Building stronger universities in developing countries

A program review report for Universities Denmark

David Manyanza
(Development Solutions Consultancy)
&
Johan Helland
(Chr. Michelsen Institute)

March 2013

CMI CHR.
MICHELSEN
INSTITUTE

Building stronger universities in developing countries
A program review report for Universities Denmark

David Manyanza
(Development Solutions Consultancy)

&

Johan Helland, team leader
(Chr. Michelsen Institute)

Final Report
March 2013

CMI CHR.
MICHELSEN
INSTITUTE

Table of Contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms:

BSU	Building Stronger Universities (in Developing Countries)
COSTECH	Commission for Science and Technology (Tanzania)
Danida	Danish International Development Agency
DKK	Danish kroner
FFU	Consultative Research Committee for Development Research (Danida)
GEP	Growth and Employment Platform
KCMC	Kilimanjaro Christian Medical Centre
KCRI	Kilimanjaro Clinical Research Institute
KNUST	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology
NIMR	National Institute for Medical Research (Tanzania)
ORID	Office of Research, Innovation and Development (University of Ghana)
PEC	Platform on Environment and Climate
PHH	Platform on Human Health
PSC	Partnership Steering Committee
PSDR	Platform for Stability, Democracy and Rights
SC	(Platform) Steering Committee
SUA	Sokoine University of Agriculture
SUZA	State University of Zanzibar
UD	Universities Denmark
UDSM	University of Dar es Salaam
UG	University of Ghana
ZCHS	Zanzibar College of Health Sciences

Summary

The Building Stronger Universities in Developing Countries (BSU) Program is a partnership initiative between Universities Denmark (UD) and universities and research institutions in developing countries, proposed by the Danish Rectors' Conference in 2010. It is fundamentally concerned with how Danish academic institutions can contribute to improve the situation of a number of African (and a few Asian) universities, in terms of boosting the academic quality of their research output and increasing the throughput and quality of their advanced training courses, and ultimately, how they contribute knowledge and skills to meet the national development challenges in their respective countries.

The project, which is co-financed between Danida and Universities Denmark is working within the following fields

• Academic upgrading and improvement of PhD level training at South universities

• Expanding the academic base at partner universities by enrolling staff in PhD degree programs

• Initiatives to improve the general research environment at South universities

• Initiatives to improve research dissemination and communication

• General institutional capacity building

The Danish academic resources required to operate this project are mobilized and organized into 4 thematic platforms

• Platform on Human Health

• Platform on Environment and Climate

• Growth and Employment Platform

• Platform for Stability, Democracy and Rights

which in turn have organized their schedule of activities into a number of Work Packages, allowing the platform to meet the challenges and address the problems identified at partner institutions in the South. This structure has shown itself effective and flexible; in Denmark it is governed by a fairly elaborate structure designed to allow full participation by all stakeholders. The counterpart structures in the South are simpler, being primarily indented to facilitate program implementation and management. The BSU program was launched in August 2011 and the purpose of this review is to look at experiences and issues that need further attention and adjustment in the second phase (from August 2013) that Danida already is committed to support.

The review has been organized in a series of meetings with staff operating the 4 platforms in Denmark and later, with representatives from BSU partner institutions in the South. The purpose of these meetings has been to clarify questions set out in the approved Terms of Reference, but also to identify issues that are of concern to the stakeholders but which are not covered by the ToRs.

A major concern among a number of the stakeholders in Denmark arise from the nature of the BSU program. There is a considerable history of research cooperation with developing countries among Danish universities; the current initiative is primarily concerned with institutional capacity building. It is not a facility for additional research funding. The value of a program focusing attention on institutional capacity is not in doubt. None the less, in the Danish context the activities of the BSU

work packages are not generally regarded as academically meriting and there are frequent claims that so far not enough has been done internally at the Danish universities to mobilize staff enthusiasm and commitment. There are clear perceptions that BSU arrangements are inadequate in terms of compensating staff and first-line departments for direct costs as well as the opportunity costs involved. Only one of the universities has actually provided substantial additional resources to meet the cost-sharing requirements implied in the funding agreement between the Rectors' Conference and Danida. This in turn means that the institutional obligations for cost-sharing are transferred to the individual stakeholders (first-line teaching departments or even individual members of staff) taking part in BSU activities. Similarly, at the partner institutions in the South the obligations arising from a BSU agreement are often added to the existing work load of staff members. The Rectors Conference is quite explicit, however, that it will adhere to the agreement negotiated with Danida, and that it will provide the academic resources from Danish universities that are required to actually design and implement this program of partnership with select institutions in the South.

This review points out that it will be difficult to protect the sustainability of the BSU program if issues of compensation and management of staff workloads are not adequately handled in the next phase. In particular, it is necessary to find institutional solutions to problems arising from institutional commitments, both in the North and in the South, to counter present notions that individuals personally have to sort out the problems.

One issue which cuts across the platforms concerns the model chosen by BSU for PhD fellowships. Initial fears that the 'sandwich' model would be far less favourably received than a full overseas scholarship model do not seem warranted. On the contrary, the sandwich model is popular among the main target group for PhD training, which are the more or less established university instructors who have not had the opportunity to complete their terminal degrees. The BSU sandwich model is not uniform across the platforms: all cover costs for study visits abroad and there is usually money for research costs, even if there is some variation with regard to rates etc. between the platforms. At some partner universities PhD training seems to come on top of normal duties. But there is a range of local responses that address at least parts of the problems. In Ghana, for instance, staff enrolled in PhD programs receive paid study leave from their respective universities, elsewhere the level of institutional support varies. Similarly, there is variation across the Danish platforms with regard to the costs covered for individual PhD students. This kind of flexibility is no doubt necessary. The platforms should, however, in the second phase, renegotiate arrangements with the host institutions to make paid study leave for PhD students the norm and clarify their policies on the funding that will be provided for staff enrolled in PhD programs: the point of this component is to increase the number of PhD qualified staff as quickly as possible. Although 'sandwich arrangements are popular, and cheaper than overseas scholarships, there seem to be significant delays in throughput because of the issues outlined above. Even with additional funding for research costs the sandwich model will be considerably cheaper than an overseas scholarship.

A number of issues have been set out in the ToRs: most of them concern the nature of the partnerships established between the platforms and the host institutions in the South, including the structures for governance. In a situation where both the academic and financial resources to a large extent are tied to one of the partners, additional efforts are required to arrive at a genuine partnership. The review has examined the structural features of the partnerships, but has not had the time or opportunity to look at the personal relations between colleagues at the institutions in Denmark and in the South. Personal relations can break or make partnerships of this nature; the impression is that there is mutual respect among the partners and across the structural features of the partnership.

It is pointed out that the BSU program has not yet achieved much in terms of donor coordination, partly because the platforms are active in a fairly restricted window of opportunity. On the other hand, there has not been much time to foster or promote specific activities that could improve on donor coordination. Furthermore, since the focus in the BSU partnership is on strengthening the capacity of

the national host institution, BSU by implication enhances the ability of the national host institutions to relate actively to national programs and other research partners.

Many of the South institutions have cooperated with Danish institutions and Danish researchers in the past and the BSU program is generally seen as an extension of previous modalities of cooperation. The new approach, with an emphasis on the institutional needs of the universities in the South to strengthen their own capacity to provide high-quality research training and sustain high-quality research has been welcomed. In Ghana there has been an independent process of reform which to some extent mirrors the BSU approach, particularly with regard to changes towards course-based PhD programs. There also seems to be general appreciation of BSU contributions to solving the demographic crisis which is a feature of so many African universities. The policy goal of increasing the number of PhD-qualified staff is shared by the African universities and BSU. But, as discussed above, there is still some uncertainty with regard to the sandwich model for PhD training. Many universities accept the advantages of working towards stronger local programs and appreciate the sandwich model in these terms; the full overseas scholarship model still seems to be preferred by the young and adventurous and it seems to have the added advantage of better throughput and quicker completion. Given that the policy objective is to quickly increase the number of PhD-qualified staff, the features of the sandwich model that present bottlenecks should perhaps be adjusted as suggested above.

The effectiveness of the structures for governance and communication was discussed, and while these structures at first sight look both complex and cumbersome, there was agreement among the partners that the structures put in place have been effective in moving the BSU program forward. There was an initial period of uncertainty, but now that all partners have had the time to familiarize themselves with the BSU program, the South partners seem to accept the structures for governance and communication as reasonable and workable.

Although it is generally accepted, both in Denmark and at the South institutions that the BSU program primarily is about capacity building and improving the context for PhD training and research, all partners agree that this approach will only prove itself eventually through actual research output. The BSU program will eventually demonstrate results in enabling institutions to access research funding in more predictable and stable ways, but for now, the lack of research funding within the BSU program is regretted. All partners accept that both research funding and the supporting structures that BSU is targeting are necessary to the ultimate goal of boosting research output and qualified graduates; the current frustrations over lacking research funding may be seen as a temporary problem that will become less acute as the BSU program matures and demonstrates success also with respect to increasing the volume of research funding to the partner institutions.

The BSU program spent considerable time to prepare the first proposals and the first work programs after the funding decisions were made. All 4 platforms rely on the monitoring matrices originally prepared and there is a need to revise and extend these from being primarily concerned with platform management to encompass the new situation after the partnership agreements with the South institutions have been entered into. Overall, there seems to be few problems with program management, and particular note is made that the platforms have made a particular effort to provide training and guidance in financial management and accounting at the partnership level. Hence, none of the partners reported problems.

The review points out that formal risk assessment does not seem to have been carried out; but the BSU program has not moved into entirely unknown territory. There is ample experience at universities in the South as well as in Denmark of active academic collaboration in the past. This has obviously guided and assisted program formulation and actual implementation in this first phase.

1 Introduction

The Building Stronger Universities in Developing Countries (BSU) Program is a partnership initiative between Universities Denmark (UD) and universities and research institutions in developing countries. It involves 11 universities in the global South, in Tanzania, Kenya, Ghana, Uganda and Nepal in cooperation projects with 7 Danish universities (as well as with individual participation from researchers at some of the Danish autonomous research institutes). The overall coordination is carried out by Universities Denmark under the oversight and guidance of the Rectors' Conference.

Universities Denmark is an organisation set up to promote the interests of Danish universities and to foster increased cooperation and communication between the universities. Building Stronger Universities (BSU) is a program that grows out of a well-established Danish tradition of research collaboration with institutions in the global South, while the direct impetus perhaps can be found in the Danish-sponsored Africa Commission (2008 – 2010) which i.a. had the Rector of Aarhus University as a member. This Commission was set up with a broad and impressive international membership and was primarily concerned with Africa's situation under the increasing and all-pervasive processes of globalisation, with a particular ambition of '*Realising the potential of Africa's Youth*', as was the title of its main report in 2009. One of the main initiatives proposed by the Africa Commission promotes post-primary education and research, including greater attention to the situation of Africa's universities.

Danish universities have a long history of collaboration with African institutions of higher education and had already contributed a lot to capacity building, principally through research collaboration with host institutions in the South and the training of scholars from the South at Danish institutions. The Rector's Conference established a working group in 2009 to suggest how Danish universities could contribute even further to strengthen universities in developing countries: a report entitled '*Building Stronger Universities in Developing Countries; Partnership for Change*' was issued in 2010. This report outlines the preferred approach in terms of organizing the Danish resources into 4 distinct thematic platforms [1] that would be the basis for forming partnerships between Danish universities and a limited number of institutions in the South, for the purpose of building networks of excellence that eventually would allow the partner universities in the South to play the central societal role that they have been given in numerous policy documents.

It is quite clear from this report, that while the Rector's Conference align their proposal for Building Stronger Universities with the recommendations of the Africa Commission and the new (since May 2010) Danish strategy for development cooperation, and commit Danish universities to this program , the Rector's Conference did not command the funds required to fully implement the schedule of activities broadly defined under each thematic platform. Some sources of funding for BSU are indicated in this report, including a core contribution from Danida and co-financing from the universities themselves (in terms of staff time, access to equipment and infrastructure). None the less, the report recognizes that significant additional and external funding would be required to meet the challenges of implementing activities at the level and scope indicated in the BSU report. Indeed, one of the activities that the respective platforms will promote concerns increased skills in preparing proposals and raising research funding from external sources.

The BSU program is fundamentally concerned with how Danish academic institutions can contribute to improve the situation of a number of African (and a few Asian) universities, in terms of boosting the academic quality of their research output and increasing the throughput and quality of their

---

[1] Initially 7 thematic platforms were discussed; the reduced number has not excluded any thematic subject matter, but seems to be a matter of administrative convenience

advanced training courses, and ultimately, how they contribute knowledge and skills to meet the national development challenges in their respective countries.

Although there is some variation across the 4 platforms with regard to structure, emphasis and terminology, the BSU program basically supports partnerships for the following purposes:

- **Academic upgrading and improvement of PhD level training at South universities**. This often involves a policy dialogue for the purpose of restructuring programs (with greater emphasis on formal, taught courses), the preparation of up-dated courses and suitable course materials and increased attention to supervision functions, including training of academically competent staff without much experience in supervising degrees. In Ghana the BSU program has coincided with national initiatives taken by the major universities to restructure and modernise the PhD programs on offer.

- **Expanding the academic base at partner universities** by enrolling staff in PhD degree programs, to meet the demographic challenge at many African universities. A large proportion of the most experienced staff will retire without appropriate replacements being available. The problem is not uniform across all universities, but many universities suffer from a low proportion of PhD qualified staff and a historical neglect of recruitment and career development for young staff. In general terms it is necessary to find opportunities for young university staff to undergo postgraduate training as part of their regular academic career. In an initial phase BSU has decided to offer a limited number of PhD scholarships (in a 'sandwich' model involving both the Danish and the South partners) – over the longer term the South partner should be able to offer well-structured PhD training programs on their own.

- **Initiatives to improve the general research environment** at South universities, in terms of cooperation in preparing research and funding proposals, creating structures for research management, building and maintaining research networks and actual research collaboration on specific (small-scale, later perhaps large-scale) research projects.

- **Initiatives to improve research dissemination**, with an emphasis on making research results more accessible, through e.g. practical research-based policy briefs and on information technology

- **General institutional capacity building.** This last point seems to be particularly difficult, since most of the platforms seem to have little to offer beyond a concern with platform-specific management issues.

Each of the 4 thematic platforms has organized the activities outlined above into a number of Work Packages that serve to organize the execution of specific tasks at a given institution in the South. It is important to note that the content of each Work Package is determined by the conditions mapped out/found at the South partner institution, to meet the specific needs at each institution. This structure avoids any notion of 'one size fits all' type of solutions from the Danish partners, but also allows similar solutions (e.g. similar courses) to be applied to similar problems. The extent of the flexibility built into this model is amply demonstrated in the Work Packages defined for the PHH collaboration with the State University of Zanzibar, where the attention in the first phase is on lower-level degrees since the conditions for supporting a PhD program were not present.

In short, the platform concept that underlies the BSU program allows participation from the whole Danish research community, drawing on the general experiences and capacities vested in Danish

institutions, to meet specific challenges and needs identified at the partner institutions in the South. There are clearly cases where the platforms are needed to identify and bring to bear highly specialized thematic skills, but also cases where this thematic specialization is less important. As such the platform model seems to be a flexible and adaptive model which builds on capacities in Denmark for academic excellence on the one side, and active domestic and international networking on the other.

1.1 The review process

As phase 1 of the BSU program draws to an end, the Secretariat of the Rectors' Conference has embarked on a review of the Program, in preparation for the 2nd phase, envisaged to start up in August 2013. Such a review is a general condition by Danida for considering funds for a new phase, The review has been carried out in two phases; the first phase covering meetings with partner institutions in Denmark while the second phase covers the South partner institutions (including Nepal) in meetings in Tanzania and Ghana.

The review is guided by the Terms of Reference issued by Universities Denmark in agreement with Danida (see Annex 1), which are primarily concerned with the organizational structure and performance of the BSU program, with specific attention to the quality of the partnerships supported and the added value that the BSU program can infuse in the institutions in the South in particular. The review will of course refer to the ToRs in question, but will in addition address issues and questions that have been brought out in the series of meetings with the partners, both in Denmark and in the South.

Some of these questions are non-issues, in the sense that they concern matters that have been extensively discussed in the preparatory stages of the program; a decision has been reached that some issues will remain part of the BSU program for the first two phases, even if full consensus across all the stakeholders may not have been reached. It should furthermore be noted that some of these issues pertain to the way in which Universities Denmark and the Rectors' Conference have set up BSU, while others primarily arise from the negotiations between Universities Denmark and Danida. The conditions for Danida financial support are set out in agreements between the parties and may be renegotiated in due course (but not in conjunction with this particular review). The review will therefore simply note the presence of these issues, but will not offer any further discussion.

These involve most notably:

- The requirement for co-financing of the BSU Agreement with Danida from Universities Denmark

- The level of administrative overhead charges, in Denmark and at partner institutions in the South

There are also some issues that have arisen during our discussions with Danish as well as South universities. These relate to the internal rules of operation of BSU and are largely related to the way Universities Denmark and the Rectors' Conference have decided to operate the program. While there is an obvious interest in maintaining the status quo for the various solutions reached for at least the initial phases of the BSU program, the questions arising carry with them implications that may have far-reaching consequences. The review will point to the need to resolve these questions, but cannot be specific with regard to recommendations for any particular outcome.

These issues more specifically concern:

- The balance between academically meriting work (primarily research) and the necessary, but less rewarding, work on the support structures for research, such as the preparation of course outlines, course materials, logistics, administrative routines.

- A particular sub-set of these issues concern the up-grading and accreditation of research laboratories, later perhaps also support for up-grading libraries and other aspects of information technology. These issues demonstrate eloquently the close relationship between practical, administrative work and successful research.

- The nature and extent of additional support from the participating Danish universities to their own staff, including the issue of compensation for additional workload. At present, only one of the participating universities has provided significant additional resources[2] (over and above the strict interpretation of the co-financing requirement) to the operation of BSU. There is definitely a need for the respective universities to arrive at clear policies that are acceptable to the concerned staff.

1.2 Direction and Thrust of the Program

When the Rector's Conference of the 8 Danish universities in 2010 approached Danida with a proposal for a project to Build Stronger Universities (BSU) in developing countries, it was quite clear that the proposal did not involve the funding of a regular program of research cooperation. The proposal was clearly for a program through which Danish universities would make available the competence and capacity of its staff to contribute to institutional capacity building for research in South institutions, with the ultimate aim of enhancing the contribution that research should make to development efforts within areas of importance to Denmark's development cooperation. Institutional capacity building in this context will primarily entail development of staff competence to do good research, but also the associated general capacity that supports and sustains this core research capacity over time.

The proposal prepared eventually outlined the construction of 4 thematic platforms to organize the envisaged partnership between the Danish universities and a total of 11 partner universities and research institutions in the South. The platform themes, identified through a reiterative process with the specific purpose of enlisting the interest and involvement of the South, were matched with relevant competences and availability of the Danish researchers. The following 4 platforms were proposed for funding:

- **Platform on Human Health (PHH)** – involving partnerships between 6 Danish universities, 3 affiliated university teaching hospitals and one specialized sector research institute with a total of 6 partner universities (2 in Ghana, 2 in the Tanzania mainland and 2 in Zanzibar). The partnerships are designed to address specific capacity building needs identified at each partner institution.

- **Growth and Employment Platform (GEP)** – involving partnerships between 7[3] of the 8 Danish universities and 4 partner universities (2 in Tanzania and 2 in Ghana) to meet what was identified as key challenges at the partner universities, with a particular emphasis on research qualifications of partner university staff, research training and research supervision (including design inputs to PhD programs and the training of PhD supervisors).

- **Platform on Environment and Climate (PEC)** – involving 7 Danish universities and with links to individual researchers at two specialized sector research institutes, with the same partner universities as the GEP above, viz. 2 in Tanzania and two in Ghana. Here, the focus is on building research capacity in the areas of environment and climate change.

---

[2] Aarhus University has been most generous in providing additional support for BSU; some support has also been provided by Copenhagen University and the Copenhagen Business School

[3] The 8th university – the IT University of Copenhagen, was established as an autonomous university in 2003 and while it is nominally a part of BSU it does not yet take active part in project activities

- **Platform for Stability, Democracy and Rights (PSDR)** – involving 7 Danish universities and partnerships to 4 institutions in the South (1 in Kenya, 1 in Uganda and 2 in Nepal). The thematic focus in this platform is on: 1) freedom, democracy and human rights, 2) gender equality and 3) stability and fragility of states.

The formulation of the platforms was the end result of a long process (partly supported by Danida grants) of discussion and consultation with possible partner institutions in the South, on the basis of an invitation by the Rectors' Conference secretariat to submit proposals in a competitive process with predetermined evaluation criteria, on the basis of an agreement by Danida to provide funds for the program. Two of the platform proposals (PHH and GEP) were found 'more mature than the other two' (and awarded a grant of DKK 10 million x 2 years) by an international evaluation panel in May 2011, while the two remaining proposals were asked to review the needs assessments on which they were based and the level of ambition proposed with regard to achievable outputs. These proposals were then granted DKK 4 million x 2 years.

In retrospect and from the point of view of the current review, it is not obvious that there are significant quality differences between the different platforms. The important point, however, is that the participating institutions accepted the decision to differentiate between the platforms and have implemented the platform Work Packages as foreseen. At this stage in the implementation of the BSU program the major difference between the four platforms seems to be one of volume, such as the number of PhD fellowships offered at the respective partner institutions.

Implementation of platform activities started in August 2011, which means that this review will be based on less than 18 months of experience. It should be noted, however, that Danida is already committed to a second phase of the project (from August 2013). From the outset, there has been an emphasis on the need to adopt a long-term perspective; the effects and results of the project are unlikely to become evident in the short term. The review may contribute to some adjustments on the basis of the experiences gained so far.

2 Some issues in Denmark

2.1 Program organization

The consultants have had a round of consultations in Denmark, meeting with the Rector of Aarhus University, representatives of the BSU Secretariat and Danida and with the 4 platforms (represented by the chairs/vice-chairs of the platform steering committees as well as the administrative coordinators of each platform). The main focus of the discussion has been on the set-up and initial implementation of the work plans of the 4 different platforms:

The proposals for the 4 platforms have been prepared by 4 different groups of researchers (on the basis of close consultations and interaction with colleagues at the partner universities in the South). They display more or less the same structure and propose activities that are organized in largely similar ways. The platforms rely on a fairly elaborate structure for governance, which apparently was deliberately designed to allow for the representation of all the Danish stakeholders in Platform Steering Committees. Each platform has a secretariat (headed by and largely limited to a coordinator paid for by BSU) based at the home university of the platform chair. The link from the platform to the Rectors' Conference, which is ultimately responsible for the project, is organized though a Danish Advisory Group and the BSU Secretariat.

While the basic concern at the Danish-based committees seems to be of allowing representation from all Danish institutions, the structures at the partner universities in the South relate more closely to the

work programs agreed. At each partner university there are working groups composed of involved university staff, assisted by a paid project officer and chaired by a staff member appointed by the vice-chancellor. Danish representatives from the platform are also members of the working groups. There are some cases with joint working groups, set up to cater to more than one platform, but one working group per platform per partner university seems to be the norm.

The adequacy of the governance structure put in place will be further discussed below, as one of the issues raised in the ToRs. At this stage we would like to point out that the governance structure in Denmark seems to be designed for a somewhat different function than what is the case in the South. Platform governance, as seen from the South, was not reported as a problem and appeared to be accepted as lean, functional and effective.

2.2 Design features

The content of the capacity building projects that the platforms are implementing is largely similar across the platforms, with some variation regarding the number and content of the work packages. A considerable part of the activities at the platform level concern the execution of a comparatively large number of undertakings related to the work packages defined by platform proposals, e.g. the preparation of a course within a particular field, running a training schedule or supervising a PhD candidate. These tasks are announced to the Danish members of the platform - and to the public through the platform's newsletters and webpage - who are requested to indicate interest in actually performing the service required. Such expressions of interests are evaluated at the platform level according to criteria previously agreed upon and tasks are allocated to the proposal best meeting the requirements.

The progress reports from the platforms indicate that this mechanism of moving the projects forward is working, but that there are difficulties attaching to it. There have been several cases where the platforms have experienced problems in identifying interested and qualified staff to take on an assignment. At one level the terms and conditions for carrying out such work may not be seen at Danish university departments as very attractive: in some cases there may even be negative opportunity costs associated with it since the end product cannot be accounted for as academically meriting. This could be even more acute if the product is seen as an isolated effort, - a stand-alone product that is not related to any wider schedule of activities that make sense in terms of the academic interests of the staff member. With its emphasis on institutional capacity building, the specific tasks of the various work packages will often involve what would normally be seen as activities in support of more interesting and more rewarding research activities, without actually getting to this stage.

The question of participation and motivation of Danish researchers needs to be carefully approached. One the one hand the need to improve institutional capacity at South institutions is generally accepted as a crucially important aspect of research cooperation. On the other hand, the new focus is a departure from established modes of research cooperation, where institutional capacity was meant to grow out of active research partnerships. BSU is established on the clear understanding that previous assumptions about institutional capacity building have proven ineffective. Together with the agreed financing arrangements, this has no doubt become a political issue within parts of the Danish universities, but it is difficult for a brief review to establish the extent of this problem. There is anecdotal evidence that progress has been delayed, but even the most vociferous critics seem reluctant to suggest that the model is unworkable and that the number of unstaffed tasks is threatening the overall unfolding of the platform work program. It would be possible, however to ask the platform coordinators to provide more quantified information.

These issues of the projects grow out of some specific design features. This BSU Program is specifically set up to support capacity building at the partner south institutions and has been agreed with the Rectors' Conference on those terms. Additionally, the Rectors' Conference has assumed a certain responsibility for this endeavor and has agreed to a certain level of contribution (co-financing)

from Danish universities as an expression of this responsibility. It is therefore important that funding for BSU activities is not confused with public resources made available through other mechanisms and for other defined purposes. Specifically, BSU funding should not be deployed to support Danish development-related research, for which other funding mechanisms are available. This is not only a matter of administrative tidiness: if these resource flows were to be confused there is a clear risk that the less attractive but highly necessary capacity building activities would suffer and that the research activities that presumably would benefit clearly will avoid the rigorous peer review and quality assurance procedures that normally govern research funding.

These concerns are less acute at the level of the partner institutions in the South where the challenge is often to expand the resource base in terms of staff members that are qualified to carry out research and to offer a research-based education to their students. In this project the particular issue of enhancing academic quality is often addressed through a learning by doing approach. Hence, there are some opportunities for small-scale research activities, designed to lead into more substantial research programs (pilot projects, training in proposal writing, even partial funding for PhD research and PhD research supervision) at the partner universities. These activities are of course primarily designed to benefit staff members at partner institutions but because the BSU Program still is very young, there seems to be little information available on how effective these approaches are in meeting their particular objectives. Particularly at universities where there is a certain level of competition among donors for promising young candidates, the model offered by BSU (a 'sandwich' degree with joint supervision and supplementary training/laboratory work/library work at a university in Denmark) may not attract sufficient attention to be effective. Obviously the issue of PhD training has been approached on the assumption that the BSU model offered across the platforms would be attractive to staff and students at the partner universities. A number of PhD candidates (and their PhD projects) have been identified but it is far too early in the process to assess how well the BSU model has worked in this regard. This issue is further discussed below.

The 'sandwich' model and the full overseas scholarship model each display some advantages and some disadvantages. The main advantage of the overseas model seems to be that it offers closer collaboration with qualified foreign advisors and seem in general to take less time than a 'sandwich' model. The main advantage of the 'sandwich model' is that it keeps students in a familiar environment and builds capacity at the home institution with the 'sandwich' student at the center.

The current review must take note of the design of the program (as briefly outlined above) as well as the program logic (will the inputs provided result in the expected outputs). The first impressions from discussions with Danish stakeholders and from program documentation seem to indicate agreement that the design is purposeful and effective, but that there may be some of intervening factors that have not been fully taken into account at the design stage that influence the outcomes of program activities. A number of these factors have been set out in the program plans as assumptions and in several cases these assumptions are now being tested by program execution. There are cases where the program context has turned out to be different from what was originally assumed: in some cases this seems to have resulted in operational difficulties, while in other cases the effectiveness of the approach and the logic of the program have been put in doubt.

3 Assessment of specific issues (ToRs)

3.1 Value added

The question of the value added by BSU to the partner institutions in the South was assessed with reference to two main areas where such value added could be expected, viz.

- donor coordination

- synergy between activities of the BSU Program/Platforms as well as with other programs supported at national level.

3.1.1 Donor coordination

Donor coordination broadly entails understanding what and how much donors are supporting a given institution or an area thereof. The basis of donor coordination is that it is important, and indeed helpful, for any donor to understand which areas other donors are supporting at any given institution in order to see how donor support may best be complementary and work for the best interest of both the donors and the organization in question by optimizing resource use. Although the strongest evidence of donor coordination is when an institution says no to a donor, in reality this hardly happens making the need for donor coordination even more pressing. Effective donor coordination involves transparent and regular information dissemination on the status of donor support and it has the effect of greatly enhancing an institution's attractiveness to donors. It is in this context, donor coordination was not only considered useful for the program but also assessed in terms of the extent the program had contributed or could be expected to contribute to enhancing donor coordination.

The BSU program is expected to add value with respect to donor coordination at the South partners institutions and generate synergy between activities within and between thematic platforms and participating institutions. This would lead not only to enhanced achievement of quality results but also building of strong institutional ties that could be expected to last after the program has come to an end. The experience so far, it seems, is that Danish partners have understood both the value of donor coordination as well as some of the current limitations. At any one South institution and owing to the thematic approach of the platform concept, the BSU program operates through a relatively small window in the entire range of a university's academic activities. Consequently, the extent to which the program can influence transparency, access to and sharing of donor support related information has often been constrained; as such nothing has been done on this particular aspect. Discussions with partner institutions in the South revealed that it has been difficult for the platforms to establish the full extent of donor coordination because such information is not easily made available.

South partners indicated that donor coordination was inadequate; either institutions do not proactively and regularly make available information regarding donor coordination or donor coordination is lacking all together. For example it was reported that at SUA the Directorate of Research coordinates all research funding such that all research related activities and their funding across different projects come together under this Directorate. Similarly, the Office of Research, Innovation and Development (ORID) coordinates research collaboration and support of all donors at the University of Ghana. The problem arises with regard to information. Without clarity coordinating research funding could mean a range of things, which may or may not include effective donor coordination. It was not clear that donor support information was regularly published, in the form of a regularly updated catalogue or on websites, or provided to new donors to assist with coordination and planning. Certainly, BSU has not been provided with such information. Other institutions met, for instance KNUST, KCMC and Tribhuvan University also reported lack of effective donor coordination.

One particular aspect of donor coordination affecting the BSU program was reported from KCMC. Since the BSU Program is supporting development of a better environment for PhD training in a general sense and not the PhD research component specifically, this could potentially cause conflict with other partners supporting research unless mechanisms for coordination are fully functional. As much as the problem is related to donor coordination, it may also bear some accounting concerns where the same PhD student is counted as being supported by BSU because they are enrolled under BSU but at the same time the same individual is being counted as being supported by another donor because the donor supports the student's research project. It was felt that such narrow demarcation of support between donors might not work in the interest of collaboration and might make it difficult for BSU PhD students to be collaboratively supported by other donors for their research projects. The issue was raised because it was understood that BSU would not provide funds to support PhD student

research projects. However, it has since been clarified that PhD research projects can be budgeted for under the program.

Meaningful donor coordination depends to a large extent on availability of systemic mechanisms for information sharing. One way of making such information available is through institutionalization of activity based budgeting that not only links activities to results but also shows activity based sources of funding and enables progress reporting to be likewise prepared. This kind of budgeting and reporting would meet the information needs of both the institutions and donors as such information could be easily available through quarterly and annual reports. With financial management having been generally recognized as a cross cutting need, activity based budgeting, which is a component of financial management, could be included as an aspect of the general capacity building. If the objective of donor coordination is to be upheld in the 2nd phase of the BSU program, it will be necessary to assess the current status of budgeting at the partner institutions with the view to introducing or improving on activity based budgeting and reporting as part of its component of wider capacity building. The Program could also look into other mechanisms for improving donor coordination, e.g. assisting South partners in establishing a partners day as an annual event, which brings together donors and stakeholders to discuss annual achievements and plans. The BSU Program could initiate this within its particular focal area of research in order to demonstrate the value of donor coordination to the wider institution.

Representatives of participating Danish universities on their part reported an unexpected value addition of the universities having to work together, for the first time, as a consortium. Although this is not without challenges, the collaboration is, nevertheless, expected to have lasting effects, among the Danish universities, beyond the life of the program. There is great expectation in Denmark that the north-south institutional collaboration will be strengthened with subsequently long lasting contribution building on the results of the program.

3.1.2 Synergy between activities and other programs

There was synergy between activities of the BSU Program within and between Platforms as well as with other programs supported at national level. For example it was reported that the University of Dar es Salaam identified a link between the BSU program and the current support on research projects by the British Royal Society. A link with the Commission for Science and Technology (COSTECH) in Tanzania was also mentioned as a possibility particularly as local funding was reportedly expected to improve following the approval by the government of Tanzania to allocate 1 % of its GDP to research.

Further examples of synergies across platforms and extending into the national level concern some of the courses developed to strengthen the sandwich PhD program at one institution and to facilitate general capacity building were offered to participants across platforms and institutions. A good example includes a course on Multivariate Data Analysis, which was run jointly by the PEC and GEP at SUA and attended not only by a wide spectrum of participants within that University but also by participants from the University of Dar es Salaam; obviously resulting into considerable cost saving. At Tribhuvan University in Nepal the Research Methodology course has also proven to be attractive to staff and students in different departments. There was also synergy within South institutions evidenced by that fact that some of the PhD courses already developed were also available for PhD programs outside the target platforms in addition to supporting the lower educational programs at MSc and MPhil levels.

The BSU Program has also fostered inter-institutional collaboration. An example is the collaboration between KCRI and NIMR in Tanzania. Involvement of NIMR to teach courses and supervise students at KCMC was a direct result of the BSU program. Maseno and Gulu universities jointly organized Social Science and Peer Based Education workshops and other workshops on Student Supervision and Teaching Methodology courses are planned. A similar situation was observed in Ghana where the University of Ghana collaborated with KNUST; e.g. by holding a joint Financial Management training

and in East Africa Financial Management training was conducted collectively for all the platforms, across institutions including Tribhuvan University, in Moshi, Tanzania.

Both KCMC and NIMR in Tanzania are institutions under the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare which has set a national research policy that links with the national development strategy as well as millennium development goals and identifies research priorities that set the direction of research in health related matters. KCRI and NIMR reported that existing capacity gaps, as benchmarked against the national research policy, were a major consideration in selecting topics and priorities for capacity building for research. Accordingly, the BSU Program added value in terms of contributing towards building the capacity that would be required to implement the national research policy.

Synergy between BSU and other Danida supported programs is still weak but expected to strengthen because BSU implementation is still in its early stages. A number of MSc fellowships to study in Denmark have been given and more are planned across platforms meeting the need to strengthen the base of staff with adequate qualifications to pursue PhD study where shortfalls existed. However, links with research related programs such as FFU were not evident because implementation had not yet reached this level. With BSU being a component of the new strategic framework for Danish support for development research that more closely links research with development cooperation through the platform approach, it can be envisaged that BSU will synergistically link with Danish support on research projects administered by the FFU as well as the pilot research program currently implemented in Tanzania and Ghana. Meanwhile, it was clear that awareness exists among South partners about these programs. Increased linkage with these programs and the directly funded research projects where either Danish institutions apply on behalf of both parties or where the Danish institutions takes initiative and researchers in the South take lead would greatly strengthen the incentive for collaboration between Danish and South institutions.

Representatives of participating Danish universities on their part reported an unexpected value addition of the universities having to work together, for the first time, as a consortium. Although this is not without challenges, the collaboration is, nevertheless, expected to have lasting effects, among the Danish universities, beyond the life of the program. There is great expectation in Denmark that the north-south institutional collaboration will be strengthened with subsequently long lasting contribution building on the results of the program.

3.2 Quality and relevance of partnerships and interrelationships

Quality of partnerships can partly be seen in terms of the competence of Danish personnel participating in the various collaborative activities as perceived by both Danish universities and partner institutions in the south and their timely availability when they are required in the South. It can also be assessed in terms of quality of students (trainee staff) that will be enrolled on PhD programs. On the other hand relevance is assessed in terms of how the issues being addressed under the BSU Program meet the needs of the South at institutional and national levels.

3.2.1 Quality of partnerships and availability of Danish partners

Platform leaders in Denmark are exercising considerable scrutiny, employing a range of methods including the use of open competitive expression of interest (EOI) procedures, to ensure that competent Danish personnel are selected for the collaborative activities. This competitive selection approach has been considered useful for building a pool of experts to select from. So far the varying approaches used by the four platforms to select staff to participate in the platform activities seems to have worked sufficiently well; providing south partner institutions with well-qualified personnel, although the motivation issues as discussed above could potentially come in the way if not carefully addressed in future.

Partners in the South were generally happy with both the competence of the Danish individuals participating in the Program and their availability when required with some caveat expressed. There was one case reported at the University of Ghana where the concerned Danish individual was not available on time despite follow up. It turned out this individual was engaged in another, larger and more rewarding assignment (with a big budget) but this was finally sorted out. Although the partnership was found useful, the University of Dar es Salaam felt that participation by Danish partners in implementing the work packages was inadequate. It was often too short and, as such, not allowing much time for interaction and working together. At KNUST (PEC) development of a course, Stakeholder Organization Theory, from the identified needs had to be dropped because there was no expression of interest from the Danish side for that particular course. The program should in future have flexible funding mechanisms for procuring expertise from elsewhere for such clearly isolated cases rather than simply cancelling them.

All the three platforms active at KNUST; PHH, PEC and GEP reported that they are happy with the level of transparency with their Danish partners. They were also happy with the quality of Danish system of expression of interest (EOI) used in Denmark to select resource persons was also found useful made available to the platforms at KNUST. When KNUST tried the EOI method they although found to that it worked better when used in addition to networking demonstrating the importance of platforms not only learning from one another but also avoiding the temptation of one solution fits all approach. The system has been adopted at KNUST as reported by PEC and GEP. No delays of support from Danish partners have been experienced and transfer of funds has also been on time.

The University of Dar es Salaam (both PEC and GEP) reported that the concept of platform was new. It was decided that participation would be open to all interested across the entire university. The arrangement was found to foster both intra and inter institutional collaboration, as it was an opportunity for individuals from different schools of the university to work together. It was felt that the entire university benefitted in terms of building capacity and confidence.

3.2.2   Relevance of partnerships

The relevance of partnerships is based on the understanding that universities are key institutions for carrying out research because of the inherent requirement for university academic staff not only to conduct research as part of their duties but also to have the highest educational level which places them on the cutting edge of research. Many countries have traditionally depended upon universities to carry out research although sector based research institutions also exist in some cases. Building stronger universities is therefore necessary in order to generate knowledge required to address development problems crucial for alleviating poverty. Although the selection of South partners was based on different considerations within the context of Danish development cooperation, issues to be addressed are based on prior identified needs of South partners making the partnerships play an important role in addressing South development problems. The issues were grouped into work packages that showed the areas where capacity building was required in the form of training, courses development and systems development. On the Danish side partner institutions were identified based on the platform configuration but the selection of individual participants was aligned to the identified needs in the South. In fact this matching process took quite some time and was one of the causes of implementation delays. Below, is an elaboration of the capacity needs as presented by the institutions that serve to further illustrate the relevance of the partnerships.

From the University of Dar es Salaam the BSU Program was described as a timely intervention. Being the oldest university in the country, the university has in the recent years suffered from two major staff loss pathways both related to its age. Most of the senior and more experienced academic staff have either retired or are due for retirement in due course. Although retirement is not entirely an unexpected matter, appropriate staffing plans could not be implemented for some years in the past because the government froze employment in the public service. As if this was not enough the university suddenly and inadvertently found itself, in recent years, being the supplier of senior academic staff to a

proliferation of new universities opening their doors. While this has, obviously, been good career advancement of the individuals involved, both this and the demographic issue have contributed to a huge capacity need at the university. Although it is a requirement of the university for every lecturer to have a PhD, only 40% of them currently have a PhD qualification. SUA, the second oldest university in Tanzania, also suffers from similar mechanisms of staff attrition resulting into a big staff seniority gap and greater need for lecturers with PhD qualification.

Tribhuvan University reported that the BSU Program was very relevant to their needs since combining research and teaching was important to the lecturers. Many of the senior and experienced faculties will be retiring within the next five years making the program a timely intervention. Quite often opportunities to study abroad tend to be limited to Kathmandu campus but the BSU Program includes faculties outside Kathmandu. The Stability, Democracy and Rights (PSDR) platform was also quite relevant given that Nepal was emerging from a decade-long conflict. It was reported that the Program's presence has evidently been felt within the university.

Like at Tribhuvan, the PSDR platform found a natural home at Maseno University where it is implemented by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the School of Development and Strategic Studies. In 2007 the university established a Stability and Strategic Studies Program at the School of Development and Strategic Studies. In addition, the university runs Media and Gender Programs. However, the university has severe capacity constraints. Out of the 300 academic staff it currently employs, the majority are junior lecturers and only 20 (6.7%) have PhD.

In order to alleviate the shortage of qualified staff, Maseno University waved payment of tuition fees for members of the faculty who register for PhD at the university. Still, the university found itself with a large number of registered students who have no research funds to conduct their PhD research projects. It was reported that, currently, there are 44 (42.7%) out of 103 faculty members of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences whose registration for a PhD Program has been dormant for a long time for lack of research funds. Most of the research funding to the university comes through individuals rather than institutional support. In this context the BSU Program has been a welcome initiative at the university. It has enabled students who are staff of the university to undertake some research under supervision from Danish counterparts.

At the University of Ghana the objectives of the Program are very much in line with the needs of the university. The University is reforming its PhD Program by changing it from a purely three-year research based program to a four-year program that includes taught courses and research. The change was based on three main reasons: i) need for students to better understand the theory and conception of research, ii) need to embrace multidisciplinary approach and iii) recommendations from the university's external examiners.

The coming of the BSU Program hastened the implementation of the new program causing it to precede the normal prior approval, which is expected to happen in August this year. Students under the BSU Program have been enrolled for a four year PhD Program while the taught courses are being developed as they are offered. In a sense the BSU PhD Program is a pilot program because other PhD Programs still consist of purely research. Similar to the situation in East Africa and Nepal, the staff position at the University of Ghana was also affected by the same demographic trends. The University is in need of qualified staff; the BSU Program is considered timely.

At the KNUST the start of the BSU Program was almost a natural extension of the long-standing collaboration between Danida and KNUST. The BSU idea came from Denmark but was well embraced by KNUST particularly because of its component of PhD training. Earlier the university had come up with a policy, which stipulated recruitment of only PhD holders for its faculty. However, there were many of its current staff who did not have a PhD qualification. Moreover, the age structure of its faculty is highly skewed towards older staff. All this meant that KNUST was to embark on a

major staff training program to enable the university to have the required number and quality of faculty in line with its new policy.

The BSU Program fitted in well at KNUST since the university had already started a PhD Program in Agriculture, which combined course work with research. BSU has been helpful in facilitating the development of taught courses and their implementation. These courses are compulsory in order to bring students, who come from different backgrounds, to the same level of understanding. It is expected that some of these courses will be offered at lower levels and exemption would be given in future for students who would have already successfully completed them. It was reported that enthusiasm for the BSU Program was high. The university dedicated a conference facility for PEC to ensure the platform functions well.

In terms of North and South relationship the partnership is focused on implementing the Program activities with a relatively heavy and unequal involvement of Danish partners across the structure relative to their South counterparts. Danish participation is traced right from the Rectors' Conference through Platforms, Partnership Steering Committees to Working Groups but the South partners do not reciprocate this relationship. While there were no concerns voiced regarding this relationship from both the North and South partners, it is the view of the Consultants that a more reciprocated relationship will help build stronger partnerships. Currently, involvement of the South partners is limited to implementation of work packages and participation in the Partnership Steering Committees, which are located at the respective South institutions. It would help to strengthen the partnerships and build stronger long-term relationships between Danish and South institutions if a mechanism could be put in place that would enable the South partners to be represented at some of the Danish forums. For example since Partnership Steering Committees are chaired by Vice Chancellors, these chairs could be invited to attend the Rectors' Conference in order to play a role at the policy and strategic level which would contribute towards building more understanding, a stronger sense of equality and ownership within the partnerships.

3.2.3 Relevance of the sandwich PhD Program

It was reported by Danish partners that competition from other donors for competent students has been observed. With full overseas scholarships being perceived in the south as more beneficial to PhD candidates, it is possible that such scholarships provided by other donors are more competitive than the BSU model and tend to attract the best candidates. The situation in the South was not as clear-cut as expressed by their northern counterparts. On their part, generally, institutions preferred the BSU sandwich program to full scholarships abroad because there is a tendency, in the latter, for individuals to stay and take up employment abroad.

KCMC reported that it preferred the sandwich program because of its relevance to students' research to the south. Earlier KCMC practiced an approach whereby students were registered for PhD at a foreign university and research work done at a home country but this has now changed. Instead, students are registered at KCMC, undergo foundational course work, carry out research work in Tanzania and go abroad for technology and other specific study requirements more easily attainable abroad. This arrangement also enabled PhD students to teach, which is an important consideration in south institutions with capacity restrictions. The University of Ghana, SUA, Tribhuvan and KNUST also reported preference for the sandwich program. On the other hand UDSM prefers abroad scholarships because of shorter completion time.

The view of the sandwich program by students seemed to vary depending on their age and commitments, particularly family commitment at home. It was reported that at Maseno University while the majority of the older and married candidates preferred the sandwich PhD program, the young and unmarried candidates preferred to study abroad. Completion rates were higher for the abroad study program. From UDSM it was reported that a sandwich program is less attractive to the

staff. It was generally felt that as long as other donors still offer scholarships, the younger and best candidates will chose and even wait for overseas scholarships.

Although there are a number of advantages to the 'sandwich' model for PhD training, in the context of BSU there is one particular feature that needs to be discussed further. Part of the reasoning leading to the preference for the 'sandwich' model concerns cost: a 'sandwich' PhD is cheaper since BSU financial obligations per student are lower, even if there is variation between the platforms with regard to what is provided. In addition there are of course a range of indirect costs relating to the development of appropriate PhD courses and other aspects of the BSU program. There also seems to be variation between the South institutions with regard to how the other costs for a 'sandwich' PhD are covered. The universities in Ghana have a system in place whereby staff members who register for a PhD are granted paid study leave from their universities; at the universities in East Africa, staff members to pursue their PhD work with a varying amount of teaching responsibility. This may not necessarily be as onerous as it sounds, since there seems to be a range of informal solutions available, as well as cases where full study leave is granted. None the less, 'sandwich' PhDs are believed to take longer time than study programs abroad because students may additional obligations at their home university.

The issue here is of course that the main purpose for BSU to be involved in the 'sandwich' PhD programs at all is to quickly increase the number of PhD-qualified staff at the partner universities in the South. There seems to be an argument in favour of a re-examination of the current BSU policy on what the different platforms provide, with a view to streamlining the 'sandwich' model; the cost-sharing model at work in Ghana has a number of obvious advantages. A revised BSU policy in this regard should involve open negotiations with the host institutions in the South for increased cost-sharing. If the South institutions cannot afford this, BSU should consider ways of covering in-country costs: a full-time 'sandwich' student will always be cheaper than a full-time student with an overseas fellowship. Given the urgency to increase the proportion of PhD-qualified staff at several institutions, all bottlenecks in the 'sandwich' model should be removed.

3.2.4 Interrelationships

An important aspect of quality of partnerships is the extent to which institutions within platforms (cross institutional relationship) are able to work together and continue to build strong relationships for continued working together in future. As already mentioned this has been observed to be of great value in Denmark. The situation in the South is such that Platforms bring together two to three institutions either in the same country or across countries. Within a Platform at a university cross institutional linkages exist between departments and schools. This has been the basis on which Platforms have been working at institutional level. It was evident during the review that institutions requested to meet the review team together because they had been working together.

An observation was made by the Danish partners of the possibility of cross- platform interrelationship whereby institutions from one platform could cross over to work with institutions on another platform. This crossover could be based on cross cutting themes or pieces of work related to the environment of providing effective institutional capacity building. Institutions that have already gained experience of working on particular cross cutting issues such as curriculum development, accreditation, admission procedures, etc. could support other institutions, which would further strengthen institutional understanding and collaboration. This was found already happening to a small extent in the South but what had not much taken place was South-South collaboration.

It was noted that a good example of south-south networking has taken place between Maseno University and Gulu University from Kenya and Uganda respectively. These universities are in neighboring countries and they are both on the same Platform of Stability, Democracy and Rights platform (PSDR). In addition to being neighbors the common history of conflicts in these countries might have naturally drawn them together at an early stage of implementation to exchange ideas at planning stage. It was reported that the two universities invited each other to their respective initial

planning workshops and one meeting was held which also involved Tribhuvan University in Nepal in August last year.

Like for the whole start up phase of the implementation of the Program, South-South collaboration was not the immediate thing partners needed to embark on. With the Program having now taken off the ground and considerable experience gained, all South partners in the discussions expressed desire to intensify South-South networking. They noted, however, that this issue had not adequately been taken into account during planning for phase 2. Realizing that little time was left before completion of planning for phase 2, the South partners suggested that rather than work to identify specific activities to be done, lump sum funds should be allocated for South-South networking in phase 2. Where possible, South-South institutions could identify activities to be jointly implemented.

The purpose of South-South networking was identified as to exchange knowledge, information and practices and to assist with the efficient use of human resources. An example was cited of the SUA short course on Multivariate Data Analysis, which had attracted participation from other universities. Making courses like this and offering them on a modular basis could enhance both inter institutional and south-south collaboration. It was felt that further development of ideas like this could be more useful in future as this could lead to possibilities of a global PhD delivery system. Realizing that more options could be explored, it was suggested that initially collaboration could focus on same platforms then expand to cross platforms. During its meeting in August more platforms identified Problem Based Learning (PBL), E-learning and Research Methodology courses as possible areas for south-south collaboration.

3.2.5 Quality of staff selected for PhD study

In most cases, PhD students are already staff members of the university and since universities have traditionally maintained fairly stringent requirements for faculty employment, it can reasonably be expected that most of the potential PhD candidates would have the required qualifications to pursue a PhD study program. In some cases fresh university graduates are recruited for PhD study in anticipation that, upon successful completion of their studies, the university would employ them. In fact as the review meetings were being held in Moshi, KCMC held interviews for fresh or recent graduates for its PhD Program. However, one problem affecting some members of staff in relation to the BSU Program is age. Because of previous difficulties of getting scholarships some staff members have passed the age limit as per Danida regulations. UDSM cited the age limit and the sandwich model as main reasons for the low number of applicants. Consequently both KNUST (GEP) and UDSM (GEP) had to raise the age limit to 45 years to enable more staff to apply. The candidates are approved by both Danish and South partners.

Owing to limitations that may imposed by labour laws, the issue of age needs to be further assessed platform wise in order to determine its magnitude. It is important particularly for old universities, which may have all the lower staff positions filled by older staff in which case they may lack flexibility to employ younger individuals because of approved positions are filled up. Establishment of the age status of potential PhD candidates will enable making informed decisions, which may include looking further afield within the institutions.

3.3 Effectiveness of governance and communication structures

The governance and communication structure of the Program can be described and assessed for its effectiveness and efficiency in terms of three components. The first component relates to governance, coordination and communication in Denmark whereby matters pertaining to Danish partners are dealt with. Intra and inter platform governance, coordination and communication among the south

institutions is another component while the third component is the total structure and how it works as a whole.

Basically, the Danish part of the structure has three levels namely the Policy body which is constituted by the Rectors' Conference which is served by the Rectors' Working Group and BSU Secretariat. Below this are the Danish Platform Steering Committees, which coordinate the Danish institutions and act like management boards that ensure within-platform coordination, make decisions on budgetary allocation and review progress within Denmark and South. Each Danish Platform Steering Committee while focusing on platform implementation within Danish institutions also provides oversight on the South institutions with the help of the Partnership Steering Committee (PSC), which coordinates platforms within each South partner institution. These two committees overlap and work almost at par such that the South based Working Groups at each university report progress, through their Working Group Leaders, to both committees.

The overlap between the Danish Platform Steering Committee (SC) and the Partnership Steering Committee lessens the hierarchy. Overall, this appears to be a reasonable and relatively lean structure within Denmark under the circumstances. Reporting over websites also ensures rapid communication. For wider communication to stakeholders, it is intended to create open access to new results to the extent possible. But if this were the only story, then there would not have been so much talk and concern about the structure. It would appear that many of the problems were initially associated with the difficulties of the institutions in Denmark working together for the first time, the challenges of conceptualization of institutional capacity building *vis-a-vis* research cooperation, issues of motivation and the complexities of needs identification which involved both Danish and South partners and the communication link between North and South.

The South component of the structure is similar to that of the Danish constituency in that it has three layers. At the top is the PSC in collaboration with the SC. The PSC, which is composed of members from the south and north, decides on research courses, PhD grants, reviews actions plans and budget and ensures coherence and coordination across platforms. Depending on the platform in question, below the PSC is a Project Officer, Coordinator or Implementation Committee. Below this are Working Groups whose membership is drawn from both the South and North constituencies. Like the North component, this part of the structure looks reasonably simple.

When taken all together, the overall structure does in fact look complex as it contains six levels although one group overlaps with another. Internal communication and finding a sense of working coherence across such an apparently hierarchical structure would normally not be without bottlenecks. One prediction that would be made from such a structure is that it would be fraught with communication problems. However, discussions in Denmark revealed that initial problems that affected implementation were not related to communication, as has been pointed out. Instead implementation was affected by extensive discussions that were needed in order to understand the concept of capacity building and how the Danish faculty could participate in the Program under different rules other than those they were familiar with.

The issues that affected implementation in the South were similar to those experienced in North. They were related to the need for time to understand how the Program works and identifying individuals who would participate in the implementation as well as associated with understanding who they would communicate with and availability of reliable communication facilities as is elaborated on the discussion of progress under 3.4.1.

3.3.1   Progress and experience with institutional capacity building

Program implementation start up activities took all the Platforms unexpectedly long. A point was made during the discussions with South partners that if they were to do it again they would have a longer inception period. It underscored the fact that start-up activities, which involved formation of the

implementation machinery with its terms of reference from the Platform Steering Committees in Denmark to Partnership Steering Committees and Working Groups in the South, identification of needs in the South and their formulation into work packages as well as identification of individual participants in Denmark took a lot of time before actual implementation could start. Start-up activities also included development of procedures contracts for selecting and contracting Danish participating individuals, recruiting and contracting full time staff on the Program namely Platform Coordinators both in Denmark and the South, developing communication systems and getting the entire machinery working.

Reporting for PEC and GEP, SUA said that implementation faced the usual start-up problems. It took considerable communication with the Platform Chair in Denmark and the University of Dar es Salaam in order to clarify and sort out issues. Implementation of some of the work packages involved staff from both SUA and UDSM. Pairing up people for the work packages between the two institutions and sorting out how to work together took time resulting into considerable implementation delay causing implementation to lag behind. SUA estimated a total of five months were spent on establishing relationships. This time investment was considered beneficial as it was reported that meetings and discussions had helped the two institutions enhance their working relationship and collaboration; a feature that is attributed to the BSU Program. .

Gulu University reported that it took time to understand what the Program was about and how it worked. They found the Program demanding and required considerable administration particularly as Program activities came on top of normal duties of the people involved in the Program implementation which also undoubtedly added to delays. At the University of Ghana time was spent in getting to understand how the Program works, particularly how to work together under the various procedures of both the Program and the University. Tribhuvan University also experienced start-up problems. At the beginning a misunderstanding existed about payments. It is a university policy to remunerate staff who write publications and therefore expectations were raised that staff similarly would be remunerated under the Program. It was clarified that there was not going to be any remuneration under the Program instead the university would consider staff participation as its contribution to the Program. KCMC reported that they experienced initial delays mainly due to getting to grasp with the program procedures including who should communicate with whom but things moved faster afterwards.

Needs identification in the South was particularly time consuming as it involved understanding the platform approach, holding consultations with stakeholders, sieving through large amounts of needs in order to align them to the platform configuration and developing work packages from which planning and activity outputs were established and budgets prepared. Preparations also involved extensive travelling and consultations with institutions within platforms. In the course of doing all this it was also necessary for Program executants to understand and find their bearing within the program implementation. It was also during all this when issues of motivation particularly in Denmark came to the surface and impacted to some extend on the speed of implementation.

It was reported that initially partners from the Danish institutions thought the program contained opportunities to conduct research and they were dismayed when they found that there was a lot of non-research activities. Their main concern was centered on the extent to which the activities necessary to promote institutional capacity building detract from their interest in devoting more time to research upon which their performance and reward are based. As far as they were concerned non-research activities would not count within the Danish university structure as academically meriting. Besides, capacity building was not a way of working that many of the university faculties were particularly conversant with. This matter took a lot of time to discuss and even though the performance measurement requirement has been identified as a potential constraint, it remains unaddressed within the universities' administrative structures.

The above challenges notwithstanding, considerable progress has been made in implementing the Program. The South partners reported that the needs being addressed are in line with their own needs

and aligned to national needs. KCMC reported that implementation has, generally progressed well in line with their three work packages on Education, Research and General Capacity Building. They experienced initial delays mainly due to getting to grasp with the program procedures including who should communicate with whom but things moved faster afterwards. As many things were concentrated towards the end of the phase, relatively little time was spent on planning phase 2.

Among the activities implemented include holding one common meeting for both GEP and PEC work packages between UDSM and SUA. The following short courses have also been given: Training of Trainers on PhD Supervision and Multivariate Data Analysis, which included a PhD student from UDSM. The short courses were highly successful, remain in great demand and have potential for continuing to draw in a lot of participants from the South partners in future at both PhD and Masters levels. Rightly, there is demand to institutionalize these courses. However, the current semester system at both SUA and UDSM will, unfortunately, limit the participation of students from courses other than PhD at SUA. This, in turn would restrict the already observed inter institutional collaboration. Hence, it is probably necessary for the BSU platform chairs to argue quite strongly for the maintenance of a modular course system, since the contributions made to the PhD programs at all institutions so far seem to depend on it. At the University of Ghana 4 PhD students enrolled, 4 PhD courses developed and 6 small research projects awarded.

In the SDR Platform progress so far at Tribhuvan University includes award of 2 PhD and award of 6 MPhil scholarships is in progress. A course on Research Methodology has been developed and proved to be very attractive. Similar activities are expected to continue in the second phase.

Gulu University started by organizing a conference to tease out needs based on the platform definition. Another conference was organized to identify research ideas for which PhD research proposals may be developed. So far 5 small research grants (up to us $ 3,300 or DKK 18,000) and 5 staff mobility (stipend) grants have been awarded. Short courses have been developed on Research Methodology and Budgeting. Collaboration with Maseno University has been established which enabled holding joint Social Science and Peer Based Education workshops and other workshops on Student Supervision and Teaching Methodology courses are planned.

The following activities have been implemented by Maseno University: Inception conference held, 2 PhD scholarships awarded, a network of PhD supervisors has been developed, small scale collaborative research grants aimed at supporting publications have been competitively awarded, 5 staff mobility grants awarded and supporting short courses developed. They are: Research Methodology, Research Proposal Writing and Academic Article Writing. A short course on Outreach Communication is to be developed in the second phase.

With respect to PHH KCMC has developed 5 support courses, completed planning on holding proposal writing workshops, developed a post graduate handbook, identified two PhD candidates and award of MSc scholarships is in progress. The University of Ghana has enrolled 4 PhD students and developed 3 support courses and ran two courses on general capacity building. In Ghana KNUST has developed 2 support courses, which are run in collaboration with the University of Ghana.

South partners expressed concern that the duration of phases was too short to enable meaningful progress and achievements to be made. In particular this first phase was fraught with start-up delays resulting in many activities being pushed towards the end of the phase; in a sense as the phase comes to an end implementation of Phase 1 work plan has just picked momentum. Even this momentum was reportedly being interrupted by now having to plan for Phase two. Besides, there has been an additional commitment (and additional tasks to be accommodated, even if the period extends into 2015) to Phase one in terms of additional 19 million DKK research dissemination, communication and networking.

It was pointed out by the resource person from Danida that while the grants as such were tied by budgetary regulations to the two-year budget, it would be possible to extend the disbursement period to three years. Besides, some of the activities such as PhD training could be budgeted to cover three years within the two-year phase. In any case should a need arise for the Program to come to an end; arrangement will be in place to ensure that all on-going activities will be completed.

An issue that perhaps has affected progress in the South, though the extent of its effect could not be established is the issue of staff work overload. Invariably South partners complained of work overload. It was reported that people involved in BSU implementation are working over and above their normal workload. To offset this the South partners proposed two solutions. One was the Program pays program executants an agreed monetary incentive while the other was partner institutions consider staff time as institutional contribution to the Program. There was a divide between the two proposals with majority favoring a monetary incentive. Examples were cited where other donors pay such an incentive. Although the Program currently pays salaries this is limited to full-time Program staff. However, an agreement has been reached at KNUST (GEP) to reimburse the department (not the individual) of the lecturers participating in course development an equivalent of actual salary level of the involved staff on the basis of an invoice.

It is the view of the consultants that addressing the staff work overload issue either through payment of incentives or in the form of institutional contribution is only part of the solution, if not just a cosmetic one, because the real effects of work overload may not be remedied by these solutions. Experiencing work overload means that staff are working over their normal workload capacity. Workload capacity is defined as the time available to staff to provide service in a month or year in relation to the time they require to perform regular tasks to the required quantity and quality. Work overload happens when tasks to be done require far more than the available time which often results in long working days, frequent fire fighting, inability to meet goals, failure to go on vacation, etc. Work overload often means a failure of the design of work system and not the failure of people doing the work. To correct work overload one must change work design and add resources. This is an issue for the institutions themselves to seriously consider undertaking as it affects the implementation of both donor funded and institutions' own activities.

3.3.2 Linkage to other research supported activities

The new overall strategy for Danish development cooperation closely links support to development research to development cooperation. Under this new arrangement the main objective of supporting development research is to strengthen research capacity in partner countries so as to create new knowledge capable of alleviating development problems. Development of the BSU Program is in line with this strategy and its thematic focus is based on the important fields of support under the strategy, which are agriculture and food, health, environment and climate and economic growth and employment. According to the new strategy the future orientation of support to development research will include among other things basing support on needs, demand and priorities in partner countries; alignment of needs with national priorities; close cooperation and coordination with other bilateral and multilateral actors, geographical and thematic focusing and focus on communication dissemination and the use of research results in development cooperation.

Within the funding framework of Danida BSU is one of the funding components for development research. The focus of BSU is on capacity development at the level of research institutions in the form of establishing PhD schools, developing accreditation systems, improving research management and the like. In addition to BSU there are other three funding components that are linked to and can complement BSU funding. The first is grants to individual researchers. Between 2004 and 2011 this component was allocated 1 billion DKK. Funding is competitively awarded annually based on three main criteria of relevance, effect and quality of research. Integration of individual capacity development into the research projects is an important element. Under the component FFU acts as a program committee that evaluates and endorses application to the MFA.

There are important points to bear in mind under the FFU component. One is that the evaluation criteria have direct bearing to the way BSU is structured and operating. The positive assessment above of the relevance, quality and south need based aspects of the BSU program puts it in an advantaged position in terms of accessing FFU funding. This is where good student research proposals can be submitted to access more research funds where needed. The fact that PhD student research projects are essentially individual capacity building projects also fulfills another important funding consideration and the component. The grants to individual research constitutes the traditional grants to research cooperation projects between Danish and South-based research partners in which Danish researchers are project holders – otherwise known as Danish driven research cooperation projects (of up to DKK 10 million per project).

The second funding component is the pilot research cooperation program, which was introduced in 2008 in Tanzania and since 2011 in Ghana aims at boosting the development of research capacity by means of South driven research cooperation with Danish researchers. It is based on South-driven research cooperation projects in which South-based researchers have identified the research topic, applied for funds based on a concept paper and identified relevant Danish research partners (up to DKK 5 million per project). The BSU program which provides the platform for cooperation between South and Danish partners puts South partners with their Danish partners at an advantage to access this type of funding without compromising quality. It is expected that strict selection criteria will also apply to BSU candidates.

The third and last funding component is the individual capacity development through scholarships. This component is administered through the Danish Fellowship Program (DFC) and it deals solely with MSc scholarships tenable at Danish universities. The scholarships are open to candidates under the Danish sponsored programs. This is where many of the MSc scholarships under the BSU are funded. This component will help address capacity development in conjunction with BSU in cases where possession of MSc will be also help to enhance enrolment into PhD programs.

Generally, the south partners were aware of the existing additional Danida funding avenues, which they could apply for in association with their Danish partners to complement implementation of their activities. However, deliberately linking the other possible Danida funding avenues to the activities of the current Program may have not been consciously considered. In part this was due to the fact that implementation of the BSU Program was just starting and many program executants were preoccupied with understanding and putting the program into implementation. With the implementation of the Program now in motion, need is emerging to look for additional funds particularly to support student research projects.

In addition to Danida funding avenues BSU can also potentially be linked to other donors who would support student research projects. An example was mentioned of a possible link with the Royal Society at the University of Dar es Salaam. Such linkages, though, can be more effectively facilitated where there ids good donor coordination as earlier pointed out

3.4 Balance and relationship between targeted and general capacity building

It was observed that although it is envisaged in the Program to address aspects of general capacity building that was essential for enhancing effectiveness of targeted capacity building within research, only two platforms; PHH and PSDR had addressed this particular issue while the other two platforms had understood this to mean Program administration. An issue was raised as to whether the Program should only focus on academic capacity building for research or it should also continue to have the ambition of embracing the aspect of institutional capacity building that would include carefully selected aspects in order to avoid being thwarted away by the gravity of institutional capacity building issues.

Looking at the general capacity building activities reported by KCMC, there is good balance between these activities and those of capacity building within research. The activities are also relevant in that they are closely integrated to further strengthen the achievements made through targeted capacity building. Among the activities carried out by KCMC are: i) Review of KCMU College's human resources development plans, ii) Train faculty in student supervision, iii) Prepare quality assurance system, iv) Strengthen post graduate administrative office.

The PHH at the University of Ghana is looking into structures to support research management but has already conducted courses related to general capacity building, such as governance and management provided to researchers and accountants and supervision training for academic staff. At KNUST general capacity building has not been done. It has been planned to look at this issue in the second phase with ideas such as strengthening research management. Another capacity building issue pertinent to PHH at KCMC was the accreditation of laboratories, which could involve aspects of infrastructure development. Laboratory accreditation which may often involve modification and procurement of special equipment is an issue that will need to be looked into on needs basis.

It was reported by SUA representatives that the need to improve the operational environment has been recognized but how to make change is still unclear particularly as the appreciation of the need at policy level is apparently low. Although many people have been trained through attendance to various leadership and management courses no change has ensued. It is unclear how and where to make effective changes on the part of general capacity building in order to ensure a conducive work environment that ensures optimal utilization of resources including human resources. On the other hand, targeted academic capacity building can be more easily implemented because of awareness of its need in the academic faculties and schools and because these sites would be relatively small business units. For these reasons, it was reported that the BSU activities at SUA are given high priority. Already there is an outcry from supervisors to include their students on the courses under BSU.

It was recognized that some of the universities, such as the State University of Zanzibar (SUZA) under the Program, were relatively young and small which was seen as opportunity to feasibly tackle the broader capacity building issues in order to assist them to start right which would also have greatest impact on targeted capacity building for research. The respective platforms could make an assessment to determine the feasibility of such an undertaking on the basis of their priorities.

3.5 Adequacy of monitoring and supporting systems

Monitoring and evaluation matrices exist for each platform based on phase 1 work plans which run for two years. They are sufficient to assess progress and achievement in the course of implementation as they provide clear performance indicators. However, it would assist the Program to see its planned contribution and how it will be achieved if the magnitude of the capacity building problem in each thematic platform and the duration required to solving it would be established.

It was evident during the review that capacity building needs for the targeted institutions are significant. From the Platform perspective the magnitude is, conceivably, somewhat manageable. It is recognized that capacity building takes a long time but it would be useful to have an idea of how long this could be. There is no master Logframe in each platform that assesses the magnitude of the capacity building objective to be addressed, how long and what it will take to achieve it. This kind of framework would provide the big picture by setting the expected results to be achieved by the Program upon which subsequent phasing and planning would be based. Monitoring and evaluation can then be done both in terms the current funding phase as well as the progressive cumulative effect towards achieving the central objective.

Based on the master Logframe, a results framework can be developed to guide subsequent implementation, planning and monitoring. This would in turn facilitate and even simply reporting. So far there have been only a few progress reports, which have been written with considerable narrative.

In view of the complexity of the governance and communication structure it will be helpful to have simpler results based reporting formats, which are based on planned performance expectations as set out in the results framework.

3.6 Program management and disbursements

The 4 platforms had to revise their budgets and work plans in the wake of the assessment made of their proposals by the international group of experts and prior to the start-up of the BSU program in August 2011. In the meetings conducted in conjunction with the current review, none of the platforms have raised issues related to program management, budget revisions and financial management procedures, neither with regard to the management of the platform activities in Denmark, nor with regard to the extension of platform activities at partner institutions in the South.

Only one program management concern was raised which had also been resolved. It was reported by SUA that at the beginning, a Program regulation required payment to be made from the Program bank account to a departmental bank account in order to make payments to activities. This regulation was found to cause payment delays which affected implementation. The problem was resolved when it was agreed to pay directly from the Program account. UG reported that no problems have been experienced in relation to procurement as the systems required by BSU are quite similar to those used by the University. Likewise, there are no problems with financial management. At UG there is no separate bank account for BSU funds because the funds are traceable and are duly accounted for due to the use of an Integrated Financial Management System (IFMS). The PHH at KNUST reported that Danish partners were helpful in providing training on Project Management, Financial Management and Reporting. The platform expected to continue making use of Danish partners on project management matters whenever they were out there.

Platform management in Denmark is vested in the university structures where the platform coordinators are located and follow the general rules and regulations for the management of public funds. Platform coordinators have also been able to draw on the experiences of the Danida Fellowship Center. Furthermore, both the universities and the staff involved have background and experience from previous projects of research cooperation and seem to be well aware of the risks involved.

Since these themes were not raised in the meetings, the review team, which is not particularly qualified to report on financial management issues, have chosen to accept the implied message that these are not particularly troubling issues in the BSU program.

As the focus of the Program was on institutional capacity building, an issue was raised as to whether the platform concept was relevant. A south partner reported that although the platform concept was part of the genesis of the BSU Program, implementation has become more multi-disciplinary and integrated thus throwing in question the platform concept. However, it was also recognized that the BSU Program is relatively a small program, such that focusing on institutional capacity building would essentially open it up to include the rather wider institutions aspect of institutional capacity building which would be beyond its current scope, financial resources and feasibility. It was reported by GEP and PEC from the University of Dar es Salaam that the platform concept was useful for the organization and management of the Program while implementation remains integrated. GEP at KNUST said that platforms make sense in terms of taught courses because they become subject specific particularly in business school. But with most of the support courses being foundational and generic, they are in most cases rather broad and not precisely subject specific within the context of the nomenclature of the platforms.

The genesis of the platform concept stems from the new Danish strategy on development cooperation which links support to development research more closely with development cooperation and which is related to the global agenda on sustainable development as defined by the 1992 United National Conference on Development (UNCED) also known as the Earth Summit. Seen from this vantage the

platform concept makes sense in supporting development cooperation whose linchpin is sustainable development. Sustainable development ties together concern for the carrying capacity of natural systems with the social challenges faced by humanity. In this context the four thematic platforms address the key areas for sustainable development namely: environment and climate change which related to natural systems and human health, economic growth and employment and stability, democracy and rights all of which are related to social challenges faced by humanity. Their implementation at the university level centres on advancing capacity building in those subjects and professional specialities relevant to these themes. The development of PhD programs and individual capacity building must be well aligned to this orientation. Care will be need to be continually exercised to ensure that the right focus is maintained. There were indications that in some cases definition of participants to individual capacity building could be overstretched

3.7 Assumption and risks

The preparation of a new proposal involving new perceptions and new models for organizing the work will always rest on some assumptions and there are always some risks associated with starting up a new program. The proposals from the 4 platforms all discuss some of the risks involved, but do so in a fairly imprecise way. There is no formal risk analysis in any of the 4 proposals, which is not the same as saying that risks associated with the platforms have been totally overlooked. A risk analysis would need to disaggregate risk into the various elements of possible risk and assign some probability value to each element, - this has not been done. Ideally, the ensuing risk matrix should be accompanied by mitigation measures, to counter and overcome identified risks. The discussion of risk, to the extent it is included in the planning documents at all, is not as clearly structured as this. But in the discussion of the assumptions that underlie the BSU proposal (and the BSU model) some of the risk elements are indicated. They are mostly concerned with staff participation, staff availability and motivational factors.

There is some discussion that the proposed schedule of activities rest on some assumptions. The concern over staff availability is most clearly raised in the proposal from the GEP. It is clearly stated that the implementation of a range of activities under the respective work packages will depend on the motivation and willingness of university staff to participate in the work packages under the conditions stipulated. There is some indication of doubt, but no mitigating measures are proposed. The PHH proposal on its part states that since the proposal to large extent is based on pre-existing policies and plans at the host institutions: the PHH is confident therefore that the plans are not founded on unrealistic assumptions.

The review seems to show that both perspectives on risks and assumptions are correct: on the one hand there have been some reports that some of the platforms have experienced problems in recruiting the required staff resources in Denmark in a timely manner, on the other hand, most work packages have been implemented more or less according to the initial plans. The PHH refers to possible 'killer assumptions', i.e. assumptions that are critical to the execution of the project. None of the platforms have identified 'killer assumptions' and although there have been delays here and there, these do not seem to have been caused by unforeseen risks and unrealistic assumptions.

3.8 Need for further analysis

In a new program like BSU, which involves new concepts and new approaches, even if it operates in an environment that to a large extent is known to many of the stakeholders, there will always be a need for better and more precise information. But as indicated above, BSU is still a fairly new program, and a lot of effort has gone into preparation of the different platform proposals. Furthermore, there does not seem to have been major upsets and delays in the unfolding of the program since its inception less than 18months ago. The respective platforms have set up workable communications and cooperation structures, allowing quite close interaction between the partners in Denmark and in the South. The

partners have of late been very preoccupied with developing new ideas and proposals for phase 2 of the program.

An initiative for further analysis at stage should probably come from the platforms and there seems to be ample opportunity in the structures established to bring forwards ideas for new analysis and new initiatives. The review has not been able to delve deeply enough into the day-to-day operation of the platforms to offer much in the way of constructive suggestions. None the less, the two main recommendations to come out of this review (concerning institutional arrangements for workload management/compensation and the question of more complete funding of the PhD 'sandwich' scholarships) will no doubt require some additional analysis before sensible solutions can be proposed.

4 Conclusions and Recommendations

The BSU program has been under implementation for less than 18 months and even if it in many ways represents a fresh approach to academic capacity building, it is being implemented in a context that is well known to the stakeholders in Denmark as well as at the South institutions. The BSU program is not a direct continuation of previous Danida-funded programs for research collaboration, but relies on many of the same academic resources in the Danish universities, many of which hold a long history and rich experiences of partnership with their colleagues in the South.

This review has taken due note of this point of departure and has pointed out that this history and tradition no doubt contributes significantly to the apparently smooth implementation of the BSU program. The program depends on a structure (the 4 platforms) that is both effective in capturing the problems at hand and moving the program forward to the provision of flexible solutions on the basis of the work packages. But since the main idea is to use the experiences and capacity of the Danish universities to improve on the situation at universities in the South, the BSU program depends absolutely on the active involvement of experienced members of staff at the Danish universities. Similarly, whatever experience can be transferred to the universities in the South must be nurtured and tended by staff members there.

The Danish Rectors' Conference has assumed ownership and leadership of the BSU program. It has committed the Danish universities to provide co-financing for the program and to implementing it. It is therefore a matter of some concern that these institutional commitments apparently have not been adequately reflected in the working conditions of individual staff members. There is some variation: one university has provided additional resources to allow its faculty to take part in BSU activities, while at other universities it is up to individual departments/cost centers to provide the co-financing required when staff members take part in BSU activities. In some departments it is possible to cross-subsidize BSU co-financing from other sources of income, while other departments are either unwilling or unable to do so. Furthermore, for the individual there will always be a question of opportunity costs: are the rewards and opportunities of taking part in a BSU project better than spending time on alternative activities. In some cases there is no doubt at play a sense of idealism and a desire to contribute to a worthwhile activity, but in general there seems to be no doubt that individual staff members or departments primarily concerned with something else should not have to carry the costs of the institutional commitments of the BSU. The experience from the first phase is that some of the BSU platforms have experienced difficulties in actually finding and mobilizing the academic resources required to implement the work plans.

At institutions in the South, there will also be an additional burden on staff members that initially may have an interest in taking part in BSU activities. For some it may be a matter of personal preference, e.g. to take part in a new PhD program. For others, the BSU project may become yet another task, on top of regular duties.

Hence, in both Denmark and at the South institutions there seems to be a situation where institutional obligations are passed on to individual staff members without adequate arrangements for proper compensation. This is threatening to the sustainability of the BSU model.

- **It is recommended that the BSU program in Phase 2 raise the issue of staff workloads and arrangements for compensation. As long as the BSU program is about institutional cooperation there need to be institutional support for individuals involved in the implementation of the program**

The second major issue identified by the review concerns the model chosen for PhD training. The purpose of supporting this component is of course the need to quickly increase the number of PhD-qualified members of staff at many African universities that now face a demographic crisis due to the skewed age composition of the current population of PhD-holders. The BSU program intends to offer a number of PhD scholarships to staff at these universities along the lines of a 'sandwich' model whereby BSU will pay for research visits to Denmark, in addition to indirect costs relating to supervision etc. There seems to be some variation between the platforms on what is provided beyond this, for instance to cover research costs. Staff members will enroll for sandwich PhD degrees which they in some cases will have to pursue in addition to normal duties. In Ghana the system seems to be that staff members who qualify will receive paid study leave; this also happens at universities in East Africa, but here the practice has not yet been as strongly instituted. The platforms of the BSU program provide research funding for PhD students, with some variation of the specific terms.

Questions have been raised about how appropriate the 'sandwich' model would be: this seems to depend a lot on the personal circumstances of the staff member in question. It seems, however, that staff members with family commitments etc. actually prefer the 'sandwich' model over a full overseas scholarship. The 'sandwich' model therefore seems appropriate for the target population at which it is targeted. Although the review has not examined this in detail, the impression is that 'sandwich' PhD projects takes longer time to complete than the overseas scholarship degrees, because of the composite funding situation outlined above.

- **The review therefore recommends that the details of the 'sandwich' model should be given further attention in Phase 2.**

Again, since it is in the interest of the host institution to increase the number of PhD-holders on staff, contributions like full study leave for staff enrolled in PhD programs should be more firmly institutionalised. The BSU program should clarify policies at the platform level with regard to funding for PhD research costs and remove possible bottlenecks. Even at a higher level of funding (if this is necessary) the BSU model would be cheaper than a full overseas scholarship, and will contribute to maintaining the advantages of the 'sandwich' model. The main justification for this recommendation is the expressed need in the BSU program to expand the population of PhD-holders at African universities, as a precondition for improving overall research quality, research output and improved training at these institutions.

The following points arise from the Terms of Reference:

Donor coordination:

Several partners agreed that donor coordination was inadequate and is one aspect of the partnership that needs to be improved on. Increased cooperation and greater synergies between partner programs could be very valuable but South institutions can rarely afford to antagonize donors by instructing them with regard to how partnerships should be fashioned. Partnerships are of course not general but often restricted to more narrowly defined areas of interest and often partners are content to be ignorant of what goes on outside these narrowly defined areas.

The main opportunity for improvement and active contribution to donor coordination seems to be a matter of improved information. At the most technical level it was suggested that host institutions need to prepare consolidated activity-based budgets, other suggestions turned to less sophisticated means of information management, such as project and partnership catalogues, in print or on web pages, or the preparation of events like an annual donors day.

It is important to get across the message that improved donor coordination is not primarily for the sake of the involved donors, but to underline the gains and advantages to the host institution in terms of taking charge of the activities of donors.

The recommendation is that the issue of donor coordination needs to be brought up more clearly and that more attention needs to be given to this issue.

Quality and relevance of partnerships:

As has been pointed out at several junctures, the BSU program draws on a historical legacy of research cooperation between Danish institutions and partners in the South. Obviously there is some movement and replacement of individuals, and some new institutional contacts, but in general people at the host institutions and in Denmark were well aware of each other. The review mission did not have the time or the opportunity to go into the interpersonal relationships between the researchers in their various roles, but we gained the clear impression that the South partners hare content with the Danish counterparts, in terms of experience, exposure and personal qualifications. Whatever the problems in Denmark with staff motivation and participation, the platform partnerships have not been saddled with second-rate staffing. In fact, the only direct comment hear concerning visiting Danish staff was that the implementation of particular items in the work packages left them with too little time for proper interaction.

There is little doubt that the South institutions had a clear appreciation of the innovative aspects of the BSU program in terms of addressing critical aspects of the situation at their respective institutions. The structure of the BSU program is flexible enough to fine-tune activities and outlook to the specific situation at the partner institutions, while maintaining the main ambition of contributing to academic improvement. The emphasis on PhD training and on PhD training programs were perhaps the most highly valued initiatives in these terms. Respectable PhD training programs are key to the fortunes of academic institutions, in terms of funding, sponsorship, partnerships and student recruitment. There was therefore unanimous approval of the objectives and direction of the BSU program on this count.

The BSU program has made the decision to offer PhD training to staff who have not had the opportunity to complete their terminal degrees and for this particular target group, which will be crucial to overcome the looming demographic crisis at many of the partner universities, there is no doubt that the 'sandwich' model is the preferred option. The various aspects of the 'sandwich' model have been discussed above; the main point for the future is to get rid of any notion that the 'sandwich' model in any way is inferior to an overseas scholarship solution. Conditions vary across the BSU partnership with regard to the precise conditions offered in conjunction with the 'sandwich' model: it is recommended (above) that the partners in each and every case review these conditions to remove bottlenecks. It is necessary, perhaps, to bear in mind that this is a program component that first and foremost will benefit the host institutions in question and that it is reasonable to expect contributions from them, at the minimum the provision of paid study leave for staff members undertaking PhD training.

An interesting aspect of the way that the BSU program has been set up is that it seems to encourage cross-disciplinary cooperation and cooperation between partners in the South. There are already good examples of PhD courses developed for one platform being found useful and in demand by other platforms. Additionally, partners in the South have used the opportunities offered by BSU networking to share approaches and experiences. There has not been enough time so far to develop South-South

cooperation to its potential, but it is a field where the South partners have indicated that they would like to see much more effort and resources allocated in the second phase of the program.

Governance and communication

The governance structure of the BSU program looks complex and daunting, in Denmark as well as in the South. The review team has come to realize some of the reasons for this, including the different functions expected from this structure in Denmark and in the South respectively. Now that the program is well into its second year of operation it seems the governance structure, which in the South is quite as easily perceived as the management structure, functions well. There were delays and some confusion in the initial stages, particularly in the South, but now that the stakeholders have become familiar with the set-up, the governance structure is not seen as an impediment.

Similarly, once the stakeholders gained sufficient familiarity with the communication structure (which obviously reflects the governance structure in many ways) there have been no particular problems with the way this has been set up.

Capacity building efforts

The main thrust of the BSU program is capacity building. This in many respects is a novel approach to academic cooperation and it has taken a while for the stakeholders, in the South as well as in the North to become completely familiar with the notion. The dedicated capacity building efforts within the selected areas (particularly relating to improving PhD training) has definitely been highly appreciated. It has taken a while, however, for stakeholders to appreciate how the capacity building efforts fit into a wider context; although there is limited funding for research (outside specific PhD projects) in the BSU program, improved capacity will eventually allow also institutions in the South to access international research funding, either by becoming crucial partners in particular areas of research or by becoming centers of excellence in their own right. The program has not yet progressed to the stage to where it actually can show success, but it is expected that BSU will play a constructive role in preparing the context for research funded by the two Danida mechanism available, i.e. regular FFU funding and the so-called pilot projects where the initiative for research partnerships rest with institutions in the South.

The BSU program has approached capacity building in fields that extend beyond the strictly academic challenges involved, realizing that if partner universities are to become strong and self-sustaining institutions, there is a broad range of interlinked functions that must be met. All the platforms have addressed fundamental issues like financial management and accounting (even if this may not have extended to the partner university as a whole); the main point is that the BSU program has been able to accommodate a wide range of needs. As a matter of policy BSU has restrictions with regard to investments in infrastructure, but beyond that at least two of the platforms have shown themselves to be very flexible in meeting needs across the board of university-related activities.

Monitoring

Monitoring and evaluation matrices have been developed for each platform in the planning stage and these are basically sufficient for assessing progress in the initial stage of the program. Performance indicators for all main activities have been formulated. As the BSU program unfolds into a second phase and beyond it may be necessary be necessary to develop a more comprehensive monitoring framework that will capture results and impacts at a scale that extends beyond the individual platforms. The achievement of the underlying policy objectives of the program (e.g. how national research influences national development policy) will require a different monitoring framework from what has already been put in place at the platform level.

Programme management and disbursements

In the meetings conducted in conjunction with the current review, none of the platforms have raised issues related to program management, budget revisions and financial management procedures, neither with regard to the management of the platform activities in Denmark, nor with regard to the extension of platform activities at partner institutions in the South. Since these themes were not raised in the meetings, the review team, which is not particularly qualified to report on financial management issues, have chosen to accept the implied message that these are not particularly troubling issues in the BSU program.

Risks

The proposals from the 4 platforms all discuss some of the risks involved in starting up a new program, but do so in a fairly imprecise way. There is no formal risk analysis in any of the 4 proposals, which is not the same as saying that risks associated with the platforms have been totally overlooked. In the discussion of the assumptions underlying the new program some of the risk elements are indicated. They are mostly concerned with staff participation, staff availability and motivational factors. As indicated above, there have indeed been some issues concerning these risk elements in the unfolding of the BSU program to date; they have not been uniform across the platforms and most platforms seem to have found pragmatic solutions to the challenges as they have presented themselves.

Further analysis

BSU is still a fairly new program but a lot of effort has gone into preparation of the different platform proposals. BSU has been able to rely on stakeholders with considerable experience from academic cooperation programs and there does not seem to have been major upsets and delays in the unfolding of the program since its inception less than 18months ago. The respective platforms have set up workable communications and cooperation structures, allowing quite close interaction between the partners in Denmark and in the South.

None the less, there will always be new circumstances and unexpected events to contend with. The established structures for governance and communication provide ample opportunities to bring forward new initiatives and new issues that require further study and understanding. The highly flexible way that the BSU program in the initial phase has been able to adapt to circumstances and meet the identified needs of the partner institutions in the South augurs well for the adaptive qualities of the program.

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

Review

of

"Building Stronger Universities in Developing Countries"

Phase One

1. Background

"Building Stronger Universities in Developing Countries" (BSU) programme by Universities Denmark (UD) is a partnership between research and higher education institutions in developing countries and in Denmark. BSU is organised in four thematic platforms based on an assessment of the Danish competencies and the priorities in the Danish development cooperation:

- Environment and Climate

- Growth and Employment

- Human Health

- Stability, Democracy and Rights

The themes are inter-linked and collaboration and interaction between platforms are strongly encouraged.

BSU comprises cooperation involving the eight universities in Denmark and selected universities in Ghana, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda and Nepal. Focus is on institutional capacity building, including strengthening the capacity and quality of PhD education, strengthening the capacity to undertake research and disseminating research knowledge to stakeholders.

In 2011, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA)/Danida provided a two-year grant of 60 million DKK to BSU (Phase 1), and in 2012 a three-year grant of 19 million DKK was allocated for capacity building within research communication, dissemination and networking for the same partners.

In mid-2013 a new two year grant of 90 million DKK is planned to be allocated to BSU (Phase 2). A review of the current support will be undertaken to inform the planning of Phase 2.

The review will be a joint learning exercise between Universities Denmark (UD), MFA/Danida and the partners in the developing countries.

Both to Universities Denmark and MFA/Danida the BSU programme constitutes a unique initiative. While researchers at Danish universities have a long history of research activities in collaboration with researchers and institutes in the South, the BSU constitutes a new concept both in scope and organisational set-up.

Realising the importance of research and tertiary education as drivers of socio-economic development also in the developing countries, the Vice-Chancellors of the Danish universities in 2008 appointed a working group to outline recommendations as to how the Danish university sector could support

capacity strengthening at universities in the developing countries in the most effective and constructive way.

In two reports the UD working group[4] presented the idea of the Building Stronger Universities in Developing Countries programme. The reports made reference to the Danish initiated Africa Commission's main report from 2009 with a number of recommendations on how Denmark can help Africa benefit from globalisation, including reflections on the role of university based research and education.

After having approved the working groups' recommendations the UD Rectors' Conference in 2010 entered into negotiations with MFA/Danida on the conditions for an agreement for a long-term initiative on strengthening the capacities for research, education and dissemination at selected partner universities in the global South. In December 2010 an agreement on a set of core conditions for support from Danida was reached. There was a joint understanding that an initiative of this nature should be implemented as a medium to long-term programme.

In the Financial Act for 2012 a provision was made for an additional grant of DKK 19 Mio., earmarked to capacity building activities within research communication, dissemination, and networking. An application by DU for a 2½ year project period was approved by MFA/Danida in December 2012. (Se 7. Documentation) This project will commence on January 1. 2013.

To Universities Denmark the programme is seen as having special qualities and potentials as a joint sector initiative, where resources across all eight Danish universities are mobilised and coordinated in an effort to provide the most relevant and qualified support to the south partners within areas where Danish universities hold special competences. By coordinating the support from more platforms to the same partner universities, as well as between platforms and research activities supported by Danida through FFU[5] in BSU partner countries, the initiative strives to generate synergy that would otherwise not be achieved.

The initiative is closely monitored by a BSU working group under the Rectors' Conference. Besides, the Rectors' Conference is following the progress of the programme closely and provides support to the overall management of the programme.

The review will not include an assessment of the general agreement on BSU between UD and MFA/Danida, incl. overhead, cost-sharing between Denmark and partner countries, co-financing etc. as the points agreed on will also apply to phase 2 of the BSU programme.

Rather, the review will be an assessment of lessons learnt with a view to recommend adjustments of the organisational and managerial setup at different levels, of the focus for activities and of communication structures and procedures.

2. Objective

The overall objective of the review is to assess the BSU programme's organisational structure and performance with a view to make recommendations for the second phase of the programme.

---

[4] The UD working group on the BSU initiative is advisory to the Rectors' Conference on BSU matters. It comprises one representative from each of the seven involved universities and the chairperson from each of the four platform steering committees.

[5] Development research projects funded by Danida.

The specific objectives of the review are to assess the partnership between Universities Denmark and universities in the partner countries, the added value by BSU to the strengthening of the institutions in the South, and the governance structures of BSU at overall, platform and institutional level. The recommendations should be targeted adjustments with emphasis on ensuring a well-functioning and efficient structure (focus of activities, organisational setup and governance) as well as ideas for enhanced North-South-South collaboration across all 11 BSU partner universities and four platforms.

In addition, the review will to the extent possible assess the general performance of the programme with regard to preliminary *results, progress, challenges, developments in risk factors, need for adjustments, monitoring etc.*

3. Outputs and timing/reporting

A mission preparation note with the key questions and proposed focus areas will be drafted by the consultant before the field mission to Ghana and Tanzania.

Two short debriefings in Ghana and Tanzania before the departure.

Debriefings in Denmark with UD and MFA.

Draft and final review report by the consultant, not exceeding 25 pages excluding annexes, with the main findings, conclusion and recommendations.

The review will start mid-January with meetings in Copenhagen and Aarhus with the Universities Denmark stakeholders and MFA.

The mission preparation note by the consultant will be forwarded no later than January 21 and the draft report will be forwarded before February 15. Final report will be forwarded one week after receiving comments from MFA/Danida, UD and the partner institutions in the South.

4. Scope of Work

The scope of work will include, but not be limited to, the following assessments:

- *The value added by BSU:*

    - in the mechanisms for *donor coordination at institution level*;

    - *in the synergy* between activities of the BSU programme/platforms as well as with other development programmes supported at national level

- The quality and relevance of the *partnerships* between actors in Denmark and in partner countries and the interrelationship between the institutions in the partner countries, including how the partnerships unfolds in decision making, communication, selection of working areas etc.;

- The relevance and effectiveness of the *governance structures,* overall, platform and institutional level;

- The relevance, quality and effectiveness of the *communication structures* in Denmark and in partner countries;

- The progress and experience with *institutional capacity building* and possible linkages to other research supported activities, e.g. the Danish supported pilot and FFU-projects;

- The balance and relationship (relevance?) between support to general *capacity building* of the partner institutions (e.g. in financial management/administration) *and more targeted capacity building within research (e.g. in accreditation, PhD-supervision, within academic areas of each platform)*;

- The adequacy of the *monitoring and supporting systems* and progress compared to plans and established indicators/targets;

- The assumptions and risks and the possible consequences for the activities of BSU

- The *disbursements* and possible need for reallocation between budget lines;

- The *programme management*, including financial management and procurement procedures;

- The relevance and effectiveness of the *administrative structures and procedures*, including challenges related to differences in the Danida given budget structure and procedures and the partner institutions' structures and procedures;

- Potential for increased *South-South cooperation*

- Need for possible *further analysis and capacity development initiatives*.

Based on the findings and conclusions, the review team will make recommendations as required and targeted the second phase of BSU.

5. Method of Work

The review will provide important input to the second phase of BSU and the method of work will focus on lessons learnt.

The team will, based on a review of documentation, initial consultations in Denmark (and possibly communication with (some) key stakeholders in the partner countries), draft a *mission preparation note*.

The note will be shared with all the stakeholders.

Based on the consultations the team will have two field missions – Ghana and Tanzania where three of the four platforms are active. All the relevant partners will be involved in the review e.g. joint meetings/workshop in Accra and Moshi respectively. The Platform for Stability, Democracy and Rights is active in Kenya, Uganda and Nepal and the partners will be invited to join the consultations in Moshi, in addition to consultations from Skype etc.

The draft findings, conclusions and recommendations will be presented to UD and MFA/Danida before being finalised.

6. Team

The team will consist of:

Mr Johan Helland, external consultant (team leader)

Mr David N. Manayanza, external consultant

The team will be supported by resource persons from MFA/Danida, Universities Denmark and partner universities in the five countries. Ms. Darriann Riber will participate in the field mission on behalf of MFA/Danida, and Mr Arne Skov Andersen will participate on behalf of UD.

7. Documentation

Application 2011 and 2012

Criteria for selection of platforms, assessment by int. team

Note for the Board of Danida (in Danish)

Agreement between MFA and BSU/DU

Inception reports

Progress reports

Financial reports

Newsletters

BSU-folders

BSU-MFA correspondence

Other relevant BSU documentation

CMI CHR. MICHELSEN INSTITUTE

Annex 2: Itinerary and People Met

Date	Time	Event	Name	Position	Organization
DENMARK: 14 -19 January					
14 Jan 13	11:30 – 12:00	Introduction	Arne Skov Andersen	Programme Manager	Universities Denmark
	13:00 – 15:00	Briefing with DKUNI and Danida representatives	Arne Skov Andersen	Programme Manager	Universities Denmark
			Darriann Riber	Chief Technical Advisor	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
			Susanne Bjerregaard	Secretary General	Universities Denmark
			Flemming Konradsen	Chair, UD / BSU Working Group	University of Copenhagen
15 Jan 13	09:00 – 12:00	Meeting with Platform on Human Health (PHH)	Bjørg Elvekjær	Coordinator Human Health Platform	University of Copenhagen
			Dorte Holler Johansen	Head of PHH Institutional capacity building work packages UG & KNUST and KCMC/NIMR	University of Copenhagen
			Henrik Bregnhøj	PHH Zanzibar (SUZA/ZCHS) Implementing Committee and focal point of e-learning (Zanzibar & Ghana)	University of Copenhagen

Date	Time	Event	Name	Position	Organization
			Flemming Konradsen	Chair, PHH	
	13:00 – 16:00	Meeting with Platform on Environment and Climate (PEC)	Jørgen E. Olesen	PEC Chair	University of Aarhus
			Susan L. Amsinck	Platform Coordinator PEC	University Aarhus
16 Jan 13	09:00 – 12:00	Meeting with Platform on Growth and Employment (PGE)	Søren Jeppesen	Vice Chair, Platform on Growth and Employment	Copenhagen Business School
			Carl E. S. Larsen	Coordinator, Platform on Growth and Employment	University of Copenhagen
			KirstenThomsen	Head of Research Secretariat (Member of Steering Committee, Growth and Employment)	Technical University of Denmark (DTU)
			Andreas de Neergaard	Member of Steering Committee, Growth and Employment	University of Copenhagen
	12:00 – 12:45		Lunch	Hosted by Platform on Growth and Employment	University of Copenhagen
	13:00 – 16:00	Meeting with Platform on Stability, Democracy and	Jens Seeberg	Chair, Platform on Stability, Democracy and Rights	Aarhus University

Date	Time	Event	Name	Position	Organization
		Rights	Pia M. Larsen	Coordinator, Platform on Stability, Democracy and Rights	Aarhus University
			Inger Lassen	Member, Steering Committee	Aalborg University
	19:00	Dinner	Arne Skov Andersen	Programme Manager	UD
			Flemming Konradsen	Chair, PHH and Chair, UD/BSU Working Group	University of Copenhagen
17 Jan. 13	08:00 – 10:30	Cross-cutting issues in administration, communication and implementation	Jens Seeberg	Chair, Platform on Stability, Democracy and Rights	Aarhus University
			Pia M. Larsen	Coordinator, Platform on Stability, Democracy and Rights	Aarhus University
			Flemming Konradsen	Chair, Human Health Platform	University of Copenhagen
			Carl E. S. Larsen	Coordinator, Platform on Growth and Employment	University of Copenhagen
			Susanne Bjerregaard	Secretary General	Universities Denmark
			Bjørg Elvekjær	Coordinator Human Health Platform	University of Copenhagen

Date	Time	Event	Name	Position	Organization
	11:00 – 12:00	Meeting with Rectors' Conference	Lauritz B. Holm-Nielsen	Vice-Chair; Rectors' Conference	Aarhus University
	15:00 – 17:00	Debriefing	Susanne Bjerregaard Tove Degnbol	Secretary General Head of Department	Universities Denmark Ministry of Foreign Affairs
18 Jan 13	Report drafting				
TANZANIA: 04 – 07 February					
05 Feb. 13	08:30 – 13:00	Meeting with Kilimanjaro Christian Medical Centre (KCMC) and National Institute of Medical Research (NIMR)	Gibson Kibiki	Chair; Human Health Working Group, KCRI	Kilimanjaro Christian Research Institute, KCMC, Tanzania
			Rogathe Machange	Administrator	Kilimanjaro Christian Research Institute, KCMC, Tanzania
			Julius Masaga	Chair, Human Health Platform Working Group; NIMR	National Institute for Medical Research, Tanzania
	14:00 – 16:00	Meeting w. State University of Zanzibar	Fatma Saleh	Assistant Coordinator; Human Health Working Groups	State University of Zanzibar, Tanzania

Date	Time	Event	Name	Position	Organization
		and Zanzibar College of Health Sciences	Wanu Bakar	Human Health Platform Working Group	Zanzibar College of Health Services, Tanzania
06 Feb. 13	08:30 - 1030	Meeting w. Uni. of Dar es Salaam (UDSM)	Felix Mtalo	Deputy Chair; Environment and Climate Platform	University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
			Cuthbert Z M Kimambo	Working Group Member, Growth and Employment Platform	University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
	11:00 – 13:00	Meeting w. Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA)	Amon Mattee	Chair; Growth and Employment & Environment and Climate Working Groups	Sokoine University of Agriculture, Tanzania
			Antony Sangeda	Project Officer; Environment and Climate	Sokoine University of Agriculture, Tanzania
	14:00 – 16:00	Tribhuvan University, Nepal	Lekhnath Sharma	Working Groups Coordinator; Stability, Democracy and Rights Platform	Tribhuvan University, Nepal
	16:15 – 18:00	Gulu University, Uganda	Ambrose E Okot	Working Groups Coordinator; Stability, Democracy and Rights Platform	Gulu University, Uganda
			Agatha Alidiri	Working Groups Assistant Coordinator; Stability, Democracy and Rights Platform	Gulu University, Uganda

Date	Time	Event	Name	Position	Organization
07 Feb. 13	8:30 – 10:30	Meetings with Maseno University, Kenya	Fredrick Wanyama	Chair; Stability, Democracy and Rights Platform	Maseno University, Kenya
			Catherine A Muhoma	Coordinator, Stability, Democracy and Rights Platform	Maseno University, Kenya
	11:00 – 13:00	Cross-cutting issues: The partnership approach, organisation, communication, implementation, etc.	Rogathe Machange	Administrator	Kilimanjaro Christian Research Institute, KCMC, Tanzania
			Julius Masaga	Chair, Human Health Platform Working Group; NIMR	National Institute for Medical Research, Tanzania
			Fatma Saleh	Assistant Coordinator; Human Health Working Groups	State University of Zanzibar, Tanzania
			Wanu Bakar	Human Health Platform Working Group	Zanzibar College of Health Services, Tanzania
			Felix Mtalo	Deputy Chair; Environment and Climate Platform	University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
			Lekhnath Sharma	Working Groups Coordinator; Stability, Democracy and Rights Platform	Tribhuvan University, Nepal
			Ambrose E Okot	Working Groups Coordinator; Stability, Democracy and	Gulu University,

Date	Time	Event	Name	Position	Organization
				Rights Platform	Uganda
			Agatha Alidiri	Working Groups Assistant Coordinator; Stability, Democracy and Rights Platform	Gulu University, Uganda
			Fredrick Wanyama	Chair; Stability, Democracy and Rights Platform	Maseno University, Kenya
			Catherine A Muhoma	Coordinator, Stability, Democracy and Rights Platform	Maseno University, Kenya
GHANA: 08 -12 Feb					
08 Feb. 13	Travel to Ghana				
	13:00 – 14:00	Courtesy call and meeting with Royal Danish Embassy, Accra	Stine Bræstrup Arthur	Program Officer	Royal Danish Embassy, Accra
			Mia Kjems Drægert	First Secretary	Royal Danish Embassy, Accra
11 Feb. 13	9:30 – 13:00	Meetings with University of Ghana, Accra	Robert E Hinson	Chair, GEP	University of Ghana, Business School
			George T-M Kwadzo	GEP	University of Ghana, Agricultural

Date	Time	Event	Name	Position	Organization
					Economics and Agribusiness
			Michael Ofori	PHH	Noguchi MEM Institute CHS
			Empi A Baryeh	Assistant Registrar	University of Ghana, ORID
			Paul W K Yankson	Chair, PEC	University of Ghana, Department of Geography
			Collins Amofal	Accountant	University of Ghana, ORID
			Richard Adanu	Chair, PHH	University of Ghana, SPH
			Chris Gordon	Director, PEC	University of Ghana, IESS
			Kwasi Dartey-Baah	PEC	University of Ghana, UGBS
	Travel to Kumasi				
12 Feb. 13	8:30 – 13:00	Meetings with KNUST	Yau Adu Sarkodie	PHH	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology

Date	Time	Event	Name	Position	Organization
			K Obiri Denso	PEC	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology
			R C Abaidoo	PEC	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology
			Tsiri Agbenyega	Chair, PHH	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology
			Robert Aidoo	PEC	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology
			T C Fleischer	GEP	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology
			Samuel Yaw Akomea	GEP	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology
			Vanessa Appiah	BSU Administrator	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology
12 Feb 13	Travel Kumasi - Accra				

Date	Time	Event	Name	Position	Organization
12 Feb 13	Departure Accra				

The Team:
Mr Johan Helland, Chr. Michelsen Institute, Norway, Team leader
Mr David N. Manyanza, Development Solutions Consultancy, Tanzania, Consultant

Ms Darriann Rieber, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, resource person
Mr Arne Skov Andersen, Universities Denmark, resource person

Partner universities in the developing countries

	Environment & Climate	Growth & Employment	Human Health	Stability, Democracy & Rights
1. University of Ghana	x	x	x	
2. KNUST, Ghana	x	x	x	
3. Maseno University, Kenya				x
4. Kilimanjaro Christian Medical Centre, Tanzania			x	
5. National Institute for Medical Research, Tanzania			x	
6. Sokoine Uni. of Agriculture, Tanzania	x	x		
7. University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania	x	x		
8. State University of Zanzibar			x	
9. Zanzibar College of Health Sciences			x	
10. Gulu University, Uganda				x
11. Tribhuvan University, Nepal				x

Danish Universities

1. University of Copenhagen (KU)
2. University of Aarhus (AU)
3. University of Southern Denmark (SDU)
4. Roskilde University (RUC)
5. University of Aalborg (AAU)
6. Technical University of Denmark (DTU)
7. Copenhagen Business School (CBS)
8. IT-University of Copenhagen (IT-U)

Annex 3: Resource documents consulted

1. Building strong universities in developing countries. Universities Denmark

2. Building strong universities in in developing countries. Partnerships for change. Universities Denmark

3. Building stronger universities, Platform for Stability, Democracy and Rights. Description, activity plan and budget.

4. Building stronger universities: Platform on Human Health – Inception Report. November 2011

5. Danish Development Research Network: Lessons from the Danish Development Research Network. July 2011

6. Danish Research Development Network. Project management in research capacity building partnerships - Guidelines. By Carsten Nico Hjortsø - Copenhagen, April 2010

7. FFU-visit to Tanzania, November 2012

8. Final report: Evaluation of NPT and niche. Ramboll, May 2012

9. Growth and Employment. Draft Minutes of Platform Working Group (PWG) meeting within Growth and Employment Platform at KNUST, January 23-25, 2012

10. Growth and Employment. Draft Minutes of Platform Working Group (PWG) meeting within Growth and Employment Platform at UDSM January 18th – 20th 2012

11. How to Note. Capacity Building in Research. DFID practice paper, June 2010

12. Inception Report for Growth and Employment Platform First phase (August 2011- July 2013) 15 November 2011

13. OECD Global Science Forum. Opportunities, Challenges and Good Practices in International Research Cooperation between Developed and Developing Countries. APRIL 2011

14. Outline of strategic Danish support framework for Danish support for development research, 2013-2018. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Denmark, August 2012.

15. Pilot Research Cooperation Programme (PRCP) on Climate Change in Vietnam: Final Review Report. 14th November 2011

16. Promoting Excellence in PhD Research Programmes in East Africa 2008-2011. REPARE-PhD Evaluation, November 2011

17. Recommendations of the panel of international experts on the Building Stronger Universities Initiative (BSU)

18. The Pilot Research Cooperation Program in Tanzania – a Review 2011

Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI) is an independent, non-profit research institution and a major international centre in policy-oriented and applied development research. Focus is on development and human rights issues and on international conditions that affect such issues. The geographical focus is Sub-Saharan Africa, Southern and Central Asia, the Middle East, the Balkans and South America.

CMI combines applied and theoretical research. CMI research intends to assist policy formulation, improve the basis for decision-making and promote public debate on international development issues.

CMI CHR. MICHELSEN INSTITUTE