most saw reductions in ODA bringing the two organizations closer together. One respondent suggested that it might cause IDRC to look elsewhere, beyond CIDA, for financial support and prospective partnerships.

Second, as noted earlier, a number of respondents commented on the increasing complexity of development assistance. The result, according to some (fourteen percent of interview responses), is a need to better understand development issues and the process of social change in the developing world. Once again, it was expressed, mainly by CIDA respondents, that this was an area where CIDA could make better use of IDRC's expertise.

A third trend noted in twelve percent of the responses was the movement, particularly in CIDA, away from projects to programs, institutional strengthening and 'policy support' for developing countries, viz a shift towards a more 'macro' approach. This direction was seen as requiring more of the kind of intellectual input that IDRC is capable of offering.

The interviews drew out a variety of responses regarding future opportunities for collaboration between CIDA and IDRC. Both CIDA and IDRC respondents highlighted 'institution strengthening' and 'human resource development' as prospective areas for further collaboration in future.

A number of CIDA respondents spoke of the value of better utilizing IDRC's expertise to help in project/program planning, feasibility studies, project monitoring, policy development, development of country plans etc. Other areas mentioned for overseas collaboration included strengthening of regional organizations, and working together in the health and education sectors.

Several respondents mentioned CIDA 'using' IDRC to facilitate its entry into Indochina. Staff in the region have in fact already discussed IDRC's strategy with respect to Vietnam.

Among survey respondents, the highest percentage, nearly half, recommended better communications as well as more regular meetings and discussions on collaboration. Forty percent pointed to the need for further exploration of opportunities for collaboration and involvement in joint planning exercises.

Forty-three percent of survey respondents suggested a variety of structural changes which might aid collaboration. These ranged from making CIDA a crown corporation, to changing IDRC's country base or transferring CIDA's funds dedicated to research to IDRC.

Many respondents pointed to the change of leadership within IDRC as an opportunity to strengthen cooperation between the two organizations. Dwindling ODA resources and possible downsizing within CIDA and IDRC were seen by survey respondents as factors which could also draw the two organizations closer together, e.g. IDRC playing more of a role as an executing agency for CIDA-financed projects, or CIDA making greater use of IDRC's 'intellectual' resources in various ways.

Most individuals in the survey saw continued collaboration as desirable but recognized the need for a clearer articulation of commitment to it. One person commented that in the absence of clearer directions from the senior levels of both organizations, the relationship will continue to be disparate in nature.

A significant number of respondents remarked that collaboration has to provide benefits for both organizations and that it's important to avoid 'collaboration for collaboration's sake'.

3.6.2 Analysis

The evaluation found that there is a desire at most levels of both organizations to continue collaborating. At the same time, there is a recognition that collaboration should be selective, tapping into the comparative advantage of each organization. This will be particularly important in the future as both organizations face the prospect of working with a diminishing base of financial resources.

A number of areas present themselves as logical candidates for collaborative efforts. Both organizations, for example, are moving towards a more 'macro' approach to development work. CIDA could draw on the expertise and contacts that IDRC has to support their work in economic adjustment and policy support in developing countries. IDRC's experience and relationships with groups in many developing countries could help CIDA develop strategies which are better rooted in an understanding of local conditions and a sense of the implications of alternate approaches.

On the other hand, IDRC's increasing emphasis on implementation of research results begs a closer relationship with CIDA. CIDA is better equipped, resource-wise, to follow through on research initiatives and help ensure that real benefits ensue for developing countries through application or dissemination of research results.

CIDA and IDRC have cooperated, to a limited extent, in the area of computer technology and development of information systems. CIDA could usefully help IDRC develop the MINISIS system to ensure wider use of it by donor agencies as well as in developing among countries. This would facilitate coordination and exchange of information among donors and institutions in developing countries.

There is a further need to look at current data bases to see how they might be developed as tools for information exchange. Collaborative initiatives in this area, as well as development of information systems, would be consistent with and supportive of both organizations' mandates.

3.6.3 Conclusions

The future of collaboration between CIDA and IDRC is likely to be shaped by three main factors:

- 1) changes in the global international development environment
- 2) organizational changes in CIDA and IDRC following completion of current strategic reviews, and
- 3) the commitment of both organizations to work together

Changes in the global international development environment which could affect relations between CIDA and IDRC include the following : diminished ODA resources, greater demands for more specialized expertise and a continuation of a shift from projects to programming and policy support for developing countries.

Each of these changes presents 'opportunities' for CIDA and IDRC to work together. With diminishing ODA resources in Canada and abroad there will be a need for all development organizations to look for strategic links which will allow them to be more effective in fulfilling their mandates. Demands for increasingly specialized expertise and the shifts away from projects also present opportunities for CIDA and IDRC to draw on each other for policy support, technical advice, identification of prospects and in other ways.

While the details of organizational change in CIDA and IDRC remain unclear, it's reasonable to assume that these exercises will lead to some 'downsizing' and attempts to 'do more with less'. This could either lead to an entrenchment mentality or more likely efforts to work more effectively with partner organizations. If it is the latter, once again, opportunities for working together could present themselves.

The third factor noted above (commitment to work together) remains uncertain. It will in some ways be a function of the strategic reviews of each organization and the perceived value of collaboration following changes arising from these exercises.

In summary, opportunities for future collaboration will fundamentally be shaped by broader contextual issues and the commitment to collaboration by senior managers and staff of both organizations.

3.6.4 *Uncertain Future*

As the conclusions above suggest, both CIDA and IDRC are moving into a period of uncertainty. Strategic reviews in both organizations could result in significant shifts in direction for both of them. These changes are unquantifiable at present but one result will be a period of time during which both organizations will discover if the changes bring them closer together or further apart.

CIDA is likely to move towards a more 'macro' approach while IDRC is assessing, among other things, the role of its regional offices. Both will have to look at the nature of their relationships with developing countries. In some cases this will entail a consideration of how to manage the downsizing of some traditional relationships.

The changes which both CIDA and IDRC are likely to undergo should not affect the basic rationale for cooperation. They will, however, determine which of the mechanisms discussed in this report will be appropriate in future and which will not. Senior managers should discuss the various options open to them over the transitional period so that both agencies can optimize their long term effectiveness and ensure complementarity of effort.

4 SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 RATIONALE FOR COLLABORATION

The scale of collaboration between CIDA and IDRC described in this report clearly implies a rationale for the two organizations to work together. While CIDA and IDRC staff interviewed during this study and statements from official documents have expressed this rationale in various ways, its main characteristics could be summarized as: effective use of Canadian ODA, complementarity of mandates, mutual benefit and enhanced developmental impact.

This study has shown that there is a substantial area of overlap and mutual interest in the work of IDRC and CIDA. Both are concerned with Third World development, both have an interest in research for development and the building of local capacity and both have an interest in exploring the relevance of topical issues in development theory and practice, such as women in development, the environment, structural adjustment and sustainability.

That both are sourced from Canadian Official Development Assistance is neither a necessary nor a sufficient reason for them to collaborate. However, given their mutual interest in responding to problems in the developing world, there is a political imperative to cooperate, where appropriate, so that taxpayers' money is well spent.

The areas in which CIDA and IDRC interests intersect is very wide. IDRC's *raison d'être* is to encourage, support and conduct research into problems in the developing world and how the knowledge gained can be applied for the economic and social benefit of those regions. CIDA's mandate is wider, but in order to implement the principles and priorities of Canada's ODA Charter, it cannot avoid an interest in research associated with development. It undertakes and supports research so that its response to development problems is appropriate as well as to develop the ability of people and institutions in developing countries to solve their own problems.

The evaluation found a need for CIDA and IDRC to enunciate their view of the rationale for collaboration. The following recommendation follows from this need.

Recommendation 1.

That CIDA and IDRC agree on a statement of rationale for collaboration in the 1990s, taking into account, among other things, their respective mandates and priorities, organizational changes in both organizations and the changing needs of overseas partners.

A possible statement of the rationale for collaboration which encompasses the various elements already discussed, is presented below.

As integral elements of Canadian Official Development Assistance, the mandates of CIDA and IDRC are complementary in many areas. Collaboration between the two agencies will maximise the impact of both organizations in their efforts to assist the people and institutions in developing countries.

Over time, development needs change as do organizational mandates, priorities and the availability of resources. Both organizations are currently undergoing organizational reviews. Consequently, the rationale and scope for collaboration and the types of collaboration that will be appropriate in the future, may change.

4.2 TYPES OF COLLABORATION : EFFECTIVENESS AND OBSTACLES

As well as informal contact between CIDA and IDRC staff at all levels, this study has identified five types of collaboration which have, to some extent, been formalized or institutionalized. These include: collaboration on projects, cross representation on committees, joint participation in international fora, strategic planning and information exchange.

In different ways, each of these contributes to the achievement of individual agency objectives. A basic level of information exchange is essential for individuals in either organization to keep abreast of changes taking place in the other and to identify opportunities for or constraints on collaborative activities. This can occur through exchange of printed material or more actively through seminars, cross representation on committees and other forms of formal or informal contact.

Other types of collaboration mentioned, such as cross representation on committees, joint participation in international fora and participation in policy development, provide opportunities for the knowledge, contacts and expertise of one organization to contribute to the development of policies and programmes in the other. This can and does happen at many levels and at both the headquarters and field levels.

Collaboration in projects is perhaps the most visible form of cooperation and, as this study has shown, it takes different forms (joint, complementary or parallel), is relatively common and is perceived as being an effective, but resource intensive, means of achieving development objectives.

The study also has shown that while each of these different types of collaboration has potential benefits, these are not always realized. A number of key factors were identified as important in influencing the outcome of any kind of collaborative activity. At the individual level, these included motivation, initiative and good personal relationships. At the institutional level, they included common priorities and interests, a willingness to overcome structural differences and the availability of resources.

Obstacles to collaboration are many. Some are structural (different mandates, policies and priorities, geographical vs. sectoral orientations, resource constraints); others are cultural (different styles, attitudes, expectations). Given these differences, mentioned often in the course of this evaluation, it is perhaps surprising so much collaboration takes place. This suggests that the rationale for and the benefits of collaboration are strong and that CIDA and IDRC have applied sufficient resources to overcome difficulties.

It is expected that implementation of recommendation 1. will clarify the present rationale for and commitment to collaboration. However, the effectiveness of various types of collaboration and the resources applied to it as well as the general relationships between the two organizations and possible future directions could usefully be reviewed on a regular basis. It is proposed that this be annually.

Recommendation 2.

That CIDA and IDRC review collaboration at a senior level on an annual basis.

Options under this recommendation could include consideration at CIDA's President's Committee and IDRC's Board of Governors or Management Committee, or annual meetings between the Presidents of CIDA and IDRC.

4.3 SPECIFIC MECHANISMS TO SUPPORT COLLABORATION

This study has identified a number of specific mechanisms which support collaboration, including a system of information exchange, a handbook on collaboration, focal or contact points for collaborative activities, the Model Contribution Agreement and participation in meetings.

While each of these mechanisms is important, the evaluation notes a need to improve the effectiveness of key mechanisms of collaboration. Their purpose must be clear and they must be targeted to respond to real needs otherwise there is a danger that they become costly, inefficient and ineffective.

Many have been established or encouraged by the IDRC/CIDA Liaison Officer. The evaluation has concluded that there are now sufficient structural linkages and mechanisms in place to support collaboration and that if properly managed and maintained, a liaison officer will not be essential.

It is suggested that those kinds of collaboration or mechanisms that people in CIDA and IDRC find useful will be retained and those that are not will disappear.

The evaluation has found that collaboration between the two organizations will be most effective if three conditions are met:

- information exchange systems are sustained; and
- a baseline of institutionalized contact exists.
- personal contacts continue to be encouraged;

There is a need to maintain the exchange of basic information and an effective and well targeted system needs to be established. There is a need to look at the needs of different interest groups in CIDA and IDRC and how they might best obtain the information they need. This may include development of compatible electronic data bases and allowing access to these for staff of the other agency. This will require further investigation.

Recommendation 3.

That information exchange systems already in place should be reviewed to ensure the information being exchanged is appropriate and well targeted.

Recommendation 4.

That a joint working group be established to look at development of compatible information data bases in each agency and the question of access to these by staff of the other.

A significant development has been the identification of individuals as focal points, particularly in IDRC Regional Offices and CIDA Field Offices, although the latter is less developed. Focal points can assist in identifying, supporting and promoting collaborative activities. If functioning effectively, a network of focal points could undertake many of the support functions currently performed by the Liaison Officer for field-based staff. Inevitably, however, as this function will be one among many for the designated individual, varying levels of effort can be expected depending on the time and resources available.

Recommendation 5.

That the system of focal points in CIDA and IDRC field offices be consolidated in order to support and promote collaborative activities and that both organizations make available, in regional/decentralized office budgets, sufficient financial resources for the designated officers to undertake their roles.

Collaboration on projects has been an important form of cooperation and will continue to be so. The Model Contribution Agreement is a useful contribution to overcoming structural barriers associated with joint projects and should make them less burdensome.

Participation of staff of one agency in relevant staff meetings of the other has proved a useful way to exchange information. With increased decentralization, participation of

IDRC in CIDA's Field Representative Meetings and CIDA in IDRC's Annual Regional Meetings offers some promise if used to explore issues of collaboration. Regional meetings of both organizations have become increasingly important vehicles for bringing staff of the two organizations together in the field. Their 'shortcoming' is that while they have concentrated on information exchange, they have not, for the most part, been used as a mechanism for planning on collaborative undertakings.

Recommendation 6

That the issue of collaboration be made a regular item on the agendas of regional meetings of both organizations. Discussions on this agenda item should be aimed not only at exchange of information but also systematic exploration of prospects for collaboration in the region.

Opportunities should also be taken for discussion of collaboration at a senior level. The 1990 Working Luncheon was one such model. Another would be to ensure that senior managers of the two organizations meet regularly. An appropriate opportunity would be during the twice annual visits to Ottawa of IDRC Regional Directors.

In Ottawa, meetings between CIDA and IDRC staff (e.g. staff in CIDA's Professional Services Branch and sectoral counterparts in IDRC Divisions) have proved valuable. These should be encouraged where appropriate.

While formal mechanisms such as those mentioned above are important, opportunities for informal contact between staff at all levels should be encouraged to build good personal relationships between CIDA and IDRC staff. If these exist, formal mechanisms become less important but those that do exist are likely to be more effective.

Recommendation 7.

That seminars and information sessions in Ottawa/Hull and the field be organized periodically as a means of increasing understanding of the other organization, presenting opportunities for networking and professional exchange, and identifying prospective areas for future cooperation.

In the course of the evaluation other mechanisms were identified which are currently under discussion or offer potential for greater use in future. The Umbrella Agreement being discussed between the Americas Branch of CIDA and the Latin America Regional Office of IDRC is an example of the former. Greater use of Canada Funds or staff exchanges are examples of the latter.

Some mechanisms, such as staff exchanges, have proved difficult to implement, despite this being one of the recommendations to enhance collaboration made by the 1987 Winegard Report. This issue should be revisited to see if there are formal or informal ways and means for such exchanges to take place. Formal means could include the Interchange Canada Program. Informal means could include a short term placement of a staff member within the other organization to work on a particular assignment.

4.4 CIDA/IDRC LIAISON FUNCTION

The existence of a CIDA/IDRC Liaison Officer position over the last seven years has provided a focus for collaborative efforts. It was an expression in the early 1980s of the commitment of the two organizations to collaborate more consciously.

The Liaison Officers have played a crucial role in providing a link between the two organization and advancing the quality and level of collaboration. They have assisted staff of both CIDA and IDRC to understand the other agency, identify opportunities for collaboration and assist in the negotiation of agreements. They have been a corporate memory for both organizations, monitoring progress on collaboration in light of changes in both organizations and exploring new opportunities. They have established systems and mechanisms to enhance knowledge of each agency by the other and overcome obstacles which have inhibited collaboration or made it difficult.

A key question today is whether the position is still required. It is a conclusion of this evaluation that it is not. Sufficient systems and mechanisms have been set up or are being put in place to ensure a flow of information between the agencies and regular contact between staff at different levels. However there are risks attached to doing away with a position that has been a focus for collaboration, provided continuity, corporate memory, motivation and supported new initiatives.

Some of the functions performed by the liaison officer will need to be retained. These include organizing regular information sessions, particularly for new staff, organizing joint seminars to promote informal contacts, completing an annual review of the state of collaboration and new opportunities and acting as first point of enquiry for staff wanting

to make contact but not knowing who to call. It is expected that these can be carried out by other staff in CIDA and IDRC. (See Table 1 for detailed analysis of functions)

Without a liaison officer, the responsibility for maintaining links, exploring opportunities and addressing problems in the relationship becomes dispersed throughout the agencies. Such an approach requires a clear commitment from senior management in both agencies and at all levels from the President down, to take collaboration seriously and encourage it among their staff.

Recommendation 8.

That the CIDA/IDRC Liaison Officer position be disestablished.

If this recommendation is accepted, there will be a need to strengthen some systems and mechanisms and transfer some of the functions currently performed by the Liaison Officer to other staff members in CIDA and IDRC. It is suggested that there be a phase out period during which these tasks can be undertaken and to maintain continuity and completion of initiatives currently underway.

Recommendation 9.

That the Liaison Officer position be phased out over a six month period from acceptance of these recommendations.

4.5 IMPACTS OF COLLABORATION

There is sufficient evidence from this evaluation and the examples of collaborative projects and other activities studied to conclude that in many areas, IDRC and CIDA can gain more by working together than they would independently, both in terms of their own mandates and in terms of developmental impact.

In some cases, it may be easier and more cost effective to collaborate with other agencies and both organizations should keep this option open.

To identify and pursue collaborative opportunities requires an investment in terms of information flow, money and staff time and effort. The willingness of individual staff members and the organizations themselves to put in resources becomes a judgement call based on the perceived benefits and impacts likely to be achieved.

In terms of overall benefits, there is a fine line between not enough inputs which could result in missed opportunities and too many which becomes inefficient and a luxury neither organization can afford.

A judicious mix of formal and informal contacts and mechanisms which support collaborative efforts needs to be arrived at to ensure maximum return on both organization's investment. This study has highlighted what these might be, but given the changing nature of development needs and organizational mandates, priorities and structures, these need to be reviewed periodically as recommended in 4.2.

4.6 CONTEXT AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR FUTURE COLLABORATION

CIDA and IDRC operate in an uncertain world. Understanding of development problems and needs change, as do assessments of appropriate responses. Government policy on foreign aid and the resources allocated to it change. At the time this evaluation was undertaken, both CIDA and IDRC were undergoing organizational reviews which are likely to lead to some internal restructuring, new priorities and directions.

The future of collaboration between CIDA and IDRC will be shaped by the opportunities that arise from these changes, by how each perceive the benefits of collaboration and by the financial and human resources they are prepared to apply to it. A commitment to collaboration will be based on common interests and mutual benefits.

Changes in the global international development environment which could affect relations between CIDA and IDRC include diminishing ODA resources, greater demands for more specialized expertise and a shift in emphasis from projects to program and policy support for developing countries.

Each of these changes presents opportunities for CIDA and IDRC. With diminishing ODA resources in Canada and abroad there is a need for all development agencies to look for strategic links which will allow them to be more effective in fulfilling their mandates. Demands for increasingly specialized expertise and the shifts away from projects also present opportunities for CIDA and IDRC to share their experience, knowledge, technical expertise and resources.

While the details of organizational change in CIDA and IDRC were unclear at the time of writing, it's reasonable to assume that these exercises will lead to some 'downsizing' and attempts to 'do more with less'. This presents opportunities for each to explore how it might work more effectively with partner organizations. Given the rationale for collaboration between CIDA and IDRC mentioned earlier, a closer working relationship between the two organizations would be an obvious place to start.

In summary, opportunities for future collaboration will fundamentally be shaped by broader contextual issues and the commitment to collaboration by senior managers and staff of both organizations.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR AN EVALUATION OF CIDA/IDRC COLLABORATION

(approved March 1991)

1 Background

CIDA was established in 1968 and IDRC in 1970. Through the first ten years, collaboration between the two agencies was sporadic and ad hoc. In 1981 the Presidents of CIDA and IDRC called for an examination of possibilities for collaboration between the two agencies. Various studies proposed a number of recommendations which were approved by the senior management of both organizations and implemented through the years. The need for increased interaction was reaffirmed by the Winegard Report 'For Whose Benefit' and was supported in the government response 'Sharing Our Future', which encouraged collaboration through staff exchanges, joint projects and making greater use of IDRC research in CIDA's human resource development projects.

The range and scope of formal and informal collaboration between the two agencies has grown, supported since 1984 by a liaison officer position. In 1988 IDRC recommended that, after three years, there be a joint evaluation of the liaison officer position and an assessment of future strategies of support in this area. In late 1989 CIDA proposed that this evaluation be undertaken during 1991. IDRC prepared an evaluation assessment which suggested two different approaches, the first focusing only on the liaison officer position, the second looking more generally at the range and scope of collaboration between the agencies. It was agreed that the latter approach would be more useful and that the utility of the liaison officer position be considered in this broader context.

2 Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation is to review the rationale and extent of collaboration between CIDA/IDRC and the mechanisms developed to promote it, and identify opportunities for, and appropriate ways to encourage, collaboration in the future.

3 Scope and Focus

The study should review all areas of collaboration between CIDA and IDRC since 1981. However primary emphasis will be placed on the mechanisms developed to promote collaboration since 1983 and the activities that have resulted. The evaluation should address questions of context, rationale, effectiveness and impact and effects. Specific questions that should be addressed in the evaluation include the following:

- . What is the rationale for collaboration? Is it still relevant?
- . How have the modalities and activities for promoting collaboration between CIDA and IDRC evolved since 1981?
- . What has been achieved through CIDA/IDRC collaboration in terms of response to the Winegard Report, rational use of Canadian ODA, and IDRC and CIDA policy objectives.
- . To what extent has collaboration affected IDRC's or CIDA's program policies and procedures?
- . What are the advantages and disadvantages of collaboration?
- . Are there any constraints on collaboration and, if so, how might these be resolved?
- . What opportunities exist for more collaboration in the future and how might these be achieved?

4 Evaluation Process

Workplan: A workplan will be prepared which elaborates in more detail the background for the study, its purpose, scope and focus, the methodology to be used, personnel undertaking the study, schedule, report outline and budget.

Methodology: Information will be gathered through a review of files and documents on CIDA/IDRC collaboration, interviews with CIDA/IDRC staff and, if possible, some recipient institutions and possibly some case studies and attitudinal surveys. Options for a limited amount of field work should be addressed in the workplan.

Personnel: Primary responsibility for undertaking the evaluation will be given to Kevin Clark, Senior Evaluation Officer in the Evaluation Division of CIDA. A consultant will be provided by IDRC to assist in the study.

Evaluation Management: The evaluation will be a joint exercise between IDRC and CIDA and the study will be jointly directed by the Office of Planning and Evaluation at IDRC and the Evaluation Division at CIDA. Meetings will be called as necessary.

Schedule: An evaluation workplan will be prepared by mid-April 1991. The evaluation proper should commence by May 6, 1991. A draft final report should be available to IDRC and CIDA by July 31; the final report by 31 August.

Budget and Cost Sharing:

CIDA and IDRC will share the costs of the evaluation. CIDA will provide the services of Kevin Clark and cover field and administrative costs associated with completion of the evaluation. IDRC will cover the costs of consultancy assistance. It is estimated that the total cost of the evaluation will be less than \$20,000.

APPENDIX B

PERSONS INTERVIEWED:

Canadian International Development Agency

Hull

Michel Archambault	Director General, Institutional Cooperation and Development Services Division, Special Programs Branch
Pierre Beemans	Director General, Social and Human Resources Development Division, Professional Services Branch
Dean Frank	Development Officer, Pakistan Program, Asia Branch
Nancy Gerein	Health Specialist, Health and Population Sector, Professional Services Branch
André Gingras	Vice President, Francophone Africa Branch
Helene Giroux	Senior Development Officer, India/Nepal Program, Asia Branch
Eleanor Heath	Senior Policy Advisor, Strategic Planning and Research Division, Policy Branch
Paul Hitschfeld	Acting Director General, Social and Human Resources Division, Professional Services Branch
Peter Houlston	Director, Strategic Planning and Research Division, Policy Branch
Douglas Lindores	Senior Vice President
Wayne MacDonald	Director, Corporate Information, Information Division, Policy Branch
Jean-Marc Metivier	Acting Vice President, Asia Branch
Penny Morton	Policy Analyst, Strategic Planning and Research Division, Policy Branch
Don Paul	Manager, Corporate Memory, Policy Branch

Margaret Paterson	Senior Project Manager, Pakistan Program, Asia Branch
Jean Quesnel	Director General, Audit and Evaluation Division, Policy Branch
Pierre Racicot	Vice President, Anglophone Africa Branch
John Robinson	Vice President, Americas Branch
Martha Terkuile	Head, Commonwealth, Francophonie and Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) Section, Multilateral Branch
John Wood	Director General, Americas Branch
Danielle Wetherup	Vice President, Professional Services Branch

Decentralized Offices and Posts

Adair Heuchan	Development Officer, Zimbabwe Program, Harare
Jean Perlin	Zambia Country Program Director, Harare
Gilles Rivard	Country Programme Analyst, San José
Victoria Sutherland	Development Officer, SADCC Program, Harare
Trevor Sykes	Agricultural Specialist, Harare
Jack Titsworth	Counsellor (Development), Nairobi

International Development Research Centre

Ottawa

Raymond Audet	Vice President, Resources
Robert Auger	Secretary and General Counsel
Mary Beaussart	Project Officer, Canadian Collaborative Projects, AFNS Division
Mario Berrios	Project Adviser, Economic Policy, SS Division

Paz Buttedahl	Deputy Director, FA Division
Françoise Coupal	IDRC/CIDA Liaison Officer
Doug Daniels	Director, Office of Planning and Evaluation
Rachel Des Rosiers	Deputy Director, EES Division
David Glover	Associate Director, Economic Policy, SS Division
Antoine Hawara	Treasurer, Office of the Treasurer
Daniel Morales-Gomez	Associate Director, Population, Education and Society, SS Division
James Mullin	Vice President, Programs
Sitoo Mukerji	Associate Director, Communications Division
Margaret Owens	Program Officer, FA Division
Allan Rix	Director, Human Resources Division
André Roberge	Head, MINISIS Systems Management, IS Division
Don de Savigny	Principal Program Officer, Health and the Environment, HS Division
Terry Smutylo	Senior Planning Officer, Office of Planning and Evaluation
Greg Spendjian	Deputy Director, AFNS Division
Mousseau Tremblay	Director, EES Division
Mark Van Ameringen	Senior Advisor, Programs
Ed Weber	Associate Director, Post Production Systems, AFNS Division

Regional Offices

Daniel Adzei Bekoe	Regional Director, EARO
Fernando Chaparro	Regional Director, LARO
Sylvain Dufour	Regional Program Officer, EESD, EARO

Andrew Ker	Senior Program Officer (Crop Production), AFNS, EARO
Berhane Kifle Wahid	Regional Program Officer (Animal Production), AFNS, EARO
Fawzy Kishk	Regional Director, MERO
Jingjai Hanchanlash	Regional Director, ASRO
Luis Navarro	Regional Program Officer (Agricultural Economics), AFNS, EARO
Vijay Pande	Regional Director, SARO
Pierre Sané	Regional Director, WARO
Ozzie Schmidt	Senior Program Officer (Post-Production), AFNS, EARO
Richard Seward	Network Coordinator, Forestry Program for East and Southern Africa, AFNS, Harare
Cécile de Sweemer	Regional Representative Health Sciences, WARO
Paul Vitta	Deputy Regional Director, EARO

Others

Jeanette Clarke	Research Officer, Agroforestry, Forest Commission, Harare
Jeffrey Fine	Director, African Economic Research Consortium, Nairobi
Manuel Gomez	Principal Scientist, Food Technology, SADCC/ICRISAT Project, Bulawayo
Lee House	Director, SADCC/ICRISAT Regional Sorghum and Millet Improvement Project, Matopos Station, Bulawayo
Richard Naxumalo	Assistant Administration Officer, SADCC/ICRISAT Project, Bulawayo
David Rohrbach	Principal Economist, SADCC/ICRISAT Project, Bulawayo
Alfred Schultz	Administration Officer, SADCC/ICRISAT Project, Bulawayo
Warren Wong	Principal, Hickling International Development Division, Ottawa (formerly in SS Division, IDRC)



APPENDIX C

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE AND SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

Introduction

The survey of CIDA and IDRC staff was undertaken to provide an opportunity for officers of both organizations to contribute their experience of collaboration, comment on key issues and suggest directions for collaboration in the future. It should be noted that the response rate from regional/decentralized staff is quite low and that only a small sample of headquarters staff was taken. Consequently, no attempt has been made to statistically analyze the data.

Given these factors, the reader should be cautious in making generalizations from this data. This is particularly the case, where responses have been broken down into sub categories - by agency and regional offices/headquarters. Given the size of the sample, headquarters figures in particular may not be representative of the wider populations. In these cases the total sample responses may be more valid indicators. In order to compare different categories of responses, data is presented as a percentage of the total number of respondents in each category.

The results of the survey has been combined with information obtained from interviews, reports and files to draw broader conclusions. These other sources are discussed in the main text of the report.

The results of the survey are detailed below. For the majority of questions, responses are presented in a table, followed by a short narrative, describing the main findings.

NUMBERS OF RESPONDENTS			
	Field	Headquarters	Total
CIDA	48	16	64
IDRC	21	9	30
Total	69	25	94

In total, 127 questionnaires were sent to CIDA decentralized posts (response rate 38%) and 80 to IDRC regional offices, excluding MERO (response rate 26%). Headquarters questionnaires were administered by telephone.

RESPONSE BY REGION			
CIDA		IDRC	
Americas	7	LARO	3
Anglophone Africa	15	EARO	4
Francophone Africa	21	WARO	4
Asia	5	ASRO	4
		SARO	2
		not stated	4

In all, 64% of responses from the field came from Africa, 16% from Asia and 14% from Latin America and the Caribbean. It was not possible to determine the source of 6% of respondents.

QUESTION 1. WHAT POSITION DO YOU HOLD IN CIDA/IDRC?

Responses from both CIDA decentralized posts and IDRC regional offices indicate that a good cross section of officers at different levels and experience responded to the survey. In CIDA's case, respondents included program directors, country program directors, project officers and sectoral specialists. In IDRC's case, respondents included deputy regional directors, senior program officers and program officers.

The questionnaires administered by telephone to headquarters staff of both organizations included a sample of officers at different levels and in different roles. In CIDA they included officers in bilateral branches, Special Programs Branch, Professional Services Branch and Policy Branch. In IDRC they included officers in the Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Division, Earth and Engineering Sciences Division, Health Sciences Division, Information Sciences Division, Office of Planning and Evaluation and the Social Sciences Division.

QUESTION 2. HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU WORKED FOR CIDA/IDRC?

AVERAGE NUMBER OF YEARS		
	Field	Headquarters
CIDA	10.4	6.9
IDRC	10.1	6.7

A number of responses from field officers indicated that they had worked in headquarters and vice versa. Some had worked in more than one region. While the relative length of experience of staff of both organizations appears similar, IDRC respondents to other questions commented often that the frequent movement of CIDA staff made collaboration more difficult.

QUESTION 3. HAVE YOU WORKED FOR IDRC/CIDA IN THE PAST?

	YES	NO
CIDA staff for IDRC	1	63
IDRC staff for CIDA	2	28

Responses to this table suggests that the number of officers who have worked in both organizations is very small.

QUESTION 4. WHAT DIFFERENT TYPES OF CONTACT HAVE YOU HAD WITH CIDA/IDRC?

	CIDA		IDRC		Total
	Field %	HQ %	Field %	HQ %	%
Informal contact	73	94	86	78	80
Discussed possible collaboration	54	56	95	78	66
Worked on collaborative projects	40	31	38	44	38
Attended joint seminars	21	50	43	67	35
Attended formal meetings of the other organization	15	50	33	78	31
Received information on the other organization's policies/programs	62	94	90	100	78
Read general information about the other organization	83	88	86	89	85
Other	15	50	24	33	24

The figures above suggest that informal contact is the most common form of personal contact between IDRC and CIDA officers, that a high proportion of respondents had read general information about the other organization or received information from it, and that a relatively low proportion of officers had worked on collaborative projects, or attended joint seminars or formal meetings with the other organization. In almost all categories, the proportion for CIDA regional staff was lowest.

QUESTION 5. FROM YOUR OWN EXPERIENCE OR OBSERVATIONS, WHAT COLLABORATIVE MECHANISMS (CIDA/IDRC) WOULD YOU DESCRIBE AS MOST EFFECTIVE? (RANK IN ORDER)

	CIDA		IDRC		Total
	Field %	HQ %	Field %	HQ %	%
Joint projects	40	12	67	33	40
Parallel projects	25	38	57	22	34
Complementary projects	71	31	76	78	66
Strategic planning sessions	56	50	62	56	56
Informal exchanges	62	69	71	44	64
Other	0	0	10	0	2

As most respondents did not rank their answers in order of effectiveness, the analysis above gives the frequency of responses in each category. Two thirds of respondents considered collaboration through informal exchanges and complementary projects were effective and just over half that strategic planning sessions were effective. The figures above also show that two thirds of IDRC regional staff saw joint projects as effective while over half saw parallel projects as effective; in both cases a much higher percentage than others.

ANSWERS TO QUESTION 6 ARE DIVIDED INTO RESPONSES BY CIDA STAFF AND BY IDRC STAFF.

A: (CIDA STAFF ANSWERS)

QUESTION 6A. IN DEVELOPING OR PLANNING A DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, HAVE YOU EVER UTILIZED IDRC SUPPORTED RESEARCH?

	FIELD %	HEADQUARTERS %	TOTAL %
Yes	35	62	42
No	62	38	56
No answer	2	0	2

QUESTION 6B. IF YES, HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST FOUR YEARS?

	FIELD %	HEADQUARTERS %	TOTAL %
Less than 5	10	8	18
Five or more	4	2	6
No answer	3	0	3

QUESTION 6C. HOW WERE THE RESEARCH RESULTS UTILIZED?

Of the twenty one respondents, seventeen indicated that IDRC research had been used in the planning and design of projects, two that it had been used to justify projects, two that it had been useful in defining issues and two that it had been useful in familiarization with local contexts.

B. (IDRC STAFF ONLY)

QUESTION 6A. HAVE YOU EVER INVITED A CIDA REPRESENTATIVE TO VISIT AN IDRC PROJECT TO ASSESS POSSIBLE USE OF RESEARCH RESULTS?

	FIELD %	HEADQUARTERS %	TOTAL %
Yes	29	56	37
No	67	44	60
No answer	5	0	3

QUESTION 6B. IF YES, HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST FOUR YEARS?

	FIELD %	HEADQUARTERS %	TOTAL %
Less than 5	6	4	10
5 or more	0	1	1

QUESTION 6C. HOW WERE THE RESEARCH RESULTS UTILIZED?

The four respondents to this question all indicated that the research results had been used in a CIDA project.

Responses above indicate that over 40% of CIDA respondents had used IDRC research in project planning (mostly more than once) and that 37% of IDRC staff had invited CIDA people to discuss utilization of research. While these are not high figures, it suggests that the practice is reasonably common.

QUESTION 7A. HAVE YOU EVER INVITED A CIDA/IDRC REPRESENTATIVE TO ATTEND AN IDRC/CIDA SUPPORTED COLLOQUIUM OR SEMINAR?

	CIDA		IDRC		Total
	Field %	HQ %	Field %	HQ %	%
Yes have invited staff of the other organization	34	50	43	56	41
No have not invited the staff of the other organization	63	44	52	44	55
No answer	2	6	5	0	3

QUESTION 7B. IF YES, HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST FOUR YEARS?

Of the 39 respondents who answered yes, 26 indicated that they had invited representatives less than five times, 7 that they had invited representatives five or more times and 6 did not give any answer.

QUESTION 8A. HAVE YOU HAD ANY CONTACT WITH THE IDRC/CIDA LIAISON OFFICER?

	CIDA		IDRC		Total
	Field %	HQ %	Field %	HQ %	%
Yes	58	44	76	78	62
No	40	56	24	22	37
No answer	2	0	0	0	1

Nearly two thirds of respondents had had contact with the liaison officer. The figures above suggest that this proportion is greater in IDRC than in CIDA.

QUESTION 8B. IF YES, HAS THIS CONTACT ASSISTED YOUR DEALINGS WITH IDRC/CIDA?

	CIDA		IDRC		Total
	Field %	HQ %	Field %	HQ %	%
Yes	68	57	62	43	62
No	21	14	25	29	22
No answer	11	29	12	29	16

Nearly two thirds of respondents considered that this contact with the liaison officer had assisted their dealings with the other organization. The figures above suggest that this contact may have been helpful to more staff in regions than in headquarters.

QUESTION 8C. HOW HAS THIS CONTACT ASSISTED YOUR DEALINGS WITH IDRC/CIDA?

Of the forty three respondents, major categories of answers were as follows:

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	
Resource person especially to facilitate contacts including invitations to meetings	11
Provided information or facilitated exchange	10
Identify or assist in collaborative efforts	9
Promotes understanding/better knowledge	7

Four respondents indicated that they preferred to use their own contacts, one said that the job was too big to be left to one person, and another suggested that the emphasis should be more practically oriented and the CIDA link be in Professional Services not Policy Branch.

QUESTION 9A. ARE YOU AWARE OF THE 'MODEL CONTRIBUTION AGREEMENT' BETWEEN IDRC AND CIDA?

	CIDA		IDRC		Total
	Field %	HQ %	Field %	HQ %	%
Yes	46	62	90	44	59
No	52	38	10	56	40
No answer	2	0	0	0	1

Given that the Model Contribution Agreement has been widely circulated through both organizations and its existence publicized in administrative bulletins, the fact that 40% of respondents were not aware of the Model Contribution Agreement is surprising. If it was not for a very high proportion of IDRC field staff who knew of the agreement, this figure would have been higher.

QUESTION 9B. IF YES, DO YOU THINK IT WILL MAKE COLLABORATION AT THE PROJECT LEVEL EASIER?

	CIDA		IDRC		Total
	Field %	HQ %	Field %	HQ %	%
Yes	45	20	16	25	29
No	5	0	11	25	7
Don't know	50	50	68	25	55
No answer	0	30	5	25	9

Since the Model Contribution Agreement is relatively new, few officers have had a chance to use it in initiating new joint projects. Therefore, the large proportion of don't know answers is understandable. Of those who answered yes, many were hopeful that it would assist collaboration.



QUESTION 10A. DO YOU HAVE, OR HAVE YOU SEEN, A COPY OF THE 'HANDBOOK FOR IDRC/CIDA COLLABORATION'?

	CIDA		IDRC		Total
	Field %	HQ %	Field %	HQ %	%
Yes	29	69	90	100	56
No	67	31	5	0	40
Don't know	4	0	0	0	2
No answer	0	0	5	0	1

The 'Handbook for IDRC/CIDA Collaboration' was produced to increase understanding of the opportunities and mechanisms for collaboration between the two organizations. These were distributed throughout both organizations. The figures above suggest that the Handbook is known by most people in IDRC, but significantly fewer in CIDA, particularly in the regions. Only 29% of respondents from CIDA regional offices had a copy or had seen it.

QUESTION 10B. IF YES, HAVE YOU READ IT?

	CIDA		IDRC		Total
	Field %	HQ %	Field %	HQ %	%
Fully	7	0	32	0	13
In part	64	64	63	78	66
No	29	27	5	22	19
No answer	0	9	0	0	2

This table shows that with the exception of the IDRC regional office respondents, between 20% and 30% of those who had a copy of or had seen the Handbook, had not read it at all. Of the total sample, 66% had read it in part and 13% had read it completely.

QUESTION 10C. HAVE YOU FOUND IT USEFUL?

	CIDA		IDRC		Total
	Field %	HQ %	Field %	HQ %	%
Very	50	14	28	0	26
Limited	40	29	67	57	52
No	10	0	6	0	5
No answer	0	57	0	43	17

Of those who had read the Handbook, fully or in part, one quarter found it very useful, half of limited use and 5% not useful. The question was not answered by 17% of respondents.

QUESTION 10D. HOW COULD IT BE IMPROVED?

A total of eighteen comments were made by respondents, with all except the last, made by officers who had read it. These comments can be summarized under nine headings, with none being any more significant than the others. The comments included:

- ▶ put on the LAN or on diskette;
- ▶ summarize main points and issues - shorten it;
- ▶ the listing of Canadian and overseas personnel and positions should be more complete and up-to-date;
- ▶ find ways to get project/program officers to read it;
- ▶ include examples of successful collaborative efforts;
- ▶ more emphasis on the importance of collaboration in planning at the country level and personal contacts;
- ▶ more coverage of collaboration at the policy level;
- ▶ ask officers what they think of it;
- ▶ send the guide to overseas missions.



QUESTION 11. FROM YOUR OWN EXPERIENCE OR OBSERVATIONS, LIST UP TO FIVE FACTORS WHICH HAVE AIDED COLLABORATION WITH IDRC/CIDA?

	CIDA		IDRC		Total
	Field %	HQ %	Field %	HQ %	%
Common or complementary mandates, priorities, interests, partners	38	38	38	67	40
Structural factors (eg management commitment, decentralization)	12	31	19	22	18
Knowledge of each other and what they have to offer	31	38	19	11	28
Meetings, visits and information exchange	23	44	52	44	35
Mechanisms for and experience of collaboration	17	6	38	44	22
Attributes of Individuals, Informal relationships	25	75	52	56	43

In all, 175 responses were given. The figures above give the percentage frequency of responses under six categories constructed from the responses. They show that 43% of respondents saw informal relationships or individual attitudes as factors that have assisted collaboration. An element of common interest was mentioned by 40% of respondents. Within this category, common priorities or objectives in particular countries or sectors was the most frequently mentioned. Meetings, visits and information were cited by 35% of respondents, knowledge of one another and what each has to offer by 28%, mechanisms for and experience of collaboration by 22% and structural factors, particularly decentralization by 18%.

QUESTION 12. FROM YOUR OWN EXPERIENCE OR OBSERVATIONS, LIST UP TO FIVE OBSTACLES TO COLLABORATION WITH IDRC/CIDA?

	CIDA		IDRC		Total
	Field %	HQ %	Field %	HQ %	%
Different philosophies, mandates, orientations and priorities	56	75	81	100	69
Structural and organizational approaches and differences	58	76	100	100	79
Lack of knowledge, understanding and information exchange	21	31	33	11	24
Insufficient joint planning, meetings and general interaction	19	12	24	22	19
Resource constraints (eg time, money, personnel)	19	19	19	33	20
Personnel attitudes and relationships	8	31	48	22	22

A total of 220 responses were given to this question. The most common obstacles given by respondents, 79%, related to structural and organizational factors. Within this category, the most common reasons given were administrative requirements and the difference in size and budget of the agencies. Others included different structures, the frequent change in CIDA staff, the different locality of regional offices and the bureaucratic procedures of CIDA.

A high proportion of respondents, 69%, also identified different philosophies, mandates, orientations and priorities as obstacles. Among these, differences in 'priorities and interests' was highest, followed by differences in orientation (country focus versus sectoral) and different philosophies. A very high proportion of IDRC staff, both regional and headquarters, (100% of headquarters staff and over 80% of regional staff) identified these as obstacles. In CIDA the proportions were also high, 75% for headquarters staff and nearly 60% for regional staff.

By comparison, other factors received limited mention. Between 19% and 24% of respondents listed lack of knowledge and limited understanding and information exchange, personal attitudes and relationships, resource constraints and insufficient planning and interagency contact as obstacles.

QUESTION 13. WHAT BENEFITS, IF ANY, HAVE YOU WITNESSED FLOWING FROM COLLABORATION WITH IDRC (E.G. IN TERMS OF YOUR OWN WORK OR AT THE ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL)?

	CIDA		IDRC		Total
	Field %	HQ %	Field %	HQ %	%
Better outcomes (eg better quality projects, utilization of research, improved impact of Canadian aid)	27	62	67	22	41
Increased availability of expertise and information	17	56	10	33	23
Very few	6	0	14	0	6

In total, 67 respondents answered this question. Responses were quite varied but most could be grouped under the heading a better outcome than would have occurred without collaboration. In all, 41% of total respondents saw a better outcome resulting from collaboration. Twenty three percent saw the benefit in terms of increased availability of expertise and information and 6% saw very few benefits.

A number of respondents commented that there were substantial potential benefits but that these had not been realized.



QUESTION 14. WHAT ADDITIONAL COSTS, IF ANY, HAVE YOU NOTED WHICH COULD BE ASSOCIATED WITH IDRC/CIDA COLLABORATION (E.G. IN TERMS OF TIME, EFFORT, MONEY)?

	CIDA		IDRC		Total
	Field %	HQ %	Field %	HQ %	%
Time	27	31	45	56	34
Effort (energy, travel)	17	19	43	11	22
Money	4	6	10	0	5
Other	0	6	14	0	4

There were 62 responses to this question. The most common cost was seen as 'time' identified by 34% of respondents. Time was viewed as a cost both in terms of the individual effort put in by officers as well as delays in getting projects operational. 22% of respondents saw 'effort' as a cost. Few respondents (5%) saw money as a cost while 4% cited other costs, including the liaison officer and costs to recipients.

Most respondents noted that the costs were not unreasonable and the effort was worthwhile and a necessary part of collaboration.

QUESTION 15. HOW WOULD YOU ASSESS THE DEVELOPMENTAL IMPACT (I.E. ON DEVELOPING-WORLD PARTNERS) OF COLLABORATION BETWEEN IDRC AND CIDA?

	CIDA		IDRC		Total
	Field %	HQ %	Field %	HQ %	%
Better development projects, activities, transfer technology	10	19	29	11	16
Generally positive without being specific	17	31	29	44	24
Indirectly through improvement of the organizations' operations	4	0	24	11	9
High potential but low impact	4	12	10	0	6
Negative because roles and responsibilities were not clear	0	6	0	0	1

There were 53 responses to this question. The most common response from 24% of respondents was that the impact was positive without being specific and identifying what the benefits were. 16% of respondents suggested what the positive impacts and a number mentioned specific examples of joint, parallel or complementary projects and other forms of collaboration which they saw as beneficial to recipients. 9% of respondents suggested that there were indirect benefits arising from changes in the organizations, 6% indicated that collaboration had high potential but few examples of significant impact and one respondent felt that the impact was negative.

QUESTION 16. IN YOUR OPINION, HAVE THE BENEFITS OF COLLABORATION OUTWEIGHED THE COSTS?

	CIDA		IDRC		Total
	Field %	HQ %	Field %	HQ %	%
Yes	31	56	43	89	34
No	10	0	14	0	9
Don't know	40	6	24	0	27
No answer	19	38	19	11	22

In response to the question, have benefits outweighed costs, 44% of the respondents said yes, 9% said no and the other 49% either did not know or did not answer the question.



QUESTION 17. LIST ANY SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING CIDA/IDRC COLLABORATION IN FUTURE, OR ANY OTHER COMMENTS ABOUT COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE TWO ORGANIZATIONS.

	CIDA		IDRC		Total
	Field %	HQ %	Field %	HQ %	%
Structural issues and changes	40	50	38	56	43
Mechanisms to promote understanding and collaboration	8	44	24	22	19
Further exploration of coll. opportunities, joint planning	23	69	48	67	40
More meetings, discussion and communication	25	88	48	100	48
Better distribution/targeting of information	19	75	19	22	29
Development of informal personal contacts	4	6	5	33	7
Need to motivate people to collaborate (incentives)	0	12	14	22	7

Responses to question 12b, 'How could obstacles be overcome' have been aggregated with responses to question 17. In total there were 182 suggestions for action to overcome perceived deficiencies in collaboration between the two organizations. The highest response, 48% of respondents suggested better communication, more meetings and discussion. A further 40% suggested the need for further exploration of opportunities for collaboration and joint planning. These could be seen as arising out of greater communication. Headquarters respondents suggested these solutions more frequently than regional staff.

The question of structural change was raised by 43% of respondents with suggestions being varied, ranging from making CIDA a Crown Corporation, to incorporating IDRC into CIDA, to transferring CIDA funds spent on research to IDRC, to changing the IDRC regional office to a different country. A number suggested the need for greater commitment to, and guidance on, collaboration from senior management.

Mechanisms to promote collaboration were suggested by 19% of respondents. These included modifying or expanding the role of the liaison officer and promoting staff exchanges or joint positions.

APPENDIX D

LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIAL

- 1 CIDA Policy Branch, May 1981 CIDA/IDRC Cooperation
- 2 CIDA, 1987 Sharing Our Future
- 3 CIDA, 1987 Canadian International Development Assistance - To Benefit a Better World. Response of the Government of Canada to the Report by the Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade
- 4 CIDA, DPS Unit Asia Branch. June 1988 IDRC/CIDA Collaborative Projects: Points to Consider
- 5 CIDA/IDRC, September 1982 CIDA/IDRC Cooperation
- 6 CIDA/IDRC, November 1989 Model Contribution Agreement Between CIDA and IDRC
- 7 Coupal, F. August 1989 A Discussion Paper - IDRC/CIDA Collaboration: Meeting the Challenges
- 8 Coupal, F. September 1989 A Report on the State of IDRC/CIDA Collaboration
- 9 Coupal, F. November 1989 Trip Report #1 Barbadoes, St. Lucia, Jamaica, Costa Rica, Washington, D.C.
- 10 Coupal, F. March 1990 Trip Report #2 Zimbabwe, Tanzania and Kenya
- 11 Coupal, F. September 1990 Trip Report #3 Montevideo, Uruguay and Peru
- 12 Coupal, F. October 1990 Proceedings from an IDRC/CIDA Working Luncheon
- 13 Coupal, F. March 1991 The State of IDRC/CIDA Collaboration -Annual Report 1990
- 14 Coupal, F. April 1991 Trip Report #5 Burkino Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Senegal
- 15 Coupal, F. May 1991 The State of IDRC/CIDA Collaboration Annual Report 1990-91
- 16 Government of Canada. May 1970 International Development Research Centre Act (Revised Statutes of Canada, 1970 1st Supplement, Chapter 21)

- 17 House of Commons Canada. May 1987 For Whose Benefit? Report of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade on Canada's Official Development Assistance Policies and Programs
- 18 IDRC/CIDA. September 1990 A Handbook for IDRC/CIDA Collaboration
- 19 IDRC, February 1991 Towards 2000: A Strategic Framework for IDRC
- 20 IDRC, EARO Strategy Working Group. April 1991 Proposed Strategy for Centre Action in Eastern and Southern Africa
- 21 Mullin, J. April 1989 IDRC/CIDA Collaboration in the Field: Issues for Consideration
- 22 Sykes, T. & Sutherland, V. April 1991 Agricultural Research in Southern Africa
Presentation to IDRC Regional Meeting
- 23 Van Ameringen, M. June 1988 Report on the Current State of IDRC/CIDA Collaboration
- 24 Van Ameringen, M. August 1988 Strengthening IDRC/CIDA Collaboration in the ASRO Region
- 25 Vitta, P. 1991 IDRC/CIDA Collaboration in Eastern and Southern Africa

APPENDIX E

CASE STUDIES OF COLLABORATIVE PROJECTS

Introduction

The aim of these case studies is to provide several examples of CIDA/IDRC collaboration on joint, parallel and complementary projects. Together the studies address some of the key issues that have arisen in collaboration on projects and some of the lessons learned. They do not provide a detailed analysis of the projects described nor of collaboration between CIDA and IDRC and are thus illustrative rather than comprehensive.

Also, the examples given are not necessarily typical of specific types of collaboration as the nature of collaboration in any project will to a large extent be conditioned by the reasons for collaboration, the interests of both parties in it and the environment within which the project takes place.

Five case studies have been included. Each case study is divided into four sections:

- an introductory statement of the type of collaboration and the aspects that are to be highlighted;
- a brief description of the project or activity, the interests of both organizations in it and the nature of collaboration between them;
- key issues in collaboration and their impact on the project or activity; and
- lessons learned.

JOINT PROJECT : Snow and Ice Phase II Project, Pakistan

Introduction

The \$5 million Snow and Ice II Project is an example of the utilization of the results from an IDRC research project and thus, in some respects, could be seen as a 'complementary project'. But it is discussed here primarily as a joint project because CIDA is providing funding and IDRC is managing its implementation. The project is the first negotiated under the Model Contribution Agreement (MCA) although discussions between CIDA and IDRC started before this agreement existed. The main aspects addressed in the case study are the implications of IDRC managing a CIDA funded project and the impact of the Model Contribution Agreement (MCA) in facilitating collaboration between CIDA and IDRC.

Description of the project and the nature of collaboration

The Snow and Ice II Project in the Upper Indus Basin followed earlier research supported by IDRC in which the technology for hydrological forecasting in high glacial areas was developed. The research demonstrated the potential of the technology for wider application. The objective of Phase II is to implement a basin wide snow and ice forecasting system which will enable improvement in long term water management in the region.

The Water and Power Development Authority of Pakistan (WAPDA) requested CIDA's involvement because Phase II was beyond the resources of IDRC and because CIDA had experience in managing large implementation type projects. CIDA agreed to participate, in part because energy had been a priority sector of involvement in Pakistan, but more so because of the potential benefits of the project with respect to water management and utilization. CIDA also saw the project as being in Canada's interest because it was a ground-breaking project in a technical area in which few people in the world have expertise and one in which Canada had a comparative advantage in terms of expertise and scientific equipment.

CIDA would normally have managed such a project itself, but on the advice of External Affairs, it approached IDRC to manage the project. A concern of External Affairs was the location of the project in the Upper Indus Basin, near the Kashmir border, an area which India and Pakistan contest. IDRC was prepared to manage the project for CIDA because of an ongoing applied research interest in the technology developed and its performance. IDRC in turn contracted BC Hydro International Ltd., a subsidiary of BC Hydro, to undertake the project as its implementing agency.



Issues and impacts

Getting the project started was complex and took two years to get off the ground. Originally planned to start in early 1989, it began in February 1991. Reasons for the delays included reaching agreement on the different accountability and procedural requirements of the two agencies. Other factors included changes in CIDA staff, IDRC's inexperience in managing this type of project, IDRC negotiations with BC Hydro, the Pakistan Government's approval process and CIDA's need to await their approval before proceeding, ongoing negotiations with External Affairs on an acceptable method of implementation and finally, the seasonal nature of the project which could only operate between June and September.

In the Snow and Ice II Project, IDRC had a previous involvement and an ongoing applied research interest and so was willing to manage CIDA funding of the project. Participation in the project enabled IDRC to be involved in the utilization of research findings on a much larger scale than it had in the past. Both CIDA and IDRC officers involved in the project saw benefits from collaboration despite the effort required to negotiate agreement and get the project started. Each organization gained from the involvement of the other.

This case study highlights two concerns raised by some people in IDRC and CIDA during this study of collaboration. The first is that in managing CIDA funds, IDRC must sign a contractual relationship with CIDA in the form of a contribution agreement and that CIDA will expect it to operate according to CIDA rules and regulations. Some people in IDRC have been uncomfortable with the contents of such agreements and the requirements which are imposed by the regulatory environment within which CIDA operates. They have argued that this impacts on IDRC's own management style and its policies, practices and procedures. As a crown corporation audited by the Office of the Auditor General, IDRC has argued that it is accountable to Parliament and therefore that CIDA should accept this as sufficient accountability.

The Model Contribution Agreement was a means to establish principles which ensures CIDA's accountability requirements are met while recognizing the special nature of IDRC. In this instance, it provided a constructive basis for negotiating a contribution agreement. The two main issues which had to be resolved were IDRC's accountability for project results and the communication channels between the various parties concerned. Eventually agreement was reached on these.

Another feature of the agreement was that IDRC officers agreed to additional requirements than were stipulated in the MCA. Given the nature of third party involvement, this included more frequent and rigorous reporting requirements from the contractor, BC Hydro International. The nature of the project was unusual for IDRC in that it was a large implementation project of a type in which CIDA had greater experience and IDRC accepted CIDA's argument for these additional requirements.

The Model Contribution Agreement assisted the process of negotiating the roles, responsibilities and obligations of each party. Where disagreements occurred, it provided guidelines and a reference point to return to.

A second concern raised by some people in CIDA and IDRC which can be discussed in relation to this project is whether IDRC should execute CIDA projects and whether this identifies IDRC too closely with CIDA's and the Canadian Government's aid policy or political interests. This was not a real concern in the negotiations of the Snow and Ice II Project. IDRC had a legitimate reason for its interest and the project was too big to undertake on its own. While it was in the Canadian Government's and CIDA's interest to be involved, and IDRC was a logical partner, the project was also consistent with IDRC's mandate.

Lessons learned

The case study has shown that a joint project in which IDRC manages CIDA funds can be consistent with IDRC's mandate and its own priorities and that, using the MCA, both sides can retain their own operating style and meet their own requirements while being responsive to the needs of the other. (In this case IDRC went further than was required by the MCA to meet CIDA's requirements.)

Despite the various difficulties CIDA and IDRC were able to work together in a technically complex and innovative project with potential future benefits to Canada which, because of political sensitivities, CIDA could not implement directly.

The availability of the MCA was helpful in that it ensured that roles, responsibilities and reporting relationships were clearly established within a general framework which respected the mandate and approach of each organization. While the Model Contribution Agreement demonstrated its usefulness in smoothing the process of negotiation of a joint project, this did not mean that detailed negotiations relating to the specific project could be avoided. The Agreement is a common reference point or framework to facilitate the process. As each project is different, it needs to be fully discussed and considered in its own context.

JOINT PROJECT : Bharatiya Agro-Industries Foundation (BAIF) Project

Introduction

The BAIF project is a joint project, managed by IDRC, in which CIDA (\$4.2 million), IDRC (\$1.86 million) and the recipient (\$1.1 million) have committed funds . It has been frequently cited during this evaluation as an example of successful collaboration between IDRC and CIDA. This case study will focus on why this is the case. It will also highlight one area of difference that emerges during the negotiations between the two organizations with respect evaluation.

Description of the project and the nature of collaboration

BAIF is a large non-governmental research and rural development organization in India. It has over 2000 employees and a competent professional and technical staff. BAIF's activities are determined by the expressed needs of rural communities. The aim of the project is to assist BAIF to improve the standard of living and quality of life of underprivileged rural communities in five Indian states through reinforcement of its program of development research in four areas (information resource centres, health systems, agricultural production and post-production systems) and strengthening of its integrated rural development field programs.

IDRC had a limited involvement with BAIF before this joint project with CIDA. As a result of contact with members of the Board of IDRC, BAIF sought assistance from IDRC to expand its program to meet wider demands through provision of technical assistance, technicians and equipment. Because of the size of the request, IDRC sought the involvement of CIDA. IDRC's involvement with BAIF is unusual in two respects: it was initiated from the top down and it involves more than one IDRC Division because of its multidisciplinary nature, thus requiring a kind of collaboration between IDRC divisions that had not previously been necessary.

CIDA was interested in the project as it was consistent with its country strategy for India (e.g. rural development and strengthening of local NGOs). Because CIDA does not fund non-governmental organizations directly in country focus projects, and because the project involved technical assistance and institutional support from IDRC, the latter organization was an obvious one through which CIDA could channel its funds. A joint project was agreed whereby CIDA and IDRC both contributed funds and IDRC would manage CIDA's contribution.

Despite some difficulties, a contribution agreement between CIDA and IDRC was negotiated. Through regular, formal and informal contact and a good working relationship between relevant staff, collaboration between the two organizations has been harmonious and constructive.

Issues and impacts

A significant issue that emerged in the negotiations was the way in which the project would be evaluated. In terms of the contribution agreement CIDA saw IDRC as its executing agency and as such its management of the project would be part of CIDA's project evaluation. This highlighted both the different perceptions of the relationship by CIDA and IDRC and their different approaches to evaluation.

In general terms, CIDA's view of the purpose of evaluation is that it should meet the needs of the funding organization, whether this be information to demonstrate accountability for funds disbursed or lessons learned to help improve project management. CIDA's approach to evaluation is based on Treasury Board procedures. Under such an approach, IDRC and BAIF would not normally be actively involved in the planning, design and management of the evaluation.

IDRC's view was that while it was managing CIDA's contribution to the project, it was more of a 'partnership' relationship with both organizations making different inputs. It thus saw itself as having an equal input into any evaluation process. IDRC also believed that the project recipient should be a major beneficiary of any evaluation and that this would be enhanced by their active participation in the evaluation process. IDRC argued that it and BAIF should be involved in the design of the evaluation, drawing up of TOR and choice of evaluators. This was eventually agreed and written into the contribution agreement. Since then all parties have cooperated to set up the evaluation.

Lessons learned

One of the main lessons from the BAIF project is that given a common interest, clearly stated expectations and a willingness to work through differences in a professional manner by both sides, an agreement can be reached which enables a collaborative project to proceed and procedural difficulties to be overcome. In terms of implementing the project there have not been any major difficulties, in part because a clear contribution agreement was worked out, but also because regular contact and sharing of information at the desk and program officer level has led to a constructive working relationship. The case study challenges a reasonably common perception in IDRC that CIDA is monolithic and inflexible.

The IDRC position on evaluation has been written into the Model Contribution Agreement. Further valuable lessons should be learned from the evaluation exercise, not only in terms of the project's effectiveness but also in the bringing together of two different evaluation approaches and an analysis of how well this works.



PARALLEL PROJECT : SADCC/ICRISAT Sorghum and Millet Improvement Project (SMIP)

Introduction

The Sorghum and Millet Improvement Project is an example of a parallel project in which CIDA and IDRC independently support the project. SMIP was visited during the course of this evaluation and discussions were held with project staff and relevant IDRC officers in Nairobi and CIDA officers in Harare. The main aspects examined were the way each donor agency related to the project and with each other, and the impact of the extent of collaboration between IDRC and CIDA on the project.

Description of the project and the nature of collaboration

The Sorghum and Millet Improvement Project was started under the auspices of SADCC (Southern African Development Coordination Committee) and ICRISAT (the International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics) in Bulawayo, Zimbabwe in 1984. Its aim was to improve the productivity and production of sorghum and millet and increase their utilization for the benefit of poorer people farming drier areas in Southern Africa. Phase I sought to strengthen research and production techniques to improve the yields and varieties of sorghum and millet. Phase II continued this work as well as exploring constraints on and opportunities for utilization of research outputs.

CIDA's interest in the project stemmed from its commitment to agricultural research in the SADCC region, where food security is threatened by the substitution of maize for sorghum and millet in regions better suited for small grains. It supported Phase I of the project and is currently supporting Phase II. IDRC's interest was the focus of the project on research into small grains' production and utilization, areas in which it had already supported research. The project has received core funding from USAID, CIDA and GTZ (Germany) since the project commenced. Phase II is due to end in 1996.

IDRC has been involved in a modest way through support for activities such as workshops, seminars and the funding of specific research projects. Two recent examples included:

- a June 1991 workshop at the project research station organized by an IDRC Program Officer which brought together members of GASGA (the Group for Assistance on Systems Relating to Grain After Harvest) and selected nationals from SADCC countries; and
- IDRC funding of a study on the marketing and utilization of small grains in Tanzania, jointly organized by the SMIP economist and the Sokoine University of Agriculture.

The involvement of IDRC staff was welcomed because of their technical knowledge and their common interests with SMIP personnel in the production and utilization of small grains.

The donor agencies related independently to SMIP which provided reports and financial information to each as required. Donors were invited to attend the annual meetings of the project's technical advisory panel. The recipient in fact provided a bridge among the several donors and kept each informed of the activities of the others.

Issues and impacts

There has been no formal collaboration between CIDA and IDRC in relation to the project. To date this has not been a problem for either organization nor for SMIP. Neither IDRC nor CIDA has detailed knowledge of the involvement of the other and what was known was the result of informal contact between the relevant program officers in the field.

Given the nature of the involvement of each organization (core funding versus technical and selected financial support), this had not caused any problems. However, the project and IDRC's involvement in it could be affected in the longer term by CIDA's decision to withdraw funding from agricultural research in the SADCC region.

Lessons learned

This kind of parallel funding in which CIDA provides core funding to an agency or project and IDRC funds activities within the agency or project, or provides support of a technical nature would appear to require limited formal ongoing contact between the two agencies. However, there is a need for relevant CIDA and IDRC program officers to exchange information regularly and be aware of the level and type of involvement or planned involvement of the other, particularly if there is any chance of overlap, duplication of effort or withdrawal of funding.

The kind of parallel involvement described in this case study is relatively non-labour intensive, although the effort required at the informal level should not be underestimated.

It should be noted that the category of parallel funding is more like a continuum than a single type. This case study is an example of one end of the spectrum, in which the involvement of one agency is almost incidental to the involvement of the other. At the other end of the spectrum would be a situation where CIDA or IDRC actively encourage the other to put in place or support a parallel activity. In such a situation there would need to be a greater level of cooperation and joint planning. The following example is closer to this type of parallel funding.

PARALLEL PROJECT : The Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)

Introduction

The Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research is a loose umbrella structure linking together thirteen International Agricultural Research Centres (IARCs) with a similar number loosely affiliated to it. It is comprised of donors who support these IARCs and meets twice a year to determine general policy and funding requirements. CIDA and IDRC hold seats on the CGIAR.

Funding of the CGIAR is an example of a parallel project through which both agencies support international agricultural research. Two issues are highlighted in this case study. The first is the effectiveness of collaboration between CIDA and IDRC in an international fora such as the CGIAR. The second is whether CIDA and IDRC should both independently fund the CGIAR and the IARCs and sit on the Consultative Group. (It has been suggested a number of times that CIDA funds to the IARCs should be transferred to and channelled through IDRC.)

Description of the project and the nature of collaboration

CIDA and IDRC have both supported the IARCs and the CGIAR since its establishment. However, each agency provides a different kind of support. CIDA provides core funding to the IARCs and IDRC special funding to research projects of particular Centres. CIDA decides its contribution based on an assessment of needs and budget agreed by the CGIAR. IDRC decides what it will fund based on its own research agenda, interests and perception of needs.

A particular feature of collaboration in this case is the different roles each plays in the consultative group. Through its Multilateral Branch, CIDA brings its experience and knowledge of international institutions to the table. CIDA's interest is primarily to ensure that the IARCs are operating effectively and get the support they need.

IDRC brings its special expertise in agricultural research and networks in developing countries. Its interest is in promoting and supporting a research agenda which will address critical development issues. Both accept and appreciate the role of the other.

While CIDA is the official Canadian representative on the CGIAR, IDRC also has an independent seat on the CGIAR. However, they are both seen as Canadian, which gives Canada an added voice in the international meetings. It also means that there is a greater need for consultation and collaboration so that Canada is seen to be acting in a consistent way. Any major disagreement or argument on the floor of the CG meetings would be embarrassing. In this sense, this case study is an example of a parallel project which operates on a basis of close and regular consultation.

Relevant officers in CIDA and IDRC meet regularly, especially prior to CGIAR meetings when they go through the agenda together and their approach to the forthcoming meeting. In the past, this has been a formal process but currently operates in a less formal manner. Regular informal contact between the two agencies ensures that they do not work at cross purposes at the CGIAR meetings.

Both organizations freely exchange information. There is always information to share, and with limited staff resources, this cooperative effort enables both to keep abreast of developments in the IARCs as well as institutional issues at the CGIAR level. While the objectives of the two agencies are not the same, they are complementary and thus collaboration is an effective strategy.

Issues and impacts

It is argued that because Canada has two seats on the CGIAR, and can develop a common position on issues, it may be able to have greater influence. A good example has been recent debate in the group on the how international forestry research should be incorporated into the CG system. The status of Canada and the position taken by CIDA and IDRC for a particular approach gained the support of Europe and has challenged the position held by the World Bank and the CG System itself. While the issue has not yet been resolved, representatives of both agencies felt that collaboration between CIDA and IDRC has been important in ensuring the issues were fully debated.

The issue has arisen as to whether CIDA funding to the CGIAR network and centres should be channelled through IDRC. It is debatable whether there would be any savings in this approach as IDRC may well have to add human resources to do the extra work. It is also debatable whether the different type of involvement would be one IDRC would want. It would then probably be the only Canadian representative on the CGIAR and would have difficulty playing two different roles within the meetings.

Another result could be that Canadian funding to the CGIAR and the IARCs may be weakened as a result of pressure to decrease its overall level of support leading to a decrease in core institutional support or specific project funding. Also Canadian influence around the table would be less. The value of the present situation is that Canada can in fact provide an official Canadian viewpoint (through CIDA) and technical expertise (through IDRC). This can be compared to Australia which has only one seat at the table to represent AIDAB, the official donor and ACIAR - the Australian Council for International Agricultural Research.

Lessons learned

At times there has been tension between CIDA and IDRC with respect to their roles in research. Collaboration in funding the CGIAR and the programs of the IARCs demonstrates that they can have complementary roles in support of agricultural research

and development research at large. If both accept the role of the other, they can cooperate in sharing information and, as in this example, play complementary roles in international fora. The case study highlights that both have strengths and expertise to contribute and through respect for each other and the roles played, Canadian influence is greater than would otherwise be the case.

There is clearly room for both organizations in such initiatives and it need not be an expensive or time-consuming task to share information. As long as roles are clearly understood and communication channels kept open, collaboration can work well.
