

**THE ROLES OF CIDA AND IDRC IN
RESEARCH FOR DEVELOPMENT AND POLICY RESEARCH:
A CASE STUDY FOR THE AREAS OF ENVIRONMENT AND GOVERNANCE**

**Nihal Kappagoda
November 1998**

ABBREVIATIONS

ACBF	Africa Capacity Building Foundation
AERC	Africa Economic Research Consortium
AID	Agency for International Development
CGIAR	Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research
CM	Corporate Memory
ECLAC	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
EEPSEA	Economy and Environment Program for South East Asia
FOCAL	Canadian Foundation for the Americas
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IITK	Indian Institute of Technology at Kharangpur
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PAD	Project Approval Document
PPF	Project Processing Facility
RSA	Research Support Activity
SISERA	Secretariat for Institutional Support for Economic Research in Africa
UPCD	University Partnerships in Cooperation and Development
UWO	University of Western Ontario
VEEM	Vietnam Economic and Environmental Management
VISED	Vietnam Sustainable Economic Development

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
Introduction	1
Definitions and Context	1
<i>Research for Development</i>	2
<i>Policy Research</i>	3
Methodology	4
Nature of Research Supported by CIDA and IDRC	5
<i>General Observations</i>	5
<i>Collaboration and Absence of Overlap</i>	6
<i>Data Analysis</i>	6
<i>Institutions Supported</i>	8
<i>Issue Areas</i>	8
Other Research for Development Supported by CIDA in Environment and Governance ..	9
Collaboration between CIDA and IDRC	10
Policy Research	17
Data Problems	18
Issues and Observations	19
ANNEXES	27

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- i. This report was prepared following a consultancy that was undertaken at the request of CIDA and IDRC for two primary purposes. The first was to obtain a clearer picture of the degree and extent to which CIDA supported “**research for development**” within its broader mandate of providing development assistance and examine the collaboration that exists between CIDA and IDRC in funding such research. The second was to identify **policy research** undertaken by both agencies to assist each in setting its priorities and meeting other policy formulation needs.

Main Findings

General:

- CIDA supports research for development
- There was no overlap where both agencies support the same institution in the same issue area.
- Similar issue areas were not supported in different research institutions in the same country.
- Both agencies worked together to support development research recognizing each others strength.
- Data on policy research was difficult to compile in both agencies.

Composition of research projects:

- CIDA funds larger projects with relatively more training and institution-building
- IDRC finances more specific research activities and dissemination of research results.

Type of recipient:

- international institutions are main recipients of CIDA support
- non-governmental research institutes, NGOs and universities are main recipients for IDRC.

Issue areas:

- IDRC - environmental conservation; CIDA - environmental management
- IDRC - economic reform; CIDA - public sector reform

Definitions

- ii. The categories of expenditure usually classified as *research for development* by donors are:
 - a) specific research projects for solving development problems;
 - b) institution-building for research;

- c) human resource development and training for research;
 - d) dissemination of research results, their adaptation and utilization; and.
 - e) the provision of research expertise through consultancies.
- iv *Policy research* is undertaken by the two agencies to assist in setting priorities, adopting policies to achieve them, formulating strategies for implementing the policies and establishing guidelines for development interventions. The work should be conceptual in nature, based on rigorous analyses and investigations, add to the stock of knowledge and be creative to be classified as policy research. It could include applied research and modeling, trend analyses and macroeconomic forecasting.

Methodology

- iv. In order to make the task more manageable, the review of projects was limited to two broad areas - Environment and Governance- as a result of decisions taken after initial exploratory work. The lists of projects identified as research projects or containing research components in the Environment and Governance categories were used to review PADs at CIDA and Project Summaries at IDRC based on the definition of research for development that had been adopted (Annexes 1 and 2). The approval documents pertaining to the projects reviewed were used to undertake a comparative analysis of the research projects funded. Policy research in the two categories that satisfied the definition adopted was also collected (Annexes 3 and 4). The methodology used for the analysis is in Annex 5.

Nature of Research Supported by CIDA and IDRC

- v. Out of 122 projects approved by CIDA during 1995/96 to 1997/98 in the Environment category, 20 were identified as having a research component, and they accounted for 26% of total appropriations under this category. For Governance, comparable figures were 21 projects that had a research component out of a total of 220 appropriated over the three years, accounting for 15% of appropriations in this category.
- vi. Comparison of the data obtained from the PADs and Project Summaries suggests that,
- a) CIDA supports research for development;
 - b) there was no overlap where both agencies support the same institution in the same issue area;

- c) similar issue areas were not supported in different research institutions in the same country;
 - d) both agencies worked together to support development research recognizing each others strength.
- vii. The PADs and Project Summaries examined enable the following comments to be made on the *composition of research projects*:
- a) the size of projects supported by CIDA was larger;
 - b) the financing of specific research activities was a greater consideration in IDRC projects irrespective of the size of the project;
 - c) although support for training by IDRC is more project related, it is a component of a relatively larger number of CIDA projects;
 - d) institution building was a component in a relatively larger number of CIDA projects which may reflect of the scale of funding required; and
 - e) the dissemination of research results was a greater priority in IDRC projects.
- viii. There was a significant difference between the two agencies in the *type of recipient*. In CIDA, international institutions were the leading recipients (with IDRC included in this category) followed by universities and government agencies each of which was about half the number for international institutions. In IDRC, non-governmental research institutes/NGOs were the leading recipients followed by universities and international institutions in equal numbers which were about 60 percent of the number for non-governmental institutes/NGOs.
- ix. The examination of the *issue areas* researched showed some differences. Environmental conservation was the major issue researched in about two-thirds of the projects supported by IDRC. Environmental management was the area most researched in three-quarters of the projects supported by CIDA. In the Governance category, economic reform was the major issue researched in half of the projects funded by IDRC while public sector management was the most important issue researched in about two-thirds of CIDA projects.

Policy Research

- x. Data on policy research was difficult to compile in both agencies. There are no procedures for collecting this data centrally and both agencies need to make a special effort in this regard.

Collaboration between CIDA and IDRC

- xi. There were 46 examples of collaboration during the three-year period under review. Twenty three were in the Environment and Governance categories. An analysis of these projects identified the following modalities for collaboration:
- a) CIDA funds were channeled through IDRC which managed the project without committing any funds;
 - b) both provided funds and IDRC managed or executed the project;
 - c) both provided funds with neither taking responsibility for the management nor execution of the project or program but serving on a board or steering committee; and
 - d) both provided funds independently for different components of a research project or program, taking each others past and present involvement into consideration.
- Of these, type (b) was by far the most common.

Issues and Observations

- xii. a) The study confirmed that CIDA supports research for development and that CIDA and IDRC collaborate in supporting a number of projects or programs, though information on such collaboration is not widely disseminated throughout the agencies.
- b) Initiatives for collaboration will continue based on need although discussions with the staff indicate that there have been operational difficulties. This could be because CIDA operates on priorities with a focus on program countries while IDRC operates on the basis of Program Initiatives without a country focus. Improving the modalities for collaboration has been a concern since the beginning but has not been addressed on an inter-agency basis.
- c) There is a need for information on new priorities or program initiatives and changes in operational procedures to be conveyed to the staff of the other agency.
- d) It would be useful to set out the basis on which CIDA supports research for development. This should cover the types of research that it supports, the criteria used for assessing research proposals, the involvement of Canadian Universities and research institutions, and the parameters for collaboration with IDRC.
- e) Data problems were experienced in both agencies in compiling the information on projects supporting research for development.

THE ROLES OF CIDA AND IDRC IN RESEARCH FOR DEVELOPMENT AND POLICY RESEARCH: A CASE STUDY FOR THE AREAS OF ENVIRONMENT AND GOVERNANCE

Introduction

1. This report was prepared following a consultancy that was undertaken at the request of CIDA and IDRC for two primary purposes. The first was to obtain a clearer picture of the degree and extent to which CIDA supported “research for development” within its broader mandate of providing development assistance and examine the nature of the collaboration that exists between CIDA and IDRC in funding such research. The second was to identify policy research undertaken by both agencies to assist each in setting its priorities and meeting other policy formulation needs.
2. The work was undertaken in two phases. In the first, the databases in both agencies were searched in nine categories for projects which entirely supported “research for development” or where such research was a component. In the second, projects in two categories, i.e. Environment and Governance, were reviewed to identify those which supported “research for development” according to the definition that was agreed to at the end of Phase 1. “Policy research” done in both agencies was compiled separately based on the definition that was adopted.

Definitions and Context

3. It is useful to set out the definitions of “research for development” and “policy research” that were discussed and agreed with CIDA and IDRC for the conduct of the study and set out the roles of the two agencies in regard to each. The definition of the former was used for reviewing the Project Approval Documents (PADs) at CIDA and Project Summaries at IDRC and provided the basis for identifying research projects for analysis.

Research for Development

4. An Ad Hoc Committee of the Board of IDRC defined development research¹ as “applied research that has the objective of leading directly to sustainable improvement in the quality of human existence or basic research that results in an improved understanding of factors that affect development.” This idea is embodied in the Act of Parliament that established IDRC in 1970 where it is stated that its “objects are to initiate, encourage, support and conduct research into the problems of the developing regions of the world and into the means for applying and adapting scientific, technical and other knowledge to the economic and social advancement of those regions.” This provides IDRC with the mandate to support research for development through its various Program Initiatives. It is not a research organization but one that finances research in developing countries.

5. CIDA’s mission, as the main agency responsible for the delivery of Canada’s official development assistance program, is to “to support sustainable development in developing countries, in order to reduce poverty and to contribute to a more secure equitable and prosperous world.”² In terms of this mandate, CIDA supports projects in developing countries in the context of the relevant Country Programming Framework. In some instances, these projects support or have a component which supports research for development. Research is also supported through multilateral channels such as by contributions made to the international agricultural research centres under the umbrella of the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) by the Multilateral Branch and by the Partnerships Branch through its support of Canadian universities. Nevertheless, supporting research is not a central feature of CIDA’s mandate and operations.

6. The main categories³ of expenditure normally classified as research for development by donors are the following:

1

The Nature of Research at IDRC, Report of an Ad Hoc Committee of the Board, 1998.

2

Canada and the World, Government of Canada, 1995.

3

It was suggested during discussions of the draft report that “and data development” be added at the end of a), “and networking” be added at the end of b), and “in pilot projects” be added at the end of d). These changes were not made as the projects were reviewed on the basis of the definition set out in paragraph 6.

- a) specific research projects⁴ for solving development problems;
- b) institution-building for research;
- c) human resource development and training for research. (Training, including studies leading to advanced degrees, are often integral parts of specific research projects);
- d) dissemination of research results, their adaptation and utilization; and.
- e) the provision of research expertise through consultancies.

Policy Research

7. Policy research has been defined for the purpose of this study as research carried out on a range of development-related problems to improve the management of development interventions by the agency concerned. A dictionary definition of policy suggests a course of action adopted and pursued in response to a specific situation or request. Accordingly, policy research is research which assists in choosing this course of action. Over the years, staff members of donor agencies have undertaken or recruited consultants to prepare a number of such "studies." They have ranged from feasibility studies, through engineering design to post-project evaluation and identification of best-practice methodologies, all of which are specific to projects or programs that are funded. In addition, studies have been undertaken on a range of development issues which are global, regional, country specific or sectoral and driven by agency imperatives such as setting priorities, programming or formulating positions for Canada at international meetings. However, not all of these "studies" can be classified as research as this would depend on the "value added" by each.
8. Both CIDA and IDRC undertake policy research to assist in setting priorities, adopting policies to achieve them, formulating strategies for implementing the policies and establishing guidelines for development interventions. The work should be conceptual in nature, based on rigorous analyses and investigations, add to the stock of knowledge and be creative to be classified as policy research. It could include applied research and modeling, trend analyses and macroeconomic forecasting. This definition may have led to subjective judgements on classifying studies as policy research. The task was simplified by the exclusion of

4

These could be in the form of applied research, basic research leading to or as a part of a larger applied research project and experimental development.

management documents, position or working papers, identification of best-practice methodologies, post-project evaluations on single projects, memoranda and briefing notes⁵.

Methodology

9. CIDA's Corporate Memory (CM) database was searched using a mix of priorities, target populations, sectors, and themes/descriptors and key words including research to identify projects approved during 1995/96 to 1997/98 which financed research for development in the Environment and Governance categories. Since the CM only contained data on the Americas, Africa and the Middle East, and Asia Branches, the search was expanded to the databases maintained in the Central and Eastern Europe, Multilateral and Partnerships (in particular the University Partnerships in Cooperation and Development (UPCD) Program) Branches to prepare a more comprehensive list of projects. A detailed review of the PADs or proposals (in the case of the UPCD Program) of the projects identified led to the identification of 50 projects (of which 14 were UPCD projects) in the Environment and Governance categories which were research projects or had research components based on the definition adopted for research for development. The data on these projects is presented in Annex 1.
10. Similarly, the IDRC databases were searched for Environment and Governance projects funded during the three-year period. The application of the definition of research for development during the review of the Project Summaries reduced the total number of projects to 116. Only projects which demonstrated the intention to create new knowledge explicitly rather than to adapt or apply existing knowledge to new circumstances were included. Further, projects which established an environment to facilitate the future creation of developmental knowledge and did not explicitly develop this within its framework, such as projects which only supported institutional strengthening or the establishment of research networks, were eliminated. The data⁶ on these projects is presented in Annex 2.

5

This definition was considered to be very restrictive as it is specific to each agency. It was pointed out during discussions of the draft that both agencies have undertaken or supported policy research which was broader in scope and fell outside the definition that was adopted in this study.

6

Data on each of the projects listed in Annexes 1 and 2 was collected in the data entry described in Annex 5 on Methodology.

12. It should be noted that this study was based on a review of PADs and related documents at CIDA and Projects Summaries at IDRC. No files were examined and only a few selected staff members were interviewed on projects involving collaboration between CIDA and IDRC. The history of the development and implementation of projects was not available though this was gathered in anecdotal form for some projects during ad hoc discussions with the staff in both agencies.
13. Attempts were made during the consultancy to collect information on policy research undertaken by CIDA in the three-year period 1995/96 to 1997/98 directly from its various Branches and by interviewing staff on a selective basis. Similarly, information from IDRC was sought from the Policy and Planning Group, the various Program Initiatives and staff interviews, again done on a selective basis, and examining the list of Research Support Activities (RSAs) approved during the period under study. Complete information could have been obtained only by interviewing all the program staff in both agencies but this was clearly not possible. The information on policy research that was collected is attached as Annexes 3 and 4 for CIDA and IDRC respectively.

Nature of Research Supported by CIDA and IDRC

General Observations

13. As stated earlier, IDRC (and not CIDA) has the explicit mandate in Canada for supporting development research. However, CIDA has a mandate for supporting development which is broader than supporting research and to a degree encompasses it. The pursuit of this broader mandate may require CIDA to support research with or without the collaboration of IDRC and/or other donor agencies. This could be for reasons of scale (which puts it beyond IDRC's reach) or that it is part of a larger development project which could or should not be separated out for operational reasons. Further, CIDA has an interest in the development of a policy formulation capability in developing countries which sometimes makes it necessary to support research for development.
14. It is possible to draw some conclusions about the research supported by comparing the data obtained from the PADs at CIDA and the Project Summaries at IDRC. One is that CIDA supports research for development even though this is not readily recognized by the staff of the agency. Even the projects listed in paragraphs 31 and 32, which relate to Environment and

Governance, illustrate CIDA's direct support for research in addition to the funding provided to international institutions and other mechanisms which are not recorded in its CM.

Collaboration and Absence of Overlap

15. The examination of the PADs at CIDA and Project Summaries at IDRC in the Governance and Environment categories does not provide any evidence of overlap where both agencies support the same institution in the same issue area. Further, there is no evidence of similar issue areas being supported in different research institutions in the same country. However, the CM does not include all funds made available to local institutions from the Canada Fund or local counterpart funds which may provide evidence of overlap but they were impossible to track and are likely to be small. On the other hand, there is evidence of both agencies working together in supporting development research recognizing each others strength in their operations. While the documents examined do not reflect it, it is understood through discussions at IDRC that this collaboration has not always been easy in both project development and implementation. These problems and issues can only be pursued through file reviews and extensive interviews which were not possible.

Data Analysis

16. While the lack of adequate data prevented a full analysis⁷, the PADs and Project Summaries examined enable some comments to be made on the nature of research projects supported by the two agencies. They are the following:
- a) the size of projects supported by CIDA was larger. About 75 percent of the IDRC projects were in the range of \$100,000 to \$500,000 and 75 percent of CIDA projects exceeded \$1,000,000;
 - b) the financing of specific research activities was a greater consideration in IDRC projects irrespective of the size of the project;
 - c) although training is more project related in IDRC projects, it is a component of a relatively larger number of CIDA projects. Training in CIDA projects could be a component of institution building and not necessarily related to research projects;

7

It would have been useful to breakdown the budgets into research projects, institution building, training, dissemination and consultancies. Unfortunately this breakdown was not available in many CIDA projects and some IDRC projects. Table 3 lists the instances in which these elements have figured in the projects funded by the two agencies.

- d) institution building was a component in a relatively larger number of CIDA projects which is probably a reflection of the scale of funding required;
- e) the dissemination of research results was a greater priority in IDRC projects; and
- f) CIDA-funded research projects which do not support global, regional or sub-regional activities were directed mainly toward program countries. IDRC projects which support national activities were spread throughout a larger number of countries.

17. Institution building, particularly in its human resource development aspects, is implicit in IDRC's financing of research projects where there is a larger element of support for local research teams. Program staff provide guidance and research feedback to project staff on an ongoing basis during implementation. This aspect of institution building is enhanced by the coordination of similar research programs at the national and regional levels and through establishing networks of researchers at the national, regional and global levels.

18. The orders of magnitude of the importance of research for development in projects supported by CIDA were reviewed. Out of 122 projects approved during 1995/96 to 1997/98 which had an Environment priority, 20 were identified as having a research component. In value terms, these projects accounted for 26 percent of the appropriations for projects with an Environment priority. Similarly, out of 220 projects approved during 1995/96 to 1997/98 which met the Governance priority, 21 were identified as having a research component. In value terms, these projects accounted for 15 percent of the appropriations for projects with the Governance priority.

19. The following reservations should be kept in mind when interpreting the statistics in the preceding paragraph. These are that,

- a) some of the projects listed in Annex 1 fall into both the Environment and Governance categories. The value of such projects were divided equally between the two categories in computing the percentages;
- b) there could be a similar overlap in the schedule of projects which meet both the Environment and Governance priorities;
- c) the statistics only relate to projects approved by the Americas, Africa and the Middle East, and Asia Branches in CIDA. These exclude activities financed by the Canada Fund and local counterpart funds; and
- d) no estimates can be provided of the proportions relating only to research activities. It would only have been possible to obtain these by reviewing the files and actual expenditures.

Institutions Supported

20. There is a significant difference between the two agencies in the type of recipient for its grants for Environment and Governance research projects. International institutions, government agencies, public research institutes, private research institutes/NGOs and universities were the different types identified in this study. An analysis of the recipients in Annexes 1 and 2 summarized in Table 4 shows that in the case of CIDA, international institutions (including IDRC) were the leading type of recipient followed by universities and government agencies each of which is about half the number for international institutions. International institutions were the leading type of institution even when IDRC was excluded. In IDRC, non-governmental research institutes/NGOs were the leading type of recipient followed by universities and international institutions in equal numbers which were about 60 percent of the number for non-governmental research institutes/NGOs.

Issue Areas

21. The examination of the issue areas in Environment researched in the projects supported by the two agencies (Table 1) showed some differences. Environmental conservation was the major issue researched in about two-thirds of the IDRC-supported projects. Environmental management was researched in just under half of the projects followed by sustainable agriculture in nearly one-fifth. Environmental management was the issue area most researched in three-quarters of the CIDA-supported projects, This was followed by pollution control and prevention, and environmental policy.
22. There were differences in the issue areas in the Governance category. Economic reform was the major issue researched in half of the IDRC-funded projects reviewed. Public sector management was another major issue researched in under half of the projects with civil society in one-third. Economic reform did not feature as a significant issue in CIDA-funded projects where public sector management was the most important issue in about two-thirds followed by civil society in one-third of those reviewed.

Other Research for Development Supported by CIDA in Environment and Governance

23. There were research projects funded by grants provided by the Central and Eastern Europe, Partnerships and Multilateral Branches which are not included in the CM. *The Central and*

Eastern Europe Branch indicated that it did not finance any research activities. The only exception appeared to be the grant given to IDRC for the Environmental Management Development Phase II project in Ukraine approved in 1997 which includes a research component. This was a follow up of a grant that was approved when the program was in the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

24. It was difficult to identify specific research projects that were funded by the *Partnerships Branch*. While it was possible that grants given by the Branch to NGOs, Non-Governmental Institutions and International NGOs may have included development research work, the research was not usually mentioned in the proposals submitted to the Branch. They could perhaps have been identified by reviewing progress reports and thereafter obtaining copies of the research but this was beyond the time and resources available for the present study.
25. Grants made to specialized institutes such as the North-South Institute and the International Institute for Sustainable Development, which are currently of the order of \$1.0 million annually to each, would have produced research output in the Environment⁸ and Governance⁹ categories. It will however be difficult to relate this output to the CIDA grant where it is made for core support. Even when was provided for a specific study such as the North-South Institute's Study of the Multilateral Development Banks (which was funded by CIDA and other donors), it was not possible to relate one or more of the study's five publications to the CIDA grant as it was not allocated to a specific component.
26. Other grants made by the Partnership Branch which have supported research were the Tier 1 and Tier 2 grants made under the UPCD Program. An examination of the successful Tier 1 proposals made by universities (which are managed by the Branch) provided a list of grants which may have produced research output in the two categories reviewed. Similarly, the review of the proposals that were available of the successful Tier 2 projects (which are managed by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada) produced an additional

8

There are examples in other categories of CIDA grants which would have contributed to research without identifying a particular activity such as the grants made to the International Centre for Diarrheal Research, Bangladesh.

9

The North-South Institute's Canadian Development Report 1998 entitled Canadian Corporations and Social Responsibility would be an example as would its forthcoming publication Civil Society and the Aid Industry.

list of grants that may have resulted in research output in the Environment and Governance categories. These projects are listed separately in Annex 1.

27. A number of grants channeled through the *Multilateral Branch* may have been utilized for research for development¹⁰. However, the only allocations that were relevant for this study (i.e. on Environment and Governance) were the contributions made to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) managed by the United Nations Development Program, United Nations Environment Program and World Bank. As in the case of grants discussed in the preceding paragraphs, it was not possible to identify research output with the CIDA contribution as each grant made by the GEF cannot be directly related, in whole or part, to the CIDA contribution. This was the case with all contributions from CIDA to multilateral institutions.

Collaboration between CIDA and IDRC

28. Collaboration between the two agencies in the Governance and Environment categories was identified initially during the review of all PADs in CIDA by selecting those that mentioned an involvement by IDRC. These projects were matched subsequently with the IDRC list to identify the corresponding project or activity. Difficulties were experienced in making this identification for the following reasons:
- a) different search criteria were used in the two agencies for identifying research projects;
 - b) the same project titles were not used by the two agencies. The phases of the project or program being financed sometimes differed from the funding phases of each agency;
 - c) the time periods during which funding was provided by the two agencies did not coincide.
29. IDRC projects that had an involvement by CIDA were identified during the review of Project Summaries. This produced an additional list of projects that provided examples of

These include the contributions made to the worldwide network of agricultural research centres operating under the umbrella of the CGIAR. A part of each of these grants is used to finance their research programs and the balance is used for core funding. Similarly, grants are provided to WHO's Tropical Diseases, AIDS, Onchocerciasis Control and Human Reproduction Programs. Contributions are also made to the Consultative Group for Assistance to the Poorest.

collaboration between the two agencies. The identification of the corresponding project or activity in CIDA posed the same difficulties that were mentioned in the preceding paragraph and was not pursued with CIDA staff.

30. Information collected from these reviews was supplemented by ad hoc searches done of the IDRC databases¹¹ (RADIUS and IDRIS) based on the consultant's knowledge of the activities and some discussions with IDRC staff members. Finally, in an attempt to place these examples of collaboration in a broader context, the RADIUS database was searched for all examples of collaboration between the two agencies across all categories during the period 1995/96 to 1997/98. This showed that there were 46 examples of collaboration covering both projects and RSAs¹² (Research Support Activity - used by IDRC for small activities). The search also made it possible to identify 23 collaborative activities in the Environment and Governance categories and these are listed below in paragraphs 31 and 32.
31. Not all the PADs and Project Summaries of the 23 activities were examined due to the difficulties experienced in identifying corresponding activities in both agencies. Nevertheless, details on some ten of the projects are given below to illustrate the type of collaboration that took place:

a) South Africa Governance Project: This project for \$9.8 million was approved by CIDA in March 1996. IDRC was responsible for the delivery of the project and was chosen for this role because of its close links through programs with the democratic movement since 1988 and continuing project support on governance initiatives in the country. No funds were appropriated by IDRC for the project but a management fee of 10 percent and expenditure for program management were included in the CIDA budget. This is one of the modalities for cooperation between the two agencies, the initiative for which appears to have come from CIDA. This project was approved by CIDA during a period when IDRC was actively seeking to manage project funds provided by other donors.

b) Multipurpose Waste Recycling Project (India): This project for \$2.15 million was approved by CIDA in January 1997. The University of Western Ontario (UWO) was the recipient of funds for research work to be conducted in collaboration with the Indian Institute

11

The information contained in the databases does not always correspond.

12

The summaries of the projects and RSAs obtained from the RADIUS database are in Annex 6.

of Technology at Kharangpur (IITK) on the commercial end-use of three contributors to environmental degradation - sewage sludge, water hyacinth and fly ash. Most of the grant was for expenses at the UWO and its staff. This project followed one approved by IDRC in June 1993 for \$0.102 million for the UWO and the State Pollution Control Board of India on Land Restoration Through Waste Management. Concurrently with the CIDA project, IDRC's Regional Office in Delhi approved a grant of \$0.230 million for the UWO and IITK for a Fly Ash Management project in India which was intended to consolidate the results of IDRC's earlier project. The initiative for this project appears to have been taken by the UWO whose principal researcher had a long standing research interest in the area. The discussions on the CIDA project and IDRC's second project were held mainly in Delhi.

c) Economic Research Consortium II (Peru): This project fell outside the time period under review. It was selected as it is an example of collaboration between the two agencies which has gone on for nine years beginning in 1989 and is expected to enter a third phase during 1998. The grant of \$4.8 million approved in March 1994 followed an earlier grant of \$3.0 million approved by CIDA in 1989 to enable IDRC to manage a program of research projects on macroeconomic stabilization, long-term reform and adjustment undertaken by five research institutions in Lima. IDRC was well placed to do this as it had been supporting research in Peru since the 1980s and had a relationship with these institutions. A management fee of 10 percent was included in the CIDA budget for IDRC during both phases. In addition, IDRC contributed \$0.344 million and \$0.750 million for Phases I and II respectively. This appears to have been a joint initiative with IDRC taking responsibility for the management of the research programs and CIDA providing the large scale funding that was necessary due to its interest in building up a capacity for policy analysis which could be drawn upon by the government. Further, it was intended to prevent a brain drain from the country which could have taken place during the late 1980s when the program began. As stated above, collaboration between the two agencies is to continue into a third phase with research institutes in all of Peru participating in the program. The program for the third phase was developed in the expectation of funding of the order of \$5.0 million from CIDA which was able to provide only \$3.5 million.

d) Environmental Study of Artisanal Small and Medium-Sized Mining in Bolivia, Chile and Peru: A CIDA grant of \$70,000 was approved in March 1996 for the Canadian Foundation for the Americas (FOCAL) for this study. FOCAL received cofinancing of the order of US\$175,000 from the World Bank and provided US\$50,000 from its own funds for this project. IDRC's role in this study was a spinoff of an earlier project it financed in 1993

on Growth, the Environment and Fiscal Policy in the Mining Sector (Latin America) for which \$0.430 million was appropriated. In March 1996 IDRC provided \$39,000 to finance a start-up meeting for the study and a coordinator whose main role was to promote the project at the Summit on Sustainable Development which was held in Bolivia in December 1996. Although small, this grant was a part of the complex financing arrangements for FOCAL.

e) Economy and Environment Program for South East Asia (EEPSEA): This initiative was launched in May 1993 at the IDRC office in Singapore with a grant of \$0.985 million from IDRC to bring donors and research institutions together to support economic analysis of environmental problems and strengthen environmental management in Asia. EEPSEA built up a program of research and capacity building in environmental and resource economics which now receives support from nine other donors including CIDA. Support for an amount of \$1.822 million over a four-year period was approved by CIDA in December 1995. The direct link to policy formulation from the research supported under the EEPSEA has provided the justification for CIDA support of the program. IDRC support for the program has continued with two further appropriations of \$0.935 million in June 1995 and of \$0.830 million in June 1997. The cofinancing mobilized has enabled IDRC to manage the program effectively with a small technical secretariat. In this instance, the initiative for mobilizing this cofinancing was taken by IDRC.

f) Africa Economic Research Consortium (AERC): This was set up in 1988 by a group of donors which included CIDA, IDRC and some others to strengthen local capacity to conduct independent research on improving economic management in the economies of Sub-Saharan Africa. The precursor to the establishment of the Consortium was the project financed by IDRC in East and Southern Africa between 1983 and 1987 which led to the establishment of successful economic research networks. During the period 1988-97 when three 3-year programs were implemented, CIDA provided two grants totaling \$4.4 million toward a total AERC (which now has 14 donors) budget of \$50.8 million. IDRC's contributions during this period through three appropriations totaled \$2.45 million. CIDA's latest grant of \$3.0 million was approved for a three-year period in June 1997 while IDRC approved a grant of \$1.003 million for a five-year period in March 1997. In addition, IDRC has provided project support to the AERC for a study on Africa and the World Trading System by approving a grant of \$0.250 million in 1997.

g) Vietnam Economic and Environmental Management (VEEM) Project: Both CIDA and IDRC have contributed \$1.0 million to this project which is managed by IDRC. The grants

were approved at the end of 1996. The overall objective of the project is to build capacity for policy formulation in trade, economic reform and poverty alleviation and community based natural resource management. This project builds on the Vietnam Sustainable Economic Development (VISED) Project which was approved in 1993 to which CIDA contributed \$3.72 million and IDRC \$0.5 million while managing the project. The VISED project assisted in developing Vietnam's capacity for managing a market economy and its integration into the South East Asian Region and enabled CIDA to establish a presence in Vietnam.

h) Environmental Management Development in Ukraine, Phase II: Following the allocation of \$5.0 million in 1993 by the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (before the Program for Central and Eastern Europe was transferred to CIDA) for Phase I, CIDA approved a further allocation of \$4.208 million for Phase II during 1997. The project will assist Ukraine to consolidate the gains achieved during Phase I and improve its environmental management and relate it to economic and market issues. The project will also focus on the water and pollution problems of the Dnipro River Basin. IDRC has not committed any funds to this project. As in the South African Governance Project, funds have been earmarked by CIDA for a management fee and program management expenses for IDRC.

i) The New Latin American Model: This project was developed by IDRC and the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) based on an initiative taken by the Executive Director of the Commission. It is a large study on the development of Latin America and the Caribbean in the 1990s with a focus on the integration of economic, social and environmental policies at the macro, institutional and micro levels. An important issue for the project was to determine whether there was a Latin American and Caribbean model of development which differed from the East Asian model. Given the scale of the project, it could not proceed without funding from CIDA whose support was assured during project development. Accordingly, IDRC appropriated \$0.33 million for the project in March 1996 and ECLAC agreed to fund the time of its staff engaged in the project. However, CIDA funding was not provided at that time and the project began with external funding from European sources. Subsequently, CIDA approved a grant of \$1.467 million in 1996 to be administered by IDRC.

j) Secretariat for Institutional Support for Economic Research in Africa (SISERA): The proposal for this project was developed to complement existing research programs to strengthen economic research at the regional level. Examples of these were the programs

supported by the AERC, Africa Capacity Building Foundation (ACBF) and IDRC which made several institutional strengthening grants in West Africa (to Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire and Senegal). The secretariat was established by IDRC with the approval of a grant of \$1.0 million in July 1997. This was done in the expectation that cofinancing of the order of \$2.0 million would be provided by CIDA, the Rockefeller Foundation and USAID though only USAID has provided funds to date. SISERA absorbed two ongoing major projects in which CIDA, IDRC and other donors collaborated. The first was the "Réseau sur les politiques industrielles" which was intended to develop research capacity in the countries of West and Central Africa to assist in formulating industrial policies and establish a research network. IDRC contributed \$1.356 and \$0.900 million over two phases, CIDA contributed \$1.612 million during the first phase and \$1.100 million during the second and USAID made a contribution during the second phase. The second was the "Programme de Troisième Cycle Inter-universitaire" which developed an Inter-University Program in Economics (at the equivalent of a Master's Program in Canada) for Francophone Africa. IDRC contributed \$0.25 million during each of two phases and CIDA \$1.000 million during the second phase. IDRC had taken the lead in both these programs and persuaded CIDA to participate in them and played a coordinating role for both CIDA and USAID vis-a-vis these projects. It appears that CIDA is considering reducing its support to the activities under the SISERA envelope because of an apparent overlap with the programs of the ACBF and due to changing priorities.

32. There were other collaborative activities in the Environment and Governance categories that were identified from the IDRC databases. These are listed below by IDRC project title, date of approval, and the IDRC and CIDA contributions obtained from the IDRC database (RADIUS). The other donors for these projects are not included in this listing. As stated, there could be other projects involving collaboration that were missed in this review.

- a) Public Process for Formulating Telecommunications Policy and Regulations: South Africa, Approved May 1995, IDRC \$0.248 million, CIDA \$0.999 million.
- b) Regional Conference on the Legal and Regulatory Framework for Civil Society, Approved July 1995, IDRC \$5000, CIDA \$20000.
- c) Development and Security in South East Asia, Approved August 1995, IDRC 0.03 million, CIDA 0.20 million.
- d) International Model Forest Secretariat, Approved September 1995, IDRC \$0.29 million, CIDA 0.25 million.
- e) Trade and Industrial Policy in South Africa, Approved March 1996, IDRC \$1.006 million, CIDA \$2.364 million.

f) Participation in the Canada-Southern Cone Environment Technology Initiative, Approved December 1996, IDRC \$0.050 million, CIDA \$0.55 million.

g) Northern Support to East European and Southern Civil Society, Approved February 1997, IDRC \$0.099 million, CIDA \$0.048 million.

h) Agricultural Policy Transition Project (South Africa), Approved February 1997, IDRC \$0.400 million, CIDA \$0.210 million.

i) Adolescence and Social Change in Egypt, Approved March 1997, IDRC \$0.195 million, CIDA \$0.850 million.

j) Desertification Indicators Workshop, Approved June 1997, IDRC \$0.045 million, CIDA \$0.010 million.

k) Élaboration du Programme D'Action National au Sénégal - Sensibilisation de la Population, Approved September 1997, IDRC \$0.342 million, CIDA \$0.064 million.

l) Urban Agriculture, Environment & Social Economy, La Habana (Cuba), Approved December 1997, IDRC \$0.105 million, CIDA \$0.150 million.

m) International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance- Institutional Support, Approved March 1998, IDRC \$0.25 million, CIDA \$0.25 million.

33. On the basis of a review of these projects, it was possible to identify the following modalities by which collaboration took place between the two agencies:

a) IDRC was the conduit for channeling CIDA funds to the recipient(s) with its role being confined to the management of the project without committing any funds;

b) both CIDA and IDRC provided funds to the recipient(s) with IDRC taking responsibility for the management or execution of the project;

c) both CIDA and IDRC provided funds to the recipient(s) with neither agency taking responsibility for the management nor execution of the project or program but serving on a board or steering committee;

d) there were instances where b) evolved into c) by the establishment of a technical secretariat by IDRC;

e) there were examples of c) where IDRC represented CIDA (and other donors) on the boards or steering committees; and

f) both CIDA and IDRC provided funds to the recipient(s) independently for different components of a research project or program while each others past and present involvement into consideration.

The most common modality appeared to be clearly (b).

Policy Research

34. An attempt was made to collect information on policy research undertaken in the two agencies during Phase 2 using the definition set out in paragraphs 7 and 8. The information collected was incomplete and disappointing.
35. Requests for information were made to all the Branches in CIDA and the list that was compiled from the partial responses received is in Annex 3. This list shows that very little progress was made in compiling the data during Phase 2. There could be many reasons for this. One may have been a misunderstanding regarding the definition of policy research and consequently the data to be included. It may also have occurred due to a mix up between policy research and the output of research for development projects. Second, the requests for information made during this consultancy came after earlier requests to the staff by the Policy Branch to serve the needs of the Inter-Departmental Policy Research Initiative and CIDA's Policy Committee which could have led to staff "fatigue" arising from repeated requests. Third, information on policy research is stored by individual staff members who were responsible for undertaking the research or contracting consultants for this purpose. There are no procedures for collecting this information centrally, even at the Divisional level. This data on policy research can only be collected from each staff member directly.
36. Requests were made for data on policy research to Program Initiatives and the Policy and Planning Group in IDRC. The list compiled, again from partial responses received, is in Annex 4. It is as disappointing as the one compiled at CIDA. Another attempt should be made to collect data systematically, particularly of policy research done during the planning stages of each Program Initiative and include mid-term/annual reviews done during the current planning cycle. It was pointed out that the research done during the planning stages of Program Initiatives may not have been in the form of research papers. Some could have been in the form of memos or even long E-mails to colleagues. These have been eliminated by the definition of policy research adopted for this study. The Policy and Planning Group may wish to revisit the collection of data of agency-wide policy research done during the period under review and include work undertaken at the regional offices as well. At the same time, IDRC's Evaluation Office could be requested to prepare a list of studies undertaken or commissioned by it which are not specific to single projects.

37. There was no link between the two agencies in the formulation of policy and no attempt was made to keep each other informed of work in progress or completed policy research in areas that would be of interest to both agencies.

Data Problems

38. It is necessary to comment on some data problems that had an impact on the output of this study. The first is that the research projects identified in the Environment and Governance categories were not comparable. The coverage of CIDA's CM was incomplete. It is geared to provide better data based on disbursements unlike the IDRC databases and this study only examined projects at the approval stage. Further, the search criteria used by the two agencies were different. It was not possible to use the same search criteria because the databases were set up differently to serve different purposes.
39. The second is that some thought should be given by CIDA to the process by which a comprehensive listing of activities (for specific or all categories) could be obtained given the need to supplement the CM with databases held by the Central and East Europe, Partnership and Multilateral Branches. Further, the sectors, target populations and themes/descriptors used by CIDA¹³ should be reviewed, e.g., the sectors include geographical survey, food aid, institutional support and material management while themes/descriptors include the micro enterprise sector (entrepreneurs are included in target populations) and human resource development which is also classified as a sector.
40. Third, in IDRC, the RADIUS and IDRIS databases were used to obtain the first listing of projects in the two categories that were reviewed. It is understood that data is first entered into the RADIUS database from the Project Summaries and then transferred to the IDRIS database. The latter contains more project information while the former provides more information on funding by other donors. However, the consultant found some peculiarities in these databases. There was a very large and obvious error in the IDRC grant for a project in the IDRIS database though this was not the case in the RADIUS database. In another, a project was entered in one database and not in the other although it was not a recent project. Co-funding sources are listed in the IDRIS database but no values are available.

13

Please see Annex 1 of the Phase 1 Report for a complete listing.

Issues and Observations

41. The study has confirmed that CIDA has supported research for development in the past. It has also shown that CIDA and IDRC have collaborated in supporting a number of projects or programs. This collaboration was the result of,

a) the recognition by CIDA that IDRC is well equipped to manage or execute research projects or programs that CIDA proposes to finance with or without IDRC cofinancing. This is often due to the close links that IDRC had forged with research institutions as a result of past funding or the development of networks between them and IDRC's ability to supervise research programs by providing mentoring and feedback to researchers e.g. Economic Research Consortium II (Peru);

b) the initiative taken by IDRC to involve CIDA due to the need for large scale funding which is beyond the scope of IDRC, sometimes as a first step toward mobilizing support for the initiative from a consortium (e.g. EEPSEA and VEEM);

c) the initiative taken by another donor agency to involve both CIDA and IDRC in a consortium or consultative group (e.g. the World Bank sponsored CGIAR); and

d) the initiative taken by a Canadian university or research institution in the developing world to mobilize support from both agencies (e.g. Fly Ash Management - India).

Information on such collaboration is not widely disseminated to the staff in both agencies suggesting the need for a special effort in this regard.

42. Initiatives of this type will continue based on need although discussions with the staff indicate that there have been difficulties in some cases both at the formulation and implementation stages. One reason for this could be that CIDA operates on priorities with a focus on program countries while IDRC operates on the basis of Program Initiatives without a country focus. Improving in the modalities for collaboration has been a concern since the beginning but has not been addressed on an inter-agency basis. CIDA and IDRC may wish to formulate a framework for collaboration based on past experience of the modalities that have delivered research programs most effectively to the recipient institutions.

43. There is a need for information on new priorities or program initiatives and changes in operational procedures to be conveyed to the staff of the other agency. Examples of these would be changes in IDRC's Program Initiatives system and new initiatives set out in CIDA's annual Plans, Priorities and Strategies.

44. Some team leaders of Program Initiatives and Regional Directors of IDRC held briefing sessions with three Bilateral Branches of CIDA in 1998. While visits of IDRC Regional Directors to Ottawa provide opportunities for discussions to be held with the CIDA staff, there is a need for such meetings to be adequately and well prepared. Similarly, IDRC Regional Directors and/or regional program staff could be invited for regional meetings of CIDA staff if there are any specific issues or program initiatives to be discussed.
45. It would be useful to set out the basis on which CIDA supports research for development. This should cover the types of research that it supports, the criteria used for assessing research proposals, the involvement of Canadian Universities and research institutions, and the parameters for collaboration with IDRC.
46. Both agencies need to make a special effort to collect information on policy research undertaken by staff or consultants. There should be agreement on the definition of policy research and the basis on which the research output will be selected for inclusion in a centralised database. Each paper could be stored electronically in a document management system once it is accepted as satisfying the criteria for policy research.

Table One
ISSUE AREA — ENVIRONMENT
Developmental Research

	IDRC (project summaries)	CIDA (project approval documents)
\$0 to \$99,999	biodiversity: 3 environmental analysis/assessment: 1 environmental conservation: 8 environmental management: 2 forest conservation: 1 information exchange: 1 pesticide control: 1 pollution prevention: 1 sustainable agriculture: 2 traditional medicines: 1 water resources: 1 SUB TOTAL — documents: 7	environmental analysis/assessment: 1 environmental conservation: 1 environmental management: 1 nonrenewable natural resources conservation: 1 SUB TOTAL — document: 2
\$100,000 to \$249,999	animal husbandry: 1 biodiversity: 6 ecotourism: 1 environmental analysis/assessment: 3 environmental conservation: 18 environmental economics: 2 environmental health: 1 environmental legislation: 2 environmental management: 16 environmental policy: 3 fisheries: 2 food security: 1 forest conservation: 1 information exchange: 1 landscape protection: 2 marine ecosystems: 4 pollution control/remediation: 1 pollution prevention: 1 sustainable agriculture: 8 traditional medicines: 1 water resources: 1 SUB TOTAL — documents: 27	environmental analysis/assessment: 1 fuel: 1 SUB TOTAL — documents: 1

<p>\$250,000 to \$499,999</p>	<p>animal husbandry: 2 biodiversity: 5 crop development: 1 desertification: 4 ecotourism: 1 environmental analysis/assessment: 6 environmental conservation: 23 environmental economics: 2 environmental education: 1 environmental legislation: 2 environmental management: 14 environmental policy: 4 food security: 2 forest conservation: 3 landscape protection: 2 nonrenewable natural resources conservation: 2 soil conservation: 3 soil degradation: 1 soil erosion: 1 sustainable agriculture: 7 sustainable growth: 1 traditional medicines: 1 water resources: 1</p> <p>SUB TOTAL — documents: 31</p>	<p>environmental conservation: 1 environmental management: 2 environmental policy: 1 sustainable growth: 1</p> <p>SUB TOTAL — documents: 2</p>
<p>\$500,000 to \$999,999</p>	<p>air quality: 1 environmental analysis/assessment: 2 environmental conservation: 4 environmental economics: 1 environmental management: 3 environmental policy: 3 marine environment: 1 soil conservation: 1 sustainable agriculture: 2 water quality: 2</p> <p>SUB TOTAL — documents: 10</p>	<p>environmental management: 1 pollution prevention: 1 nonrenewable natural resources conservation: 1 vehicle emissions: 1</p> <p>SUB TOTAL — documents: 2</p>

<p>\$1,000,000 to \$4,999,999</p>	<p>biodiversity: 1 environmental conservation: 1 SUB TOTAL — documents: 1</p>	<p>air quality: 2 energy efficiency: 2 environmental analysis/assessment: 1 environmental conservation: 4 environmental economics: 2 environmental legislation: 1 environmental management: 8 environmental policy: 4 food security: 1 grasslands: 1 landscape protection: 1 marine ecosystems: 1 pollution control: 2 pollution prevention: 4 pest control: 2 reforestation: 1 renewable natural resources conservation: 2 soil conservation: 1 sustainable agriculture: 1 waste management: 3 water quality: 1 wetlands: 1 SUB TOTAL — documents: 8</p>
<p>\$5,000,000 +</p>		<p>environmental analysis/assessment: 1 environmental management: 3 environmental policy: 2 marine ecosystems: 1 marine environment: 1 pollution prevention: 1 urbanization: 1 waste management: 1 water quality: 1 SUB TOTAL — documents: 5</p>

Table Two
ISSUE AREA — Governance
Developmental Research

	IDRC (project summaries)	CIDA (project approval documents)
\$0 to \$99,999	Human Rights: 1 Democratic Institutions/Development: 1 Public Sector Competence: 3 Civil Society: 2 Political Will: 2 Economic Reform: 2 SUB TOTAL — documents: 5	Public Sector Competence: 2 SUB TOTAL — documents: 2
\$100,000 to \$249,999	Human Rights: 3 Democratic Institutions/Development: 1 Disarmament/Peacebuilding: 3 Public Sector Competence: 3 Civil Society: 4 Political Will: 1 Economic Reform: 9 Youth: 1 SUB TOTAL — documents: 16	Democratic Institutions/Development: 1 Public Sector Competence: 1 SUB TOTAL — documents: 1
\$250,000 to \$499,999	Human Rights: 1 Public Sector Competence: 10 Civil Society: 6 Economic Reform: 6 Youth: 1 SUB TOTAL — documents: 15	Democratic Institutions/Development: 1 Political Will: 1 SUB TOTAL — documents: 2
\$500,000 to \$999,999	Public Sector Competence: 1 Civil Society: 1 Economic Reform: 1 SUB TOTAL — documents: 2	Public Sector Competence: 1 SUB TOTAL — documents: 1
\$1,000,000 to \$4,999,999	Public Sector Competence: 1 Economic Reform: 2 SUB TOTAL — documents: 2	Human Rights: 1 Democratic Institutions/Development: 1 Disarmament/Peacebuilding: 1 Public Sector Competence: 5 Civil Society: 6 Political Will: 2 Economic Reform: 1 SUB TOTAL — documents: 11
\$5,000,000 +		Public Sector Competence: 4 Civil Society: 1 SUB TOTAL — documents: 4

Table Three
RESEARCH EXPENDITURES
Developmental Research

	IDRC (project summaries)	CIDA (project approval documents)
\$0 to \$99,999	research projects — applied: 13 research projects — exp. dev: 2 training: 1 dissemination of research results: 8 experts: 1	research projects — applied: 1 training: 2 experts: 2
\$100,000 to \$249,999	research projects — basic: 5 research projects — applied: 38 research projects — exp. dev: 3 institution building: 5 training: 12 dissemination of research results: 22 experts: 6	research projects — applied: 1
\$250,000 to \$499,999	research projects — basic: 3 research projects — applied: 44 research projects — exp. dev: 6 institution building: 3 training: 19 dissemination of research results: 31 experts: 2	research projects — applied: 3 institution building: 2 training: 1 dissemination of research results: 1 experts: 1
\$500,000 to \$999,999	research projects — applied: 11 research projects — exp. dev: 2 institution building: 1 training: 6 dissemination of research results: 7 experts: 1	research projects — applied: 1 institution building: 1 training: 3 dissemination of research results: 2 experts: 2
\$1,000,000 to \$4,999,999	research projects — basic: 2 research projects — applied: 3 institution building: 1 dissemination of research results: 3	research projects — basic: 2 research projects — applied: 15 research projects — exp. dev: 5 institution building: 4 training: 9 dissemination of research results: 6 experts: 12
\$5,000,000 +		research projects — applied: 5 research projects — exp. dev: 2 institution building: 3 training: 4 dissemination of research results: 1 experts: 3

Table Four
RECIPIENT AGENCIES
Developmental Research

	IDRC (project summaries)	CIDA (project approval documents)
\$0 to \$99,999	IO: 2 Public Research Institute: 1 Private Research Institute: 9 University: 3	Govt: 1 Private Research Institute: 2 University: 1
\$100,000 to \$249,999	IO: 11 Govt: 7 Public Research Institute: 2 Private Research Institute: 19 University: 12	Private Research Institute: 1
\$250,000 to \$499,999	IO: 13 Govt: 3 Public Research Institute: 1 Private Research Institute: 17 University: 13	IO: 2 Private Research Institute: 2
\$500,000 to \$999,999	IO: 5 Govt: 1 Private Research Institute: 6 University: 2	IO: 1 Govt: 2 Private Research Institute: 1
\$1,000,000 to \$4,999,999	Govt: 1 Public Research Institute: 1 Private Research Institute: 1 University: 1	IO: 7 Govt: 2 Private Research Institute: 9 University: 4
\$5,000,000 +		IO: 2 Govt: 2 Private Research Institute: 2 University: 1

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: CIDA Research Projects

ANNEX 2: IDRC Research Projects

ANNEX 3: CIDA Policy Research

ANNEX 4: IDRC Policy Research

ANNEX 5: Methodology

**ANNEX 6: Projects Involving Collaboration Between CIDA
and IDRC**