

Ministry of Foreign Affairs TAS

File no.: 104.dan.8.1.2600

External Grant Committee Meeting 29 November 2013

Agenda Item no.: 1

1. Title: Building Stronger Universities in Developing Countries, Phase Two
2. Partners: 7 Partner universities in Tanzania, Ghana, Uganda, and Nepal
3. Amount: DKK 100.0 million
4. Duration: 34 months from 1 January 2014 to 1 November 2016.
5. Presentation to the Programme Committee: April 18, 2013
6. Previous Grants: 18.12.09: DKK 5.0 million; 23.10.10: DKK 3.0 million; 07.07.11: DKK 60.0 million; 17.12.12: 19.0 million
7. Strategies and policy priorities: 'The Right To A Better Life – Strategy for Denmark's Development Cooperation' (2012) and 'Strategic framework for Danish support for development research' (draft, 2013)
8. Danish National Budget account code: 06.35.01.10.41 – 'Projekter i Danmark'
9. Desk officer: Henrik Vistisen
10. Head of Department: Tove Degnbol

11. Summary:

The objective of the Building Stronger Universities programme is to strengthen the capacity of seven universities in four Danida priority countries to undertake high-quality research. Support is provided to their research environment and research processes, and activities include i.a. support to strengthening research policies and strategies, PhD schools, development of research concepts, enhancement of research quality assurance, and improving libraries and publication managements systems. The universities select partners among Danish universities which can provide support in the areas identified. The second phase builds upon the experience and results achieved during the first phase, and many of the activities will continue. The organisation and management of the programme, however, has been changed to ensure that the responsibility for identification and implementation of activities rests with the universities in the South.

Objective and problem formulation:

Research-based knowledge is necessary to address existing and emerging development challenges. Research may lead to innovations and new technological solutions, which contribute to alleviating poverty and provide the background for long-term sustainable development processes. Research produces new knowledge necessary for political decision-making and may also challenge existing positions by drawing attention to negative implications e.g. for particular population groups. Research play a key role in documenting results of developing processes, and research is needed in universities to provide research-based education. Access to research and evidence-based knowledge that can inform policy choices can be seen as both an important common good and a political right.

The importance of ‘building knowledge economies’¹ applies both to countries in the North and in the South, and there is increasing awareness among political leaders in developing countries of the importance of research. Although several developing countries are investing government funds in research, they cannot meet the massive challenges, including the needs for country-specific research and building capacity for research uptake², without external support.

The OECD/DAC definition of capacity³ inspires a definition of research capacity as “the ability of individuals, organisations and systems to undertake and disseminate high quality research effectively and efficiently”⁴.

Applying this definition, it is useful to distinguish among efforts addressing the individual, institutional, and national level of the research system, and it is important to avoid the pitfall of equating research capacity only with the skills and competences of staff in research institutions. Donors, however, have tended to concentrate on individual capacity development and have provided the largest share of support in the form of Master and PhD scholarships⁵.

Based on the view that an enabling environment in the form of institutions with policies, strategies, internal organisation, work processes, and infrastructure conducive to undertake high-quality research is just as important as the skills of individual researchers, the Building Stronger Universities (BSU) programme applies an institutional approach to the challenge of developing research capacity. It aims at strengthening the ability to produce high-quality research by supporting the wider research environment and research processes in selected universities in Danida priority countries.

¹ World Bank: “Building Knowledge Economies. Advanced Strategies for Development.” Washington D.C., 2007.

² Enrique Mendizabal, Ajoy Datta and John Young: “Developing capacity for better research uptake: the experience of ODI’s Research and Policy in Development programme”. ODI Background Note, December 2011.

³ “Capacity is the ability of people, organisations and society as a whole to manage their affairs successfully”, OECD/DAC: “The Challenge of Capacity Development – Working towards Good Practice”, 2006.

⁴ Ajoy Datta, Louise Sahxson, and Arnaldo Pellini: “Capacity, Complexity and Consulting”, ODI Working Paper 344, March 2012.

⁵ E.g. Göran Hyden: “Mapping the World of Higher Education and Research Funders: Actors, Models, Mechanisms and Programs”, Danish Development Research Network and Universities Denmark, October 2010 and Norad: “Evaluation of the Norwegian Programme for Development Research and Education (NUFU) and of Norad’s Programme for Master Studies (NOMA)”, Evaluation Report 7/2009. Sweden, the Netherlands and UK are notable exceptions to the general tendency to provide capacity development support in the form of PhD and Master scholarships.

The overall objective of the programme is: *Capacity of seven universities to undertake high-quality research enhanced through support to the research environment and research processes.*

This objective is supported by two intermediate objectives:

- 1) *Research policies, strategies, organisation and research processes improved.*
- 2) *University-wide services and facilities to support research activities strengthened.*

The first intermediate objective relates to the academic environment. The second objective addresses the administrative and infrastructural conditions at university and faculty level necessary for undertaking high-quality research.

During the first phase of the programme, it was found that collaboration with Danish universities was an effective and appreciated means to strengthening the research environment and processes of South institutions. The feed-back from South partners is that they have benefitted significantly from the skills and experience made available to them by Danish universities and would prefer to continue with the partnership-based activities. University academic staff understands opportunities and challenges of activities such as the establishment of a PhD school better than e.g. consultants from the private sector, and they understand the long-term perspective of the endeavour of building research capacity.⁶ The programme, therefore, builds upon continued collaboration between South institutions and Danish universities.

Challenges and underlying reflections:

Capacity development is inherently endogenous processes which national partners must drive themselves. Donors can assist and facilitate the processes but without building on agendas and efforts of national partners with a strong ownership, external support is not likely to achieve much.

In situations with many different stakeholders, efforts and energies to invest in change or oppose it, ownership is complex. Evidence shows that an incremental approach may be the best to gradually make the environment for capacity development support more enabling, and it is commonly agreed that a long-term perspective is necessary⁷.

During the first phase of the BSU programme, many relevant activities were undertaken, and results measured in terms of output were satisfactory. Partnerships between actors in South institutions and Danish universities were developed, but the overall organisation and management of the programme did not sufficiently reflect the understanding of capacity development as processes that must be driven by national partners. Thus, Danish Universities had the overall responsibility for the programme, and the organisational set-up was extensive and complex.

⁶ David Manyanza & Johan Helland: "Building Stronger Universities in Developing Countries: A program review report for Universities Denmark", Chr. Michelsen Institute Bergen, March 2013 and feedback provided by South partners during the preparation process of the second phase.

⁷ Technical Advisory Services: "Addressing Capacity Development in Danish Development Cooperation – Guiding Principles and Operational Steps", January 2011.

The second phase of the programme builds upon the experience and results of the first phase. The overall organisation is changed; the coordination by Danish Universities through four thematic platforms is replaced by a substantially leaner management set-up, where each South institution is directly responsible for identifying and implementing its activities. Danish partners are selected by South institutions based on an assessment of their ability to support them in their endeavours.

Efforts have also been made to make the programme more focused and less complex. The number of countries has been reduced from five in the first phase to four in the second phase, and the number of South institutions has been reduced from 11 to seven. Criteria for selecting institutions to be included in the second phase have considered i.a. their size and complexity, the assistance provided by other donors, and the experience from collaboration during the first phase.

Project description:

The institutions included in the programme represent a mixture of larger institutions with relatively high capacity (University of Ghana and Kwame Nkrumah University in Ghana), medium-sized institution with extensive experience of making use of donors support (Sokoine University of Agriculture and Kilimanjaro Christian Medical College in Tanzania), small provincially-based universities with limited capacity (Gulu University in Uganda and State University of Zanzibar and in Tanzania), and a private university (Kathmandu University in Nepal) (for a brief presentation of all partners, see annex 1).

The institutions were selected in the first phase by Danish Universities based on their experience of joint collaboration on specific research projects. As it is considered important to build upon experience gained and aim at long-term collaborations which from the beginning were meant to be long-term, all the institutions in the second phase were also part of the first phase with the exception of Kathmandu University.

Activities identified by each of the seven institutions relate to one of the two intermediate objectives with emphasis put on the first objective relating to the academic environment and research processes. A ceiling of 10% of the total budget for each institution has been put on investment costs (e.g. in the form of library and laboratory construction) in relation to the second intermediate objective.

Examples of activities under the first intermediate objective (aspects of strengthening research capacity related to the academic environment) include:

- Developing or enhancing research policies and strategies at university or faculty level.
- Curriculum development to advance selected research themes.
- Strengthening of research processes e.g. through development of research concepts and proposals, pilot studies, faculty staff exchange, training in research quality assurance, ethical and quality standards, and protocol development.

- Establishing or strengthening PhD schools, including course development, courses in research methodology, scientific writing, review of theses and development of PhD supervision guidelines and training.
- PhD grants to selected younger staff at institutions facing an ‘aging of staff’ problem and finalisation of PhDs granted during the first phase.

Examples of activities under the second intermediate objective (administrative aspects of strengthening the research environment) include:

- Development of resource mobilisation strategies and implementation.
- Strengthening financial management systems and procedures, including accounting and audit.
- Improved budgetary planning and monitoring.
- Development of grant management procedures.
- Improved procurement policies.
- Enhanced library and publication management systems.
- Strengthening of laboratory facilities (e.g. in relation to ISO certification etc.).
- Maintenance and common service systems.

It has been decided not to fund direct research cooperation projects, which are funded by Danida through the budget for North and South-driven research cooperation. Teaching activities at master level will not be funded either, as BSU focuses at strengthening research capacity, and MSc training is funded by many other donors. Only a relatively limited budget will be allocated to new PhD training and this will be used only for staff employed in the institutions concerned. This is based on the experience that institutions, which offered PhD grants to non-staff candidates during the first phase, in several cases found it difficult to attract applications.

As exchange of experience across institutions has been requested by South institutions during the preparation process of the programme, a mid-term seminar for all involved South and North institutions will be organised by Danida Fellowship Centre (DFC) in mid-2015. The purpose of the seminar will be both to exchange experience (e.g. on obtaining international funding for research, coordinating donor support to faculties or thematic areas, and on preparing research strategies) and to make joint stocktaking of key milestones of the programme.

The organisation and management of the programme is based on the responsibility of each South institution to identify and implement its activities, and on the direct interaction between the South and North institutions involved in a partnership.

During an inception phase of four months, the match-making of South institutions with Danish partners will be facilitated by DFC and a process consultant drawing on the experience of South-driven research projects. Based on a description by each South institution of the areas they want to prioritise, criteria for assessment will be developed, and consortia of Danish universities will be invited to express interest. Based on this, the South institutions will make

their choice of partnership. One consortium with two or several Danish universities will be selected, and this exercise is conducted only once.

When the match-making has been made, South institutions and their Danish partners will make the detailed planning of activities and submit a final project description for approval by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs through DFC. The budget for each of the South institutions will be shared with 60% to the institution and 40% to the Danish consortia. Funds will be channelled directly to each partner, but South institutions must authorise the transfer of funds to their Danish partners.

Each South institution will appoint a coordinator (typically a staff member in the Vice-Chancellors office), who will undertake the coordination across faculties and will be the key interlocutor of the consortium of Danish partners and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The management of the grant will be undertaken by existing university structures.

Each consortium of Danish universities will have a lead institution and a person responsible for the management of the Danish part of the grant. If competences and skills are required but not available within the consortium, the person must ensure that these are sourced elsewhere.

The overall management responsibility of the programme will rest with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Technical Advisory Services), while DFC is responsible for the administration. Embassies in the four countries will, to the extent possible, take part in the on-going dialogue with the South institutions.

The administration by DFC includes approval of final project descriptions from each South institution, transfer of funds, approval of progress and financial reports, approval of annual audit reports, and support to the financial management of the grant as needed by the South partners.

To support the monitoring not only at output level but also at outcome level, a consultant with expert knowledge on capacity development will be recruited to facilitate a common understanding within each of the seven institutions of the key dimensions of strengthening research capacity and the specific results to be expected. Based on the final project descriptions, a detailed results framework for each institution will be drawn up, and the consultant will help organise a baseline survey for each institution.

A mid-term review will be undertaken by Technical Advisory Services immediately before the mid-term seminar to feed into the stocktaking of programme progress at the seminar. The mid-term review will provide the basis for the decision by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the use of unallocated funds.

Danish Universities will remain an important partner for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and has been invited to participate in an Advisory Board on Development Research to be established. Semi-annual meetings chaired by The Minister for Development Cooperation will

discuss research priorities and monitoring of major activities, including progress of the BSU programme.

Previous results:

During the first phase of BSU, emphasis was put on training courses in relation to formal research education for PhD students and scientific staff, training of PhD supervisors, and provision of PhD scholarships. Some South universities also had faculty staff exchanges at Danish universities, developed research proposals together with their Danish partners, conducted joint accreditation workshops, organised training in research fundraising, and organised stakeholder workshops to disseminate research.

Reports show that most of the actual results are very close to the output planned. The most notable result is that twice as many PhD students and staff as initially expected have participated in formal research education (about 1,000 participants in the six institutions, which will continue in the second phase). Faculty staff exchange, on the other hand, is an area where the programme has underperformed⁸. Given the delays of starting up the programme, the achievements demonstrate strong commitment by both South institutions and Danish partners involved.

Outcome level results of the first phase are obviously more difficult to present, since the programme has been running for only two years. During the preparation of the second phase, South institutions have stressed their appreciation of the strengthening of PhD training in their institutions and of building an environment more conducive for research over time. Some have expressed that BSU by addressing the wider institutional environment provides valuable assistance to a transformation from a situation where they largely transmit knowledge (education) to a situation where they produce new knowledge (research). The training of PhD students and staff has made them more aware of how their research could address broader societal problems, while others have mentioned that it has become easier for them to link up with relevant international research networks.

A review of the first phase of the programme conducted by external consultants for Danish Universities in early 2013⁹ and an independent evaluation undertaken in the spring of 2013 presented very different assessments¹⁰. While they agreed that the PhD training and the support to joint proposal writing have been highly appreciated by South institutions, the overall assessment by the review was that BSU was a relevant programme, which should be continued, whereas the evaluation was highly critical. A key explanation of the difference appears to be that the review disregarded the design and organisational aspects of the programme, while the evaluation focussed exactly on this. The evaluation found the idea of supporting institutional capacity development sound but criticised the programme in the first phase for being top-

⁸ Overview of expenditures and outputs, BSU, phase I. Data provided by Danish Universities, 24 June 2013.

⁹ David Manyanza & Johan Helland: "Building Stronger Universities in Developing Countries: A program review report for Universities Denmark", Chr. Michelsen Institute Bergen, March 2013.

¹⁰ Orbicon & ITAD: "Evaluation of Danida-supported Research on Agriculture and Natural Resource Management 2006-2011", Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, August 2013. The evaluation included a chapter on the BSU platforms (Environment & Climate, and Growth & Employment) which fell within its thematic focus.

down, based to a large extent on Danish priorities, excessively complex, and administratively costly.

The findings on South institutions' appreciation of the programme activities as expressed in the review, and the many specific positive results achieved are among the arguments for continuing the programme. The critical assessment by the evaluation of the overall design in the first phase has been a key reason for the redesign in the second phase.

Special considerations and priorities:

The overall objective of the BSU programme is in line with the objective of Danish support for development research which is 'to strengthen research capacity in partner countries and to create new knowledge capable of alleviating development problems' (The Danish International Development Cooperation Act, 2012).

It is also in line with the Strategic Framework for Danish Support for Development Research (September 2013, draft), which identifies institutional capacity development as a crucial area that supplements other forms of Danish support for development research, notably the grants provided to strategic research cooperation between researchers based in Danish institutions and in South-partner institutions. While these grants are meant to contribute directly to the production of new knowledge, BSU contributes to the development of general research environment and research processes in partner institutions, which will enable the institutions to produce high-quality research in the future.

The management of the programme based on the responsibility of each South institution to run its own activities is in line with the ambition defined in the Strategic Framework to ensure that a larger share of the Danish support to development research is 'south driven'.

The strategy for Danish development cooperation 'The Right to a Better Life' provides the overall framework for the programme. The key principles of Human Rights Based-Approach (participation, accountability, transparency and non-discrimination) that guide all support for development research also apply to the BSU programme. It is a key challenge to ensure participation and non-discrimination through equal opportunities for all, especially that women have the same access to programme benefits as men. All monitoring data should be gender disaggregated to keep track of the participation of female staff and PhD students in training and other activities, and since experience shows that women are less able to leave their institution to travel to Denmark and elsewhere, most of the activities in the programme will take place within the South institutions. Transparency will be pursued through clear and transparent procedures, administrative processes and through access to research results. Accountability is pursued through clear and explicit requirements on progress reporting, results management and on financial management.

Budget:

The overall programme budget is DKK 100.0 million for a period of two years and ten month (1 January 2014 to 1 November 2016).

Grants allocations to the various South institutions differ according to their expected possibilities to make use of the grants. The assessment of the capacity of the institutions is based i.a. on their size, the availability of prepared strategies for their research development, their experience of cooperating with international donors, their administrative capacity, and the results of the support during the first phase. If it turns out that institutions perform better than expected, the unallocated funds will be used to consolidate their activities and possibly fund new activities relevant to achieve the overall objectives of the programme.

Budget for BSU phase II (DKK million)

	2014 (12 months)	2015 (12 months)	2016 (10 months)	Total
University of Ghana	5.3	5.3	4.4	15.0
Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology	5.3	5.3	4.4	15.0
Sokoine University of Agriculture	4.2	4.2	3.6	12.0
Kilimanjaro Christian Medical College	2.8	2.8	2.4	8.0
State University of Zanzibar	2.8	2.8	2.4	8.0
Gulu University	2.8	2.8	2.4	8.0
Kathmandu University	1.9	1.9	1.5	5.3
Continuation of PhDs from first phase of BSU	6.8	6.8	6.6	20.2
Danida Fellowship Centre	1.0	1.0	1.0	3.0
Reviews, technical support, mid-term seminar	0.5	1.0	0.5	2.0
Unallocated	0	1.5	2.0	3.5
BSU Total	33.4	35.4	31.2	100.0

A budget line has been dedicated to finalise the many PhD scholarships initiated during the first phase to ensure that all students who have started a PhD education will be allowed to finalise it. Some of these students are from the five institutions, which were part of the first phase but are not included in the second phase.

DFC has been allocated a budget to undertake the administration of the programme, including visits to South institutions to follow up on progress and audit reports, when needed.

Overhead costs for South partners will be 12% of their grants, and each institution will be allowed to use an additional 8% for coordination of activities across faculties. In line with the agreement with Danish universities in the first phase, overheads for Danish consortia will be 20% of the funds they receive.

Significant risks:

The most important risk for the programme is of insufficient commitment from institutions and key persons in the participating institutions, both in the South and in Denmark. While the South universities have a clear interest in improving their systems and had a generally positive

response to BSU I, they will continue to be working under resource constraints, which may have a negative effect on their focus. South partners may be given other responsibilities and be less able to engage in BSU activities than expected. It will be highly relevant to counter this eventuality by clearly engaging with South universities (and key individuals) so that their input and ideas are reflected in the programme design. This underpins the thinking of the match-making process to be used in BSU II, whereby the South universities are placed in the driving seat.

With regard to the Danish universities, there may be some incentive issues relating to the value (to their institutions) of the programme. It will be a new experience for the Danish partners to present expressions of interest and await the selection by South institutions of the consortium they prefer, and some may find that BSU commitments are too onerous to justify the potential gains. The main risk response is continued dialogue with South partners and potential Danish partners. During the preparation process, South institutions have continuously stressed their dedication, and Danish partners actively involved in the first phase have closely followed the preparation of the second phase. Some of the constraints characterising the first phase (notably the requirement of co-financing by Danish universities), have been removed, and based on the engagement seen so far, it is believed that the match-making process and the subsequent collaboration will take place as expected.

It may be a challenge to ensure that each of the relatively different South institutions receives support tailored to its needs and absorption capacity. The risk response by DFC is to monitor the development closely and through dialogue with the partners propose the necessary adjustments. Moreover, the two independent experts (TA) that will be made available in support of DFC's role will help the overall process by enabling tailoring and the value of synergies to be highlighted.

In terms of institutional risks, the administrative capacity of South institutions varies, and some are likely to find the management responsibility an additional burden. DFC will closely monitor the capacity and performance of the South institutions to should the task, and adjustments will be proposed accordingly.

There is always a risk of giving relatively weak institutions responsibility for financial management. Based on unfortunate experience in other research programmes, DFC will both provide the necessary financial management support and apply safeguards such as clear financial management guidelines and annual audits.

The institutions included in the programme are supported also by other donors. Although information has been collected regarding other donors, it will be a challenge to ensure that the Danish support supplements the other support in the best possible way. To mitigate this risk, the dialogue with South institutions will emphasise the importance of considering all donors' support when planning the use of Danish funds, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs will also approach larger bilateral donors to some of the institutions directly (e.g. Norway in the case of Sokoine University of Agriculture).

Annex 1 - Partners:

Ghana:

University of Ghana

Founded in 1948, University of Ghana (UG) is the oldest and largest of the thirteen universities and tertiary institutions in Ghana. The mission of UG is to develop world-class human resources to meet global development challenges. The University offers courses in arts, business, physical and biological sciences, law, agriculture, nuclear and allied sciences, and engineering sciences. It has recently set itself the goal of becoming a research university that will include four Centres of Excellence, which will conduct research in malaria; food security and crop improvement; poverty reduction; and environment and climate change. The University has also revised its PhD programme so that the PhD training is now a four year programme with the first year dedicated to course work while increasing the number of PhD students who are trained.

The number of students at UG is 34,937. The number of teaching staff is 998, and the number of research staff is 136.

Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology

The Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST) in Kumasi was established in 1951. Colleges of KNUST include agriculture and natural resources, health sciences, art and social sciences, architecture and planning, engineering and science. The university has the ambition to create learning environments that are research based and universities that are in dialogue with the broader society in which they are embedded. The strategic plan of KNUST addresses policies such as the ICT for Education Policy of the Ministry of Education, the Youth for Entrepreneurship Development Policy, the Tertiary Education Expansion Policy, and the National Institutional Renewal Programme (NIRP) of the Public Sector Institutional Transformation in Ghana.

The total number of students at KNUST is 37,588. Of these, 32,221 are undergraduate students (app. 2/3 male students and 1/3 female students), and 5,379 are postgraduate students (app. 71 male students and 29% female students). The number of teaching staff is 932, and the number of staff principally engaged in research is 38.

Tanzania:

Sokoine University of Agriculture

Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA) dates back to 1965 when it was started as an Agricultural College offering diploma training in the discipline of agriculture. Today it offers training in the fields of agriculture, forestry and nature conservation, veterinary medicine, science education, environmental science and rural development. SUA has faculties of agriculture, forestry and nature conservation, veterinary medicine and faculty science, and has a Development Studies Institute.

The vision of SUA is to become a renowned centre of learning and knowledge creation for sustainable land use, betterment of agriculture and improved livelihood. It is among the top priorities of the university to develop and run quality programmes according to current and emerging needs, and to undertake basic and applied research to generate new knowledge that responds to the contemporary and emerging needs of the society.

The number of students at SUA is 8,208 (app. 2/3 male students and 1/3 female students). The total number of teaching and research staff is 508.

Kilimanjaro Christian Medical Centre

Kilimanjaro Christian Medical Centre (KCMC) established in 1971 in Moshi works under the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare (MoH) and is a leading health facility in Tanzania. It hosts 14 schools of Allied Health Sciences. KCMC is a tertiary health facility that implements the Government policy on education and research and it provides advice to the government through the MoH directly or through the National Institute for Medical Research (NIMR). The Kilimanjaro Clinical Research Institute of KCMC is among the R&D institutions that the Tanzanian Commission for Science and Technology uses to provide expert service for national research policy. KCMC has recently scaled up its PhD programmes.

The total number of students at KCMC is 2,100 students. The number of teaching staff is 108, and the number of research staff is 102. The total number of KCMC staff is 1,560.

State University of Zanzibar

Founded in 1999 and having started its academic activities in 2001, the State University of Zanzibar (SUZA) is the only public university in Zanzibar. The Zanzibar Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (2010-2015) identifies SUZA as one of the institutions that will be consulted for capacity building and strategic involvement of higher learning and research. SUZA's stated Vision is to become the preferred higher learning institution in education and research in the region. It is a core strategic objective of the university to increase the volume and promote research-oriented education, research, publications, and outreach services to the public. It is the strategic vision to strengthen research, publications and community services through building capacities, increasing quality, efficiency and effectiveness of research, publications and outreach activities.

The number of students at SUZA is 3,042, and the number of teaching staff is 130. SUZA has no staff specifically employed for research purposes.

Uganda: Gulu University

Gulu University (GU) is a young university founded in 2002. Initially, the intention of the Ugandan Government was to establish Gulu University with a focus on training in, and promotion of, agriculture and environmental conservation. Being the only university in the greater Northern region, it was realised that other disciplines were equally important to be introduced to spur development in the conflict-ridden region, particularly conflict management, human health, education, business and entrepreneurial development skills. Hence, the focus of Gulu University has broadened to include both natural and social science disciplines.

The number of registered students at GU is 4,431. GU has 209 academic staff, and 155 research staff.

Nepal: Kathmandu University

Kathmandu University (KU) is a private university established in 1991. Its vision is to become world class university devoted to bringing knowledge and technology to the services of Nepal. KU has a decentralised system where each of its schools (School of Arts; School of Education; School of Social Science, School of Engineering; School of Management; School of Medical Science; School of Science) exercises a considerable degree of autonomy in deciding the courses offered, the curriculums, and the actual academic training. M.Phil and PhD programs were started in 1997.

The number of students at KU is 3,695, and the number of staff is 1,491.

Annex 2 - Background facts: Economic development, poverty situation, political scene and the human rights situation in Ghana and Tanzania Uganda and Nepal.

Ghana:

Ghana is a low-income country and according to the World Bank, in 2011 Ghana's GDP amounted to USD 39.20 billion. Ghana had a population of 24.97 million people and GNI per capita USD 1,410. The latest available data (2006) shows that poverty headcount ratio at national poverty line is 28.5%, and as of 2011, life expectancy was 64. Ghana is a constitutional democracy. John Atta Mills took over as head of state in 2009, but he died in July 2012 and was succeeded by his vice president John Dramani Mahama, who subsequently won a December 2012 special presidential election.

Tanzania:

Tanzania is a low-income country and according to the World Bank, in 2011 Tanzania's GDP amounted to USD 23.87 billion. Tanzania had a population of 46.22 million people and GNI per capita USD 540. The latest available data (2007) shows that poverty headcount ratio at national poverty line is 33.4%, and as of 2011, life expectancy was 58. After being ruled by one party system, in 1995 Tanzania had its first democratic elections since 1970. President Jakaya Kikwete is sitting his second terms since he was elected in December 2005. Zanzibar elects a president who is head of government for matters internal to Zanzibar. Since 2010 it has been Ali Mohamed Shein. Since 1995 there have been two consecutive elections, which the same party won despite international observers' claims of voting irregularities. The formation of a government of national unity between Zanzibar's two leading parties succeeded in minimizing electoral tension in 2010.

Uganda:

Uganda is a low-income country and according to the World Bank, in 2011, Uganda's GDP amounted to USD 16.81 billion, Uganda had a total population of 34.51 million people and a GNI per capita of USD 510. The latest available data (2009) shows that the poverty headcount ratio at national poverty line is 24.5% of the population, and as of 2011, life expectancy at birth was 54 years. After 26 years of President Yoweri Museveni's rule, ongoing threats to freedom of expression, assembly, and association continue to raise serious concerns. The government banned a political pressure group calling for peaceful change, obstructed opposition rallies, and harassed and intimidated journalists and civil society activists working on corruption, oil, land, and sexual rights. The notorious Anti-Homosexuality Bill, still proposing the death penalty for some consensual same-sex activity, looms in parliament.

Nepal:

Nepal is a low-income country and according to the World Bank, in 2011 Nepal's GDP amounted to USD 18.88 billion, Nepal had a population of 30.49 million, and a GNI per capita of USD 540. The latest available data (2011) shows that the poverty headcount ratio at national poverty line is 25.2% of the population, and as of 2011, life expectancy at birth was 69 years. A six-year peace process between Nepalese government forces and Maoist combatants remain in limbo, and human rights commitments undertaken in the peace accords remained unfulfilled. Impunity for wartime abuses is the norm, and the government has promoted government

officials and security force members suspected of involvement in human rights abuses, although the government advocates for establishing a truth and reconciliation commission. Parliament was dissolved after deadlocking over drafting of a new constitution, leaving the country without a legislature.

Annex 3 - Indicators:

Overall programme indicators

Outcome indicator 1		Strengthened research policies, strategies, organisation and research processes	
Baseline	Year	2014	To be defined during inception phase
Target	Year	2016	# % <i>Ph.Ds and other research products are underpinned by university agreed research policies and procedures</i>
Output indicator 1.1		Policies and procedures for carrying out Ph.D research established	
Baseline	Year	2014	Partially in place. To be further defined during inception phase
Target	Year	2016	# new or revised Ph.D policies and standards have been developed and introduced as compulsory requirements. % of academic staff trained in their supervision/quality assurance.
Output indicator 1.2		Introductory courses for Ph.D students covering e.g. research methodology, research proposals, thesis presentation, academic writing, research grants etc.	
Baseline	Year	2014	To be defined during inception phase.
Target	Year	2016	# new Ph.D introductory courses have been developed and run as standard parts of Ph.D. % of academic staff trained in course delivery.
Output indicator 1.3		Gender balance among faculty and student members	
Baseline	Year	2014	Typically 33% faculty members are women
Target	Year	2016	40% faculty and Ph.D students are women

Outcome indicator 2		Strengthened university-wide services and facilities to support research activities	
Baseline	Year	2014	To be identified during inception phase
Target	Year	2016	XX% university services are ISO certified or similar.
Output indicator 2.1		Grant financial management system strengthening (assessment, upgrading, staff training)	
Baseline	Year	2014	To be identified
Target	Year	2016	% success rate of applications for research grants
Output indicator 2.2		Standard and capacity of research laboratory facilities	
Baseline	Year	2014	Standard variable. Precise standard to be identified
Target	Year	2016	% Laboratory facilities satisfy standards for verifiable research in # fields
Output indicator 2.3		Standard and capacity of research library facilities	
Baseline	Year	2014	Standard varies. Precise standard to be defined
Target	Year	2016	% Library facilities meeting key criteria for facilitating Ph.D level research

Examples of output indicators at university level

University of Ghana (UG)			
Output indicator		Research proposals improved	
Baseline	Year	2014	# of research proposals are approved for funding
Target	Year	2016	# of research proposals are approved for funding
Output indicator		Research grant management improved	
Baseline	Year	2014	No courses in grant management
Target	Year	2016	Three courses in grant management for Office of Research, Innovation and Development (ORID) implemented

Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST)			
Output indicator		Two PhD education programmes developed	
Baseline	Year	2014	No education programmes in (i) Agribusiness Management (AM) and (ii) Value Chain (VC)
Target	Year	2016	Two PhD education programmes developed in AM and VC
Output indicator		Research grant management and monitoring system established	
Baseline	Year	2014	No grant management and monitoring system in place
Target	Year	2016	Grant management and monitoring system established and 20 staff trained in its use

Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA)			
Output indicator		Curriculum based on Agricultural Value Chain (AV) developed	
Baseline	Year	2014	No curriculum on AVC exist
Target	Year	2016	Curriculum based on AVC has been developed
Output indicator		Finance Department staff trained in grant management	
Baseline	Year	2014	No training has taken place in grant management
Target	Year	2016	15 staff from FD trained in grant management

Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University Colleague (KCMC)			
Output indicator		Dissemination strategy for research products developed	
Baseline	Year	2014	No strategy exists
Target	Year	2016	Dissemination strategy developed and operationalised
Output indicator		E-library established	
Baseline	Year	2014	No e-library
Target	Year	2016	E-library established

State University of Zanzibar (SUZA)			
Output indicator		Policies regarding Ph.D thesis support upgraded and 30 staff trained	
Baseline	Year	2014	To be confirmed
Target	Year	2016	Policies upgraded & 30 staff trained to provide competent Ph.D supervision
Output indicator		Library services upgraded	
Baseline	Year	2014	Limited access to research databases and international journals subscription (to be established)
Target	Year	2016	Access to # research databases and # international journals subscription

Gulu University (GU)			
Output indicator		At least five multidisciplinary concept courses at PhD level developed and implemented	
Baseline	Year	2014	No such courses exists
Target	Year	2016	Five plus multidisciplinary courses for PhD graduates developed and implemented
Output indicator		Financial management System (FMS) installed and five staff trained	
Baseline	Year	2014	No FMS in place
Target	Year	2016	Financial management System (FMS) installed and five staff trained

Kathmandu University (KU)			
Output indicator		Comprehensive research policy and action plan established	
Baseline	Year	2014	No overall research policy
Target	Year	2016	Research policy established at least in one faculty
Output indicator		Improved procurement policies	
Baseline	Year	2014	Procurement policies need improvement
Target	Year	2016	Procurement policies meet standards for international good practice

Annex 4 - Approved response by representation to summary of recommendations in the appraisal report

Since Technical Advisory Services is responsible for the programme, the appraisal has been undertaken by external consultants. Based on the revised programme document, Technical Advisory Services is responding in the right column titled 'Follow-up by the Representation'.

Title of (Country) Programme	BSU Phase II
File number	104.Dan.8.L.2600
Appraisal report date	18 October 2013
Grant Committee meeting date	29 November 2013
Summary of possible recommendations not followed (to be filled in by the Mission)	
<p>An elaborate results framework cannot be prepared until final activities for each institution have been identified during the inception phase. Provision for the preparation of the results framework is made in the programme document in the form of a process action plan/timeline for the inception phase and TOR for a monitoring consultant who will assist with the elaboration of the result frame and the preparation of baselines.</p>	
Overall conclusion of the appraisal	
<p>The programme document will need substantial revision before it meets Danida guidelines and quality standards. Revisions relate to all sections of the programme document. The document should be redrafted so that it is leaner and accords with the objectives and principles outlined in the draft Danida strategic framework for support to development research (2014 - 2018).</p>	

Recommendations by the appraisal team	Follow up by the Representation
<p>1. Country programme Level:</p> <p>1. Justification and rationale of the country programme, preparation process and strategic linkages between country programme vis-à-vis the country policy document.</p>	
<p>1.1 The programme document should spell out more clearly the needs identified and the context within which the programme is being implemented</p>	<p>1.1 Needs and context are described more clearly in the revised programme document.</p>
<p>1.2 The rationale of the programme (justification with clear link to policy, South university demand and rationale for approach) should be more fully specified. Furthermore, lessons learned should be revised to ensure that these are based on evidence</p>	<p>1.2 Rationale specified. Results and lessons learned from BSU I are better reflected.</p>
<p>2. Thematic Programme Level:</p> <p>2. Consideration of relevant Danida strategies.</p>	
<p>2.1 The link to the draft Strategic Framework for Danish Support to Development Research 2014-2018 should be made more explicit</p>	<p>2.1 The link is made more explicit by explaining how BSU support complements other support forms and by relating to the vision of more South-research as presented in the draft strategic framework.</p>
<p>3. Proposed thematic programme support design including rationale, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability and partner choices.</p>	
<p>3.1 The Development Objective should be streamlined and brought more into line with Danida's strategic framework for research (draft). Likewise, the two immediate objectives should be brought into line with the first two IOs of the strategic framework (1a & 1b) so that they are quite distinct.</p>	<p>3.1 Development Objective and Intermediate Objectives have been revised and are in line with the draft strategic framework.</p>

Recommendations by the appraisal team	Follow up by the Representation
3.2. There should be a clearer description of the overall BSU II design and structure, taking its outset in the two IOs	3.2 The revised programme document contains a more elaborate description of the design and structure.
3.3. Rationale for partner choice should be made explicit	3.3. The section has been edited. Partnerships are a continuation of those established under BSU I with a view to enhance their maturity and benefit from the results of longer term commitments.
3.4. Modalities and management arrangements should be clearly explained	3.3. Modalities and management are explained at more length and clarified.
4. Adherence to the aid effectiveness agenda	
4.1. The degree of alignment should be discussed and the extent to which the partner universities in the South have been involved in the formulation should be described	4.1. Alignment is discussed and outlined. Inputs from the formulation consultant's interaction with interlocutors in the South are inserted and utilized.
4.2. The role and the engagements of other donors and degree of complementarity to other on-going university capacity development activities in partner organisations in the South should be explained	4.2. Based on input from each of the South partners, other donor support is outlined. The dialogue on how best the Danish support can complement the support provided by other donors will continue during the detailed planning of programme activities in the inception phase.
5. Budget	
5.1 Rationale for budget allocation to universities should be made explicit	5.1 Rationale for each of the budget lines is made explicit.
6. Identified risks and risk management	
6.1 Risk should be presented in new Danida risk format	6.1 Risks are presented in the new format.
6.2 Risk management section should be elaborated	6.2 The section has been elaborated.

Recommendations by the appraisal team	Follow up by the Representation
7. Engagement Level	
7. Capacity of partners	
7.1. Capacity of partners in the South should be presented in short format in annex	7.1. Capacity and challenges of South partners are outlined in the text.
8. Results Framework	
8.1. Clear outputs and indicators must be identified and presented in new Danida results matrix format	8.1. A results framework cannot be elaborated until final activities for each institution have been identified during the inception-phase. Provision is made in the programme document for the preparation of the results framework in the form of both a process action plan/timeline for the inception phase and TOR for a monitoring consultant who will assist with the elaboration of the result frame and the preparation of baselines.
9. Monitoring and reporting arrangements	
9.1. Monitoring and reporting must be developed and described in accordance with the Danida guidelines	9.1. Monitoring and reporting sections have been elaborated.

I hereby confirm that the above-mentioned issues have been addressed properly as part of the appraisal and that the appraisal team has provided the recommendations stated above.

Signed in Copenhagen..... on the 18 October 2013

(signed).....Erik Bryld, Team leader, Managing Director, TANA Aps.

I hereby confirm that the Danish Mission has undertaken the follow-up activities stated above. In cases where recommendations have not been accepted, reasons for this are given either in the table or in the notes enclosed.

Signed in Copenhagen.....on the 14 November 2013

(signed)..... Tove Degnbol, Head of Department, Technical Advisory Services (TAS), Danida

Annex 5 - List of relevant supplementary material:

- Programme document “Building Stronger Universities Phase II (BSU-II)”, Technical Advisory Services, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, November 2013.
- Concept note for the second Phase, March 2013.
- Minutes from the Programme Committee meeting 18 April 2013.
- Appraisal of Building Stronger Universities Phase II (BSU-II), TANA Aps., October 2013.
- David Manyanza & Johan Helland: “Building Stronger Universities in Developing Countries: A program review report for Universities Denmark”, Chr. Michelsen Institute Bergen, March 2013.
- Orbicon/Itad: “Evaluation of Danida supported Research on Agriculture and Natural Resources Management 2006-11”, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, September 2013.
- Draft Strategic framework for Danish support for development research, 2014-2018, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, September 2003.