Evaluation of Peace, Conflict and Development (PCD) Research Support in Countries and Regions affected by Violent Conflict.

Synthesis of Case Studies

Commissioned by the Peace, Conflict and Development (PCD) program - International Development Research Centre (IDRC).

Emery Brusset
Clotilde Gouley
Mark Hoffman
Annina Mattsson

April 2009

channel
research

Channel Research is pleased to submit the Synthesis Study Report, presenting the findings of the field visits that took place in Uganda, Sri Lanka, Palestine and Colombia. This report is part of the evaluation of the Peace, Conflict and Development (PCD) Research support in countries and regions affected by violent conflict, commissioned by the Peace, Conflict and Development Program of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC).

The document is the property of IDRC, and is not confidential.

Please address all communications concerning this report to:

Ms Annina Mattsson
mattsson@channelresearch.com
45 route des Marnières
1380 Lasne – Belgium
Phone: +32 633 65 29
Fax: +32 2 633 30 92

Table of contents

List of acronyms and abbreviations

CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DPMF	Development Policy Management Forum
DFAIT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
FLACSO	Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
ICES	International Centre for Ethnic Studies
INCORE	International Conflict Research institute (University of Ulster)
INGO	International Non Governmental Organization
INER	Institute for Regional Studies of the Medellín-based Universidad de Antioquia / *Instituto de Estudios Regionales*
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
PACT	Palestinian Adolescents Coping with Trauma (PACT)
PCD	Peace, Conflict and Development Program
PO	Project Officer
REDIF	Colombian National Network on Forced Displacement
ToR	Terms of Reference
UBC	University of British Columbia
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

Executive Summary

1. Evaluation objectives and approach

This report reflects the findings of four individual case study reports commissioned by the Peace, Conflict and Development (PCD) Program of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC). The main objective of this evaluation is to identify the factors (conditions and programming modalities) that facilitate or hinder the research process for PCD-supported projects in countries and regions affected by violent conflict, and the advantages and disadvantages of PCD programming modalities in achieving PCD objectives in such unstable settings.

The evaluation should be considered as a learning exercise. Four specific objectives guide this evaluation which focuses on:

1. **The conflict context**- developing a clear understanding of the conditions under which the research was conducted.

2. **Partner and PCD achievements**– learning about the contributions that research can make.

3. **Programming modalities**– highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of PCD programming.

4. **Forward thinking-**– exploring in more depth the challenges and opportunities surrounding PCD supported research today, as well as the implications of potential expansion.

2. Methodology

2.1 The Case Study Approach

The analytical tools included:
1. Documentation review as well as calling on experience from related projects.
2. Qualitative semi-structured field and headquarter interviews by the team, including data observation, face to face and remote consultations, and workshops.
3. Validation process: quality assurance and peer review mechanisms from within IDRC.

2.2 Project Sample and Criteria

The findings of the individual country reports and the synthesis report are based on a contextual analysis of a series of selected PCD-funded research projects.

Given the very large number of projects funded by IDRC/PCD in a wide range of geographic locations and differing political contexts, it was necessary to identify a smaller pool of funded project that could be looked at in greater detail through a process of 'purposeful sampling'. The overall criteria for the selection of the case studies was the aim of gaining insight into particular processes as they operate in specific contexts rather than to make broad generalisations. The starting point was therefore the context in which funded research was taking place rather than the projects themselves.

The initial pool of possible case studies was identified by IDRC/PCD : three in Columbia ; four in South Asia ; four in East Africa (one of which was multi-phased); and four in Palestine (one of which was multi-phased)

Given the time and budget constraints of the evaluation, it was evident that not all of these projects could be covered in the course of the evaluation. After discussion with PCD staff, in particular seeking the advice of the relevant regional project officers, the list of case studies was further narrowed by Channel Research.

On the basis of this process, the following cases were selected for the evaluation. In the case of multi-phase projects, only the current phase of the project was explored in detail, though relevant insights from previous phases that came to the fore or had a bearing on the current phase of the program were included in the evaluations.

Middle East

- **Between State and Tribe: The Rule of Law and Dispute Settlement in Post-Oslo.**

The overall aim of this project was to produce policy recommendations on the role of customary law in the present and future Palestinian justice system in order to contribute to efforts to reform the judiciary. Primary and secondary research that was undertaken and the publication that resulted were equally important.

- **Strategic Consequences of Palestine Divisions And Integrating Islamist Militants into the Political Process.**

The main objective was to review current Palestinian domestic and strategic policy choices and likely future scenarios, developing a better understanding of the socio-political changes, as well as examine the process of leadership transition within the Palestinian nationalist movement. The project is still ongoing. It aims to answer the question of whether or not the integration of Hamas into the political process will serve to moderate the group and bring it closer to mainstream social attitudes and policies.

- **Palestinian Adolescents Coping with Trauma (PACT) (Phase I, II, III).**

This is a multi-phase project initially starting in 2002 examining the effect of armed conflict, military occupation and other sources of local violence on Palestinian youth. The PACT project addresses a central component of conflict, namely the destructive psycho-social effects of violence.

South Asia

- **Post-Tsunami Reconstruction in Contexts of War: A Grassroots Study of the Geo-Politics of Humanitarian Aid in Northern and Eastern Sri Lanka & Aceh, Indonesia**

The objective of this research is to examine and compare the consequences for existing political conflict of the post-tsunami international humanitarian interventions in Sri Lanka and the Aceh province of Indonesia. It seeks to understand the resulting divergent trajectories these dynamics took in Sri Lanka and Aceh and to suggest better articulations and configurations for INGOs intervening in existing zones of political conflict affected by natural disasters with high humanitarian costs.

- **Diasporas, Transnationalism and Global Engagement: Tamil and Sinhala Transnational Communities and Networks in Canada and Their Nexus in Sri Lanka**

This project entails a study of Tamil and Sinhala transnational networks in Canada and their nexus in Sri Lanka. It explores the transnational community in one location and how this impacts on their linkage with other locations in the homeland and host country. It also examines how policies in both Canada and Sri Lanka may facilitate and/or impede the engagement of the Sri Lankan transnational communities in civil conflict transformation and post-conflict reconstruction and development in their homeland.

Columbia

- **Reparation for internal displacement in Colombia:**

The main objective of this project is to "identify and analyse the different perceptions, expectations and social practices of Colombia's internally displaced on issues of reparation and their relation to the construction of public policies that are differentiated along gender, generational and ethnic lines". This project was granted support in the context of a research competition on gender justice in conflict and post-conflict societies, jointly organised in Colombia and Guatemala in 2004-2005 by PCD

and the Gender Unit. The research team initially included researchers from the Universidad de San Buenaventura (Cartagena) and the NGO Volver a la Gente. Due to unforeseen circumstances, the partnership between the University and the NGO fell apart and only the researchers from the Universidad de San Buenaventura continued to be involved.

- **Forced migration of Colombians: a comparative study on fear, historical memory and public representations in Colombia, Ecuador and Canada (Phase II).**

This is the second phase of a complex inter-institutional and inter-regional research project on forced migrations of Colombians. The general objective is "to carry out a comparative study of two-types of forced migration of Colombians: internal displacement in Colombia and refugees from Colombia in Ecuador and Canada, and identify how social fears, historical memory and public representations of internally displaced people and refugees influence the reconstruction of their life projects and integration in a new social environment". This research work follows a previous phase of a large and complex project developed between December 2004 and December 2006.

- **Engendering reintegration programs for ex-combatants in Colombia: a study of experiences between 1990 and 2003 .**

While the four decade old armed conflict in Colombia has been the subject of considerable research work, the gender perspective has only recently been gaining ground. The Institute for Regional Studies (INER) of the Medellín-based Universidad de Antioquia has gathered a team of senior and young researchers to carry out this study and analyze experiences of women in reintegration in Colombia between 1990 and 2003. The general objective is "to undertake a gender sensitive and retrospective study of reintegration processes for ex-combatants in Colombia between 1990 and 2003 with a view to formulating a series of conclusions and recommendations that might inform and help direct future reintegration policies and programs for female combatants".[1]

East Africa

- **A Regional Gender and Generational Analysis of Armed Conflict in East Africa (Phase I,II, III)**

This is a three-phase multi-year, regional and comparative study on the root causes and consequences of armed conflicts in Northern Uganda, Eastern Uganda and Southern Sudan. It started in January 2005 and the third phase was approved in March 2008 for a period of 2 years. The general objective is to produce rigorous field based research to inform the policy and programming of the governments of Uganda and South Sudan, multilateral and bilateral organizations, governmental and non-governmental agencies working in situations of armed conflict and post-conflict

---

[1] IDRC, 2007. Project Approval Document Funding and Appraisal rev 2007-12-21.

reconstruction in Uganda and Sudan. The study is intended to assist these bodies in their responsibility and efforts to protect civilian populations.

- **Comparative Research on Resolution of Pastoralist Conflicts in the East African Region: Case Studies from Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda.**

This project, being carried out by DPMF, (a regional Civil Society Organization) covering sub-Saharan African) is a comparative study across five countries in East Africa – Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda – examining cross-border pastoralists conflicts with a view to developing appropriate policies and strategies for coping with the challenges of conflict mitigation and resolution in such conflicts.

3. Evaluation findings

Drawing on the four case studies, it is possible to identify four broad areas in which the finding of the individual case studies on the conduct of research in situations of armed conflict coalesce: responding to the the conflict context, research intent and achievements, programming modalities, and around elements of forward thinking.

3.1 Addressing the Conflict Context

The centrality of credible, capable research partners (individual and institutions) emerges from the reviews of PCD funded research. Three minimum conditions enable partners to conduct research in conflict situations, especially where violence is about to increase, in an optimal way. Cultivating these should enable PCD to increase the quality of its support in these exceptional circumstances, while the conditions should already be focused on when selecting projects. The common minimum conditions can be summed up as three qualities of an appropriate partner:

- Locally highly respected and experienced **lead researchers** will support the project by engaging in an experienced manner with local authorities and conflict-wide respected institutions, while fostering capacity building by incorporating young researchers.

- The inherent unpredictability of conflict makes **adaptability** necessary, as informed research decisions can enable the project to capitalise on changes in the timeframe using successive stages of research.

- **Conflict sensitivity** aimed at producing principled and yet impartial research, which is able to handle information in a manner that does not compromise the source of information while adhering to evidence based processes.

While IDRC's mandate was not always fully understood by research partners, its reputation as a funder of innovative research, the processes by which it initiates and develops research projects and the quality of its partner institutions, provided a solid foundation for a principled and uncompromising research process. Once projects were

up and running, they were largely reliant on research partners who knew their way around the various conflict actors, who could interpret the various lexicons deployed in the conflict setting and who could navigate there way around the various obstacles so as to sustain the research without putting researchers at risk or exacerbating conflict dynamics. The ability of research partners to mobilise networks of researchers is one of the single most important factors of success before the launch of the research, a practice which is paradoxically not emphasised in the PCD prospectus.

At the inception stage of the evaluation, there had been discussion in PCD about linking project guidance to types of situations and partners. The conclusion from the case studies is that it would be tricky to design such a conflict typology, as it would focus on initial conditions, which are reliant on external interpretation, and likely to change over the course of a funded project. All the studies point to the fact that the risk assessment is very difficult, particularly at the outset, and that risk management has been done in an optimal manner locally.

3.2 Research Intents and Achievements

In conflicts, outcomes can be complex and even chaotic at times. In such contexts, the deployment of conceptual and methodological frameworks situated outside the dominant discourse, as well as innovative interconnections, has characterised PCD funded research fostering insights that move beyond simple, linear cause and effect connections.

The projects surveyed in this evaluation make use of a range of research methodologies including questionnaires, surveys, small focus group discussions, and participant observer methodologies. While these constitute fairly traditional research methodologies, their use in the context of ongoing armed conflicts faces particular challenges, notably surrounding the level of trust accorded the researcher by a local community. The access to information may be particularly challenging in countries experiencing violent conflict. This requires researchers to be creative and nimble in developing and accessing alternative sources of information.

A distinctive feature of the research commissioned by PCD is that it is profoundly grounded and therefore cautious in the claims it makes regarding its likely impact in ameliorating conflict dynamics.

The determination of the researchers to enable and embrace local norms and concepts has a limiting effect on the comparative nature of the research but gives it greater efficiency in tackling political issues. Furthermore, given that many of the projects are ongoing, the dissemination and policy influence aspects of the research projects are difficult to predict and even to track.

The research and organisational capacity of Southern research institutions can be weakened by prolonged conflict. In the East Africa projects, this resulted in capacity building taking place at the level of individual researchers rather than at the level of institutions. In some cases, such as in Aceh, this resulted in the research project relying predominantly on external researchers. Where Northern researchers and/or

research institutions were a significant presence in a research project, the nature of their impact was variable. In some cases it successfully contributed to capacity building. In others, an asymmetrical relationship between researchers from the north and from the south was detrimental capacity building.

3.3 Programming Modalities

The strengths of the IDRC/PCD approach to supporting research clearly lies in its willingness to fund research projects in difficult situations. The willingness to take on innovative and even audacious research projects created a strong interest in IDRC support amongst partners, and increased the possibilities of adaptability in cases of force majeure.

IDRC's risk assessment includes an assessment and monitoring of institutional capacities. This could become more thorough, possibly using better a triangulation with other reliable sources in the area (although this is admittedly very difficult to do). This weakness of capacity assessments has led to situations in which partner institutions are unable to provide appropriate levels of research support or financial oversight and project management

There is, however, beyond this continuity, a number of absent linkages that weaken performance. The first lack of linkage lies in the tension between a strong concern for good reports and an equally but unrelated concern for the financial audit trail. The latter is problematic in a conflict environment, which often leads to delays in the agreed timetable resulting in additional expenditure by research partners, and compounded by weak management capacity and limited financial oversight by southern institutions. The absence of induction training on administrative requirements was mentioned as a possible source of risk.

The second lack of linkage is the inconsistent relationship between the partners and the Program Officers, as some of these tend to focus on the administrative dimensions, while others actively engage in supporting and reacting to the research.

A third and less easily defined cleavage is that which has developed between what one of the evaluators has labelled the global north of research and the researchers from the south. This manifests itself in South Asia (where particular dynamics of research and emancipatory agendas are very developed), by practices that tend to privilege the discourse and perspectives of researchers from the global north (which can include researchers coming from the south but who have adopted the mode of thinking in the north), in relation to both conceptual and methodological issues. This can lead to a weakening of the position and creative potential of southern researchers.

3.3 Forward Thinking: Some Recommendations

The recommendations made tend to reinforce orientations that already exist, although sometimes only latent.

Flexibility. Space should be given for adjustments to plans, timetables and budgets set out initially as an important element of enabling research to proceed in difficult circumstances.

Institutional capacity. A crucial factor to successful implementation and completion of a research is the possibility to sustain long term research capacity. Key individuals, groups of individuals or organisations should be supported through training in project management. This can be supplemented by the development of a financial capacity to report better and in a timely manner. Strategic partnerships with established organisations and institutions elsewhere in the world offer possibilities for the intensity of dialogue that is required. Predictable streams of funding for large research projects and thematic programmes are seen as a counterweight to the short-term consultancies which attract younger scholars.

Local Networks. The routine objective of projects should be to build up an indigenous, non-metropole research capacity which has access to and the trust of local populations, able to interpret information within a local context, offering an alternative point of view to the dominant political, policy and academic discourses.

Local knowledge and 'insider' vs. 'outsider'. When the local capacity is limited and weak, mentoring mechanisms should be put in place or knowledgeable researchers should be drawn from 'outside'. As with institutional capacity, strategic partnerships may be useful in developing and sustaining local capacity. However, it is crucial that there is sensitivity to power-knowledge dynamics.

Judgement. Lead researchers should be allowed to use their common sense and more detailed knowledge of the situation to make judgment calls on whether to allow the research to proceed. Developing deliberate levels of trust with the community should mitigate the risks.

Policy relevance and influence. It would be useful to explore strategies which develop a more targeted approach (key individual policy and decision makers), articulating the research findings in institutional and policy discourses and lexicons that are comprehensible to policy makers. This could be complemented by periodic reviews that allow for an exploration of unforeseen areas of influence

External commitment and support. While civil and political conflicts gain new importance in the context of globalization, the research community in the affected countries is increasingly under pressure and intimidated. The proximity of PCD staff should be encouraged, while the Canadian image is a very positive one that could be further used to provide guarantees (although this needs to be assessed on a case by case basis).

1 Background of the evaluation/study

1.1 Contextualized need for the evaluation/study

Despite widespread research activities in conflict-affected areas around the world, there is limited analysis of the actual process, methods and challenges of conducting research in these contexts. There is substantial literature on research methods in general, but little addresses the ethical and methodological challenges of researching in societies experiencing violent conflict – particularly from the perspective of researchers from the 'global south' conducting research on conflicts in their own societies[2]. Yet, researchers working in such circumstances often face difficulties in connecting with the mainstream research community and do not receive adapted support, in terms of research design and ethics, required by these specific contexts.

Over the course of the last decade, through its Peace, Conflict and Development Program Initiative (PCD), IDRC has supported applied research and capacity-building on peace and conflict research in Latin America and the Caribbean, in sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East and South Asia – often with a view to advance global norms and learning on cross-regional analysis of peace and conflict processes[3].

IDRC works in partnership with institutes, universities, policymakers, civil society organizations, as well as networks of researchers. Recognizing the non-linearity of conflict, and the complexity of conflict situations and peace dynamics, IDRC aims at proactively impacting these situations through its support to applied research and policy-influence. PCD is a thematically focused research program that remains responsive to the priorities of Southern partners and also seeks to develop south-south research programs and networks[4]. The four broad thematic areas covered by PCD are the following:

- Democratic Processes in Governance and Peacebuilding;
- Political Economy of Peace and Conflict;
- Security and Insecurity;

---

[2] To date there are only a handful of volumes specifically addressing methodological and ethical issues surrounding research on and in conflict situations: AGC Nordstrum, *Fieldwork under Fire* (University of California Pres, 1996); M Smyth and G Robinson (eds), *Researching Violently Divided Societies: Ethical and Methodological Issues* (Pluto Press, 2001); O Hargie and D Dickenson (eds), *Researching the Troubles: Social Science Perspectives on the Northern Ireland Conflict* (Mainstream Publishing, 2003); EJ Porter, G Robinson, M Smyth, A Schnabel and E Osaghae (eds), *Researching Conflict in Africa: Insights and Experience* (UN University Press, 2006) and E Dauphinee, *The Ethics of Researching War: Looking for Bosnia* (Manchester University Press, 2007). Most of these pieces of work are limited to reflections on experiences from the point of view of the researcher from the 'global north'.

[3] PCD has not been active in all these regions over the last ten years. In the case of South Asia, it only developed a significant profile from 2004 onwards.

[4] PCD's primary aim is to develop southern research capacities. It does this primarily but not exclusively through south-south networks. It also supports north-south and south-north networks to deepen learning and capacities in both sectors through interaction with each other.

- Violence, Trauma, Justice and Reconciliation.

1.2   Intended use and users of the evaluation

According to IDRC's *Evaluation Guidelines*, "*an evaluation user is one who has the 'willingness', 'authority', and 'ability' to put learnings from the evaluation process or evaluation findings to work in some way. The primary intended users are those particular individuals or groups who are affected by the outcome of the evaluation, are in a position to make decisions about the evaluation, and intend to use the evaluation process or findings to inform their decisions or actions.*"[5]

The intended users of this evaluation are PCD program staff (primary intended users), IDRC senior management, IDRC program staff and PCD's partners (secondary users). The audience[6] of the evaluation also include other agencies/donors working in conflict contexts.

The evaluation seeks[7] to improve PCD (and other IDRC) programming approach (project and program identification and development, programming modalities, monitoring, reporting and evaluation.) in contexts of active conflict where PCD already works. Building on lessons learnt from previous and current programming experience, it also assesses how, when, and under what conditions, PCD could expand programming.

The evaluation also aims at increasing PCD partners' understanding of the value, utility and reach that research might have in contexts of conflict, as well as clarifying PCD and IDRC's role, and the expectations of what PCD and IDRC can and cannot do to support partners in conflict contexts.

1.3   Objectives and evaluation/study questions

As stated in the revised Terms of Reference (ToR)[8], the main objective of this evaluation is to identify the factors (conditions and programming modalities) that facilitate or hinder the research process for PCD-supported projects in countries and regions affected by violent conflict, and the advantages and disadvantages of PCD programming modalities in achieving PCD objectives in such unstable settings.

This evaluation is not an accountability evaluation, but a learning exercise. Four specific objectives guide the evaluation which focuses on:

1) **The Conflict Context**: Get a better understanding of what conditions (security, research infrastructure, community of researchers, etc.) need to be in place, especially when a return to violence seems imminent, so that 1) PCD can feasibly

---

[5] IDRC, "Identifying the Intended User(s) of an Evaluation", *Evaluation Guidelines*, p1.

[6] "*It is important to distinguish between the intended audience and the user(s) of an evaluation. An audience is a group, whether or not they are the client(s), who will or should see and may react to an evaluation. The audience is interested in the evaluation but has a more passive relationship with it than the primary intended user(s).*"*Ibid*.

[7] For more details on the intended uses of the evaluation, see ToR here attached, .

[8] The ToR have been adjusted following the methodological workshop that was held in Ottawa on the 29th and 30th of April 2008 with IDRC staff and Channel Research team.

support research and 2) partners can feasibly conduct research in line with PCD's program objectives. Each case study outlines the actual conditions the researchers are working in and sheds light on lessons learnt.

2) **"What Happened" - the Partners' and PCD's Intents and Achievements**: Build a body of learning around the contributions PCD supported research can make in influencing policy, building research capacities, and increase domestic ownership of peace processes when taking into account the prevailing environmental conditions surrounding the research process and ethical considerations.

3) **The "How"- Programming Modalities**: Increase learning around the strengths and weaknesses of PCD programming modalities and its relationships to its research partners in contributing to the achievement of PCD objectives in countries and regions affected by violent conflict.

4) **Forward Thinking**: With a better understanding of prevailing conditions, challenges and opportunities surrounding PCD supported research as well as PCD's programming modalities: explore the implications (in terms of resources, security, institutional risks, policy influence, how we partner, etc.) of potential expansion of PCD programming into countries and regions affected by violent conflict.

1.4   Values and principles guiding the evaluation/study process

This evaluation/study is guided by the **international recognized standards** for evaluation quality, which include impartiality, independence, credibility, transparency and usefulness. The evaluation has been conducted under the standards of ethics for social science research (e.g guaranteeing the integrity of data or ensuring that there is no conflict of interest with the evaluator).

Given the complexity and high sensitivity of the conflict context, the evaluation/study has been conducted from a **conflict-sensitive approach**, at two different levels:

▪ First, attention has been paid to the *interaction between the evaluation process itself and the research process,* and/or context: e.g the possibility of visiting communities involved in the research project has always been assessed together with the researchers, trusting their judgement call on the negative unintended effects it could have on the research process itself or on the visited communities and interviewed people.
▪ Secondly, the evaluation examines the *interaction of the research process with the context setting*, including policy influence, but also unintended negative and/or positive effects of the research process.

As stated in the guiding principles of IDRC's Evaluation Unit, the "*evaluation should be an asset for those being evaluated. Evaluation can impose a considerable time and*

resource burden on partner organizations (...)"[9]. Whereas this evaluation does not aim to evaluate IDRC's partner organizations against results, and is orientated towards leaning, the process required time from staff and researchers. The evaluation team has taken this parameter into account when it planned and conducted the field visits.

In some instances the researchers were reticent about participating in this study and in providing access to documentation. Although the lead researchers had been contacted by PCD about the review, there seems to have been a degree of misunderstanding about the nature of the review, and consequently misinterpreting it as an evaluation of the projects themselves. Once the nature of the exercise became clear, many were very cooperative and showed a considerable degree of interest in their study and its findings (along with those of the other three associated studies and the synthesis report). It is worth noting that some were concerned about the confidentiality of their comments and the possibility that they might be identified as the source of critical commentary. Every effort has been made to maintain the confidentiality of the interview processes.

In order to ensure the validity and credibility of the findings, the team has applied the data triangulation method, comparing the views of researchers against each other, the views of the PCD/IDRC program officers and the primary and secondary documentary sources.

---

[9] IDRC, Guiding Principles of IDRC's Evaluation Unit, http://www.idrc.ca/uploads/user-S/12095810441Evaluation_Unit_Guiding_Principles.pdf

2   Methodology

2.1   The Case study approach

The evidence collected is based on three broad types of analytical tools:

1. Documentation review of plans, monitoring, evaluations and general reporting, as well as calling on experience from related projects.
2. Qualitative semi-structured field work by the team. This consists of a series of interlinked data collection methods including direct observation, individual interviews of key informants, interviews of members of the population, and workshops.
3. Validation process: this consists of the extensive use of quality assurance and peer review mechanisms from within IDRC, as agreed with PCD.

The qualitative field work consisted of interviews in areas where research is physically conducted or where the researchers are based, i.e, in Uganda (Moroto-Karamoja and Kampala), Kenya, Sri Lanka (Colombo), Occupied West Bank and Colombia (Bogota, Medellin and Cartagena).

In the Inception Report and at the inception workshop, a range of issues and themes were identified for exploration in the course of the evaluation. While these continued to inform and help structure the individual case studies, they were not used as a checklist. In each of the country-based studies, the richness of the individual case was allowed to come to the fore, in particular allowing the insights as well as issues and areas of concerns of the local researchers to be highlighted.

2.2   Project Sample

The findings of the individual country reports and the synthesis report are based on a contextual analysis of a series of selected PCD-funded research projects.

Given the very large number of projects funded by IDRC/PCD in a wide range of geographic locations and differing political contexts, it was necessary to identify a smaller pool of funded project that could be looked at in greater detail through a process of 'purposeful sampling'. The overall criteria for the selection of the case studies was the aim of gaining insight into particular processes as they operate in specific contexts, rather than random selection or thematic distinctions. The starting point was therefore the context rather than the projects themselves.

The initial pool of possible case studies was identified by IDRC/PCD on the basis of three criteria:

- That they represent the geographic spread of PCD's funded research
- That they were located in 'focus countries' in which PCD funded research had a 'critical mass' and where there was a history of PCD engagement

- That they were located in areas experiencing violent armed conflict as broadly defined in PCD's prospectus.

In Latin America, Columbia was the only country that fit the criteria.[10] In the Middle East, Palestine satisfied all criteria and is a PCD 'focus country'.[11] In Africa PCD's funded research focuses largely on Eastern and Southern Africa. Within those regions countries that fit the criteria were Uganda and Sudan and both were put forward as possible candidates for the evaluation. In South Asia, PCD has nascent programmes developing in Afghanistan and Nepal, but these were in very early stages of development and it was felt there was not sufficient information available for their inclusion in the evaluation. PCD therefore identified a number of possible programmes in Kashmir and Sri Lanka.

Following this initial filtering process, the list of possible case studies was narrowed on the basis of two further criteria:

- Projects that were in PCD's current programming cycle (though some would have entailed continuation of research funded in previous programming cycles)
- In cases where the violent conflict is distributed unevenly (eg Uganda, Sri Lanka) the project would require field work in areas of active conflict.

On the basis of these criteria a pool of potential case studies was identified by PCD : three in Columbia ; four in South Asia ; four in East Africa (one of which was multi-phased); and four in Palestine (one of which was multi-phased).

Given the time and budget constraints of the evaluation, it was evident that not all of these projects could be covered in the course of the evaluation. After discussion with PCD staff, in particular seeking the advice of the relevant regional program officers, the list of case studies was further narrowed by Channel Research on the basis of the following criteria:

- That the projects were in the latter stages of planned research activities
- That there was sufficient accessible documentary evidence regarding the project
- That researchers involved in the project were accessible
- That the locales in which the research was taking place were accessible
- That, in the opinion of PCD staff and relevant project officers, they were producing or likely to produce interesting research outputs.

On the basis of these criteria, the following cases were selected for the evaluation. In the case of multi-phase projects, only the current phase of the project was explored in detail, though relevant insights from previous phases that came to the fore or had a bearing on the current phase of the program were included in the evaluations.

---

[10] There had been some discussion regarding Guatemala as a possible case, but after discussion with PCD at the inception workshop it was decided that it was not suitable as the nature of the ongoing violence was largely criminal rather than political.

[11] While PCD supports funded research in other countries in the region, such as Lebanon, these are generally as part of cross-comparative case studies.

2.2.1 Project Sample and Field Work in Palestine

During the field work in Palestine, the consultant spent 6 days in the West Bank city of Ramallah where she met face-to-face with project leaders and staff of the research project covered by this study and outlined below. Unfortunately some of the research assistants were out of town due to the summer holidays from the University, and one of the lead researchers was on a speaking tour in the United States. These key informants were interviewed by telephone instead. Although a field visit for one of the active projects was planned, it had to be cancelled in order not to jeopardise the relationship of the partnering institution with its local implementing arm. There were no security incidents during the visit.

The selected projects are:

Project 101610 – Between State and Tribe: The Rule of Law and Dispute Settlement in Post-Oslo

Partner: Dr. Mudar Kassis, Institute of Law, Birzeit University (hereby known as the Rule of Law Project)

The aim of this project was to produce policy recommendations on the role of customary law in the present and future Palestinian justice system[12]. This project investigated the tensions between the formal and the informal justice systems in Palestine and formulated policy recommendations, on how these two potentially conflicting systems can be reconciled in a future Palestinian judiciary.

The primary and secondary research that was undertaken and the publication that resulted were equally important, as they have provided new insights into the growing field of informal justice.

Project 102990 – Strategic Consequences of Palestine Divisions AND Project 103849 – Integrating Islamist Militants into the Political Process

Partner: Khalil Shikaki, Director, Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research (PSR)

One component of this project is often better known as the Young Guards project, designed to review current Palestinian domestic and strategic policy choices and likely future scenarios. It does this by developing a better understanding of the socio-political changes that led to existing divisions and particularly the emergence of the 'young guard' (within Fatah). It also examines the process of leadership transition within the Palestinian nationalist movement. The project aimed to propose strategies

---

[12] Second Interim Technical Report, Informal Justice: The Rule of Law and Dispute Resolution in Post-Oslo Palestine, p 3

to deal with potential consequences of the current Palestinian divisions on the domestic scene, and explore the future of the peace process.

Another component of this project is formally known as 'Integrating Islamist Militants into the Political Process', which is labelled as the Hamas project. The main question that it aims to answer is whether the integration of Hamas into the political process will serve to moderate the group and bring it closer to mainstream social attitudes and policies. It looks at the new dynamics within Hamas from three perspectives: political governance, social processes and the peace process. It also maps the hierarchy of the movement both in Palestine and abroad.

Projects 101323, 103302, 104728 – Palestinian Adolescents Coping with Trauma (PACT) (Phase I, II, III)

Partner: Dr. Rita Giacaman (Phase II, III, III), Associate Professor and Director**,** Institute for Community and Public Health (ICPH), Birzeit University, and Yoke van der Meulen-Rabaia (Phase III), PhD Candidate and Researcher, ICPH, Birzeit University

The Palestinian Adolescents Coping with Trauma (PACT) started in 2002 as a two year project examining the effect of armed conflict, military occupation and other sources of local violence on Palestinian youth. It was a collaboration between the Social Program Evaluation Group at Queen's University in Canada and the Institute for Community Public Health (ICPH) at Birzeit University in Palestine. The project has since completed phase II which incorporated a communal perspective of community psycho-social and mental health into existing Community Based Rehabilitation (CBR) initiatives to create a Community Psycho-Social and Mental Health (CPMH) focus for youth.

PACT is currently in phase III which aims to expand and elaborate on the model of internal community support which was developed in phase II. The PACT project addresses a central component of conflict, namely the destructive psycho-social effects of violence and the need to assess and address the mental health consequences of extended violent conflict.

It was suggested in the Inception Report that all the pre-selected PCD projects in Palestine would be covered as most of the partners and researchers were concentrated in Ramallah in Palestine and two of the selected projects have the same partner and three projects are phases of the same project. However, Amjad Atallah from Strategic Assessments (SAI) in Washington, the partner for Project 102737 "Third Party Intervention" could not be reached at any point during the evaluation and the contact details for his research partner Jarat Chopra was received too late. This project has therefore not been included in this final report.

Data for this study was collected from numerous sources such as IDRC and partner project documentation, through semi-structured interviews with the researchers

involved in the projects either face-to-face in Palestine or over the phone. Discussions were also held with current and past PCD staff. Unfortunately it was not possible to speak to the objects of the research in Palestine. However, given that this was not an accountability evaluation, this was not a central problem for the scope of this study.

2.2.2   Project Sample and Field Work in South Asia

Of the four PCD-shortlisted projects, two were selected in consultation with IDRC because they represent ongoing research and were seeking to develop new 'paradigms' for exploring their respective topics. The two selected projects had the added advantage of the principal investigator and lead researchers being associated with the same research institute in Colombo, the International Centre for Ethnic Studies (ICES). Both also had unique and distinctive elements in their organization and management modalities that differed from IDRC's primary but not exclusive modality of supporting South-South research projects and networks.

The two projects selected for review are:[13]

Post-Tsunami Reconstruction in Contexts of War: A Grassroots Study of the Geo-Politics of Humanitarian Aid in Northern and Eastern Sri Lanka & Aceh, Indonesia [103614]

Partner: Dr Malathi de Alwis, International Centre for Ethnic Studies, Colombo

This was initially a two-year project which would examine and compare the consequences for existing political conflict of the post-tsunami international humanitarian interventions in Sri Lanka and the Aceh province of Indonesia. Through a multi-sited, micro-level, grass roots-based, long-term study, it examines from the point of view of the affected communities themselves, how material (infrastructural reconstruction and livelihood rehabilitation) and non-material (psycho-social) interventions are carried out by all stakeholders in partnership or competition, and whether they exacerbated or alleviated existing fissures within and between communities. The project seeks to understand the resulting divergent trajectories these dynamics took in Sri Lanka and Aceh and to suggest better articulations and configurations for INGOs intervening in existing zone of political conflict affected by natural disasters with high humanitarian costs.[14]

Diasporas, Transnationalism and Global Engagement: Tamil and Sinhala Transnational Communities and Networks in Canada and Their Nexus in Sri Lanka [103776]

---

[13] The two projects which were not selected were: Kashmir: New Voices, New Approaches [102633] and Human Rights and Peace Audit Exercises on Partition as a Method to Resolve Ethno-National Conflicts in South Asia [103989]. Although not the direct subject of this evaluation, relevant insights from these two projects will also be drawn on.

[14] IDRC, *Post-Tsunami Reconstruction in Contexts of War* Project Approval Document Funding and Appraisal, June 2006

Partner: Dr R Cheran, International Centre for Ethnic Studies, Colombo and University of Windsor, Toronto

This project entails a study of Tamil and Sinhala transnational networks in Canada and of their nexus in Sri Lanka. The project explores the transnational community in one location and how this impacts on their linkage with other locations in the homeland and host country. Through an examination of political organisations, a mapping of formal and informal remittance mechanisms, and an investigation of informal or irregular migration networks, it explores the various dimensions of the role of transnational groups in 'host' and 'home' countries and the extent to which different groups within the diaspora communities identify strongly with 'homelands' and 'homeland' politics. In particular, in the context of Canada's post-9/11 anti-terrorism measures (including the proscribing of the LTTE as a 'terrorist entity' in April 2006), it examines how policies in both Canada and Sri Lanka may facilitate and/or impede the engagement of the Sri Lankan transnational communities in civil conflict transformation and post-conflict reconstruction and development. [15]

Although the two projects have a substantial Sri Lanka empirical focus, the two projects focus on a number of issues relevant to the South Asia context – ethnic nationalism, the role of diasporas, the possible peacemaking and peacebuilding openings created by an acute humanitarian crisis.

Data for this study was collected from a variety of sources. Prior to the field visit and to acquire background on the research projects, a desk review of key documents was conducted. These included IDRC internal documents, project technical reports, drafts of articles and papers produced by the research teams, as well as articles and reports on the conflicts in Sri Lanka and Aceh.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with PCD/IDRC staff in Delhi and a number of the principal researchers involved in the projects. These interviews were conducted through face-to-face meetings in Sri Lanka in the course of a field visit in October 2008, in London or via telephone. Interviews were also conducted in Sri Lanka and London with individuals who were familiar with the situation in Sri Lanka and knowledgeable about the constraints faced in carrying out research in the context of ongoing political violence or post-conflict situations.

During the course of the evaluation it was not possible to conduct interviews with external stakeholders or potential consumers of the research outputs of the projects as both projects were ongoing and neither had reached the point at which the project outputs had been finalised or circulated to external parties.

---

[15] IDRC, *Diasporas, Transnationalism and Global Engagement: Tamil and Sinhala Transnational Communities and Networks in Canada and their Nexus in Sri Lanka* Project Approval Document Funding and Appraisal, December 2006

2.2.3 Project Sample and Field Work in Latin America

Colombia was selected as a country case study because it was the only country in Latin America that fit the country sampling criteria defined by IDRC/PCD: countries in which IDRC/PCD programming has "some history" (i.e and not just very recent projects), and countries experiencing violent armed political conflict. Guatemala had been initially discussed as a possible option, but Colombia was eventually preferred mainly because of the nature of the conflict (criminal *versus* violent political conflict).

During the field visit in Colombia, the consultant has conducted several in-depth personal and group interviews with the researchers involved in the three selected research projects. The consultant met the researchers in Bogotá and Medellín, and other institutions in Cartagena. A phone interview with the Program Officers for Latin America was also conducted.

Due to time constraints, the consultant had to focus the field visit meetings on the research team, and could not interview many external stakeholders, except on two occasions. In Medellín, the researchers from Corporación Región helped the consultant to organize a small workshop with victims from internal displacement who have participated in the research process. The consultant also visited Non Governmental Organizations (NGO) in Cartagena which were not directly involved in the research projects, but which could bring interesting insight.

IDRC/PCD has identified the three selected projects according to the following criteria:
- projects where the research would require field work in areas of active conflict;
- diversity of team composition and institutional modality (NGO, university);
- diversity of challenges faced during the research projects.

The selected projects are:

Reparation for Internal Displacement in Colombia (reference 102865):

This research project was granted support in the context of a research competition on Gender Justice in Conflict and Post-Conflict Societies, jointly organised in Colombia and Guatemala in 2004-2005 by PCD and the Gender Unit. Its main objective is to "*identify and analyse the different perceptions, expectations and social practices of Colombia's internally displaced on issues of reparation and their relation to the construction of public policies that are differentiated along gender, generational and ethnic lines*"[16]. The research team initially included researchers from the Universidad de San Buenaventura (Cartagena) and the Non Governmental Organization (NGO)

---

[16] IDRC, 2007. Project Approval Document: Funding and Appraisal - 102865;
Universidad de San Buenaventura – Seccional Cartagena and Corporación Volver a la Gente, 2005. Propuesta de investigación.

Volver a la Gente. Due to unforeseen circumstances, the partnership between the University and the NGO fell apart and only the researchers from the Universidad de San Buenaventura continued to be involved, with the support from other professors specialized for example in gender issues.

Forced Migration of Colombians: A comparative study on fear, historical memory and public representations in Colombia, Ecuador and Canada. Phase II (ref. 104027):

This is the second phase of a complex inter-institutional and inter-regional research project on forced migrations of Colombians. The general objective is "*to carry out a comparative study of two-types of forces migration of Colombians: internal displacement in Colombia and refugees from Colombia in Ecuador and Canada, and identify how social fears, historical memory and public representations of internally displaced people and refugees influence the reconstruction of their life projects and integration in a new social environment*"[17]. This research work follows a previous phase of a large and complex project developed between December 2004 and December 2006 by a network of Canadian and Latin American institutions, including the University of British Columbia (UBC), the NGO Corporación Región (based in Medellín) and the Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences (FLACSO) in Ecuador. Their activities have also been well articulated to other networks such as the Colombian National Network on Forced Displacement (REDIF)[18]

Engendering Reintegration Programs for Ex-Combatants in Colombia: a study of experiences between 1990 and 2003 (ref. 102072).

While the four-decade armed conflict in Colombia has been the subject of considerable research work, the gender perspective has only recently gained ground. The Institute for Regional Studies (INER) of the Medellín-based Universidad de Antioquia has gathered a team of senior and young researchers to carry out this study and systematise experiences of women in reintegration in Colombia between 1990 and 2003. The general objective is "*to undertake a gender sensitive and retrospective study of reintegration processes for ex-combatants in Colombia between 1990 and 2003 with a view to formulating a series of conclusions and recommendations that might inform and orient future reintegration policies and programs for female combatants*".[19]

2.2.4 Project Sample and Field Work in East Africa

The selection of the projects for East Africa has been made based on conversations with program staff whilst in Ottawa. IDRC/PCD programming focuses largely on Eastern and Southern Africa which is why projects carried out in this geographical area have been selected. Projects have been selected upon the criteria that they involved field work in areas of active conflict. They both present a number of issues that are interesting in terms of possibly expanding IDRC investment in the region. The

---

[17] IDRC, 2007. Project Approval Document: Funding and Appraisal – 104027.
[18] *Red Nacional de Investigadores sobre Desplazamiento Interno Forzado*.
[19] IDRC, 2007. Project Approval Document Funding and Appraisal rev 2007-12-21.

first project is being carried out through a Northern institute (Tufts University) which is not the usual model for IDRC. The second project is being carried out across 5 different countries (Somalia, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda and Sudan) in a large and very inhospitable area.

The selected projects are:

A Regional Gender and Generational Analysis of Armed Conflict (Phase I,II, III)
Partner: Tufts University, (Phase I, II, III), Feinstein International Famine Center.

This is a three-phase, multi-year, regional and comparative study on the root causes and consequences of armed conflicts in Northern Uganda, Eastern Uganda and Southern Sudan. The first and second phases of this project were conducted from January 2005 to December 2007, and the third phase was approved in March 2008 for a period of 2 years.

Its general objective is to produce rigorous field based research to inform the policy and programming of the governments of Uganda and South Sudan, multilateral and bilateral organizations, governmental and non governmental agencies working in situations of armed conflict and post-conflict reconstruction in Uganda and Sudan. The study is intended to assist these bodies in their responsibility and efforts to protect civilian populations.

Comparative Research on Resolution of Pastoralist Conflicts in the East African Region: Case Studies from Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda.
Partner: Development Policy Management Forum (DPMF), Addis Ababa/Nairobi.

DPMF is a regional civil society organization (CSO) covering sub-Saharan African countries, with registered offices in Nairobi, Kenya and Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Since its inception in March 2005, DPMF has carried out activities that aim to deepen and institutionalise democratic governance in African countries. Comparative research is a DPMF focus, with the objective of enhancing the capacity of policymakers and civil society, by generating for their use research-based information focusing on civil service and democratic governance, conflict and peacebuilding, regional integration and civil society and leadership[20].

DPMF was awarded an IDRC grant in March 2005 to carry out a comparative study in five countries in East Africa (Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda). The *general objective* of this research project is to undertake an analysis of cross-border pastoralist conflicts in Eastern Africa, with a view to developing appropriate policies and strategies for coping with the challenges of conflict resolution and mitigation and contributing to sustainable development and peace building.

In order to prepare the field visit and to acquire background on the research projects, the consultants first gathered data through a desk review of key documents. These

---

[20] DPMF, Program Focus, http://www.dpmf.org/about-us.php

sources included IDRC's internal documents, reports, articles and papers sent by the research teams, as well as recent articles from United Nations (UN) agencies and NGO's reports on the East Africa conflict context.

During their field visit in Kenya and Uganda from the 08th to the 17th of September 2008, the consultants conducted several in-depth personal and group interviews with the researchers involved in the two selected research projects. The semi-structured interviews helped the consultants to gain insight on which challenges the researchers face in conflict-context such as Kenya, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda, how the researchers perceived the research-public policy articulation in those countries, what the research teams perceive as strengths and weaknesses of IDRC's modalities and other key issues as defined in the ToR of this study. Phone interviews have also been conducted with the researchers that the consultants could not meet personally.

Direct observation of the researchers work has been possible in Karamoja (Tufts University project). The consultants had the opportunity to meet the respondents and participants to the research process, and gained a deeper understanding of context and the research conditions in this region. The time spent in Moroto also allowed the consultants to go beyond formal interviews with the research team, allowing them to have informal discussions which shed lights on a number of issues that we would have otherwise been missed.

Due to time constraints, the consultant had to focus the field visit meetings with the research team, and could not interview many external stakeholders who could have also brought interesting conclusions, for instance on the use of the research findings, the risks to the informants or on the conditions of working in the regions where the research projects unfold. Nevertheless, the consultants have met UN representatives in Kampala and Moroto (Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs - OCHA) who were well aware of the research process.

2.3   Validity of the evidence and ethical considerations

In order to ensure the validity and credibility of the findings, the consultants have applied the data triangulation method, commonly used for evaluation and qualitative research in social sciences.

In some instances the researchers were reticent about participating in this study and in providing access to documentation. Although the lead researchers had been contacted by PCD about the review, there seems to have been a degree of misunderstanding about the nature of the review, and consequently misinterpreting it as an evaluation of the projects themselves. Once the nature of the exercise became clear, many were very cooperative and showed a considerable degree of interest in their study and its findings (along with those of the other three associated studies and the synthesis report). It is worth noting that some were concerned about the confidentiality of their comments and the possibility that they might be identified as the source of critical

commentary. Every effort has been made to maintain the confidentiality of the interview processes.

3   Evaluation findings

3.1   Addressing the Conflict Context

This section addresses the first issue set out in the ToR, namely obtaining a better understanding of the minimum conditions (security, infrastructure, professional communities) that would enable research in conflict situations to take place in an optimal way. It asks about the minimum conditions that should be in place to secure research, especially when violence is about to increase. This should enable PCD to increase the quality of its support in these exceptional circumstances, as well as promote the pursuit of PCD's objectives of enabling partners to carry out research, where the resulting partnerships are primarily though not exclusively "south - south" in nature.

The similarities in the findings of the four country studies are striking. Although differences of formulation can be traced back to the cultural specificities or to the nature of the conflict or even to the identity of the evaluators, a fresh eye can easily distinguish commonalities that can give PCD a firm footing. These revolve around the idea of a good partnership.

The common minimum conditions can be summed up as three qualities of an appropriate partner:

1. **Solid lead researchers**. The presence of authoritative, locally highly respected researchers. This is enhanced by IDRC's ability to establish connections with institutions perceived to be legitimate to all parties in the conflict as much as possible (such as Birzeit University in Palestine), as well as the willingness to broaden research horizons beyond the "usual suspects" or that have access to difficult areas where other actors cannot go into. These lead researchers should then be able to attract and use young researchers, and engage in an experienced manner with the authorities, using their professional and political judgement.

2. **Ability to adjust**. Because of the inherent unpredictability of conflict, all studies confirm the need for researchers to have the ability to make informed research decisions accordingly. This allows them to capitalise on changes in the timeframe making optimal use of successive stages of research to employ more appropriate research methods (low profile participant observation in Sri Lanka, or surveys more appropriate for remote work in Palestine) or explore the same questions in different locales or to rethink aspects of the project so that they were manageable and doable in light of the changed circumstances. The establishment of networks by lead researchers, and the delegation of research tasks to local researchers located in security enclaves or highly volatile areas, is singularly effective as an adaptive research method.

3. **Conflict sensitivity**. The projects have been generally successful at steering a course of principled and yet impartial research, which is able to handle

information in a manner that does not compromise the source of information while adhering to evidence based processes. This has taken place along a range of practices that run from the ability to create a space for policy dialogue, to providing policy relevant statements. Clarity of objectives and identity of the partner is complemented by a good control of the flow of information (better managed in Colombia than in Palestine) and awareness of the consequences of the release of information to any other actors for those who participate in the research.

An implication of the above is the desirability of a continued emphasis on the centrality of the assessment of the capability and credibility of partners as the lynchpin in PCD's decision making on the funding of research. At the time of the evaluation inception workshop, there was some discussion within PCD regarding the possibility of developing a typology of fragile country situations which could inform the project assessment process. The conclusion from the case studies is that it would be tricky to design such a conflict typology, as it would focus on initial conditions, which are likely to change over the course of a funded project, and would be reliant on external interpretation. Nevertheless, it is important to have some assessment of the likely trajectories of the various dynamics at play in a particular country situation, and their likely impact on the feasibility of a research project. These can be part of an overall risk assessment.[21] This may have implications for IDRC's assessment mechanisms which deal primarily with the partner institution and the proposal, and not the country itself.

The one element of IDRC guidance which is based on broad categories of country situations is the security restrictions that apply to staff travel. These have proven not to be consistent with the perception of security by local partners.[22] While these restrictions are clearly placed on IDRC by the Canadian government as a whole, there may be opportunities to make greater use of non-PCD resources and expertise (individual researchers and/or institutions) to provide capacity in visiting and monitoring projects.[23]

---

[21] It is worth noting that country profiles are routinely developed and revised by IDRC to which PCD program officers have access. To this extent, in the developing any risk assessment for projects in a particular country, Program Officers are reliant on the overall quality of these IDRC country profiles and assessments. As an adjunct to these, Program Officers will consult with regional directors when project development begins in a particular country.

[22] To an extent, this is not surprising as risk is always going to be different for locals as compared to foreigners/outsiders. In some situations, they will be more vulnerable due to lack of local connections or language skills. Conversely, there may be situations where their status as outsiders provides them with a degree of security not available to locals. This means that the whole issue of what constitutes as 'safe' area for research and for whom is highly contextual. Just because an area is 'safe' for locals does not necessarily mean it is 'safe' for outsiders and vice versa.

[23] It is also worth noting that the monitoring of projects by PCD staff may be hindered by the restrictions and impediments may be created by the host country in the form of visa or travel restrictions. While these may not prohibit access, they can dissuade visits depending on the country's political instabilities. These constraints might also apply to non-Canadians thereby limiting the ability of some non-PCD resources to contribute to project monitoring.

While IDRC's mandate was not always fully understood by research partners, its reputation as a funder of innovative research, the processes by which it initiates and develops research projects and the quality of its partner institutions, provides a solid foundation for a principled and uncompromising research process. However, partners are often unaware of the nature of IDRC's relationship with, including its distinctiveness from, other arms of Canadian government, including the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAIT) and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). This distinctiveness allows IDRC to support research that CIDA and DFAIT could not support – providing scope for underwriting innovative research in the context of ongoing conflicts. This, along with the image of Canada, and its perceived neutrality, has effectively increased the room for manoeuvre for PCD's funded partners.

The second and all the subsequent steps of the critical path to a good project are those taken by the researchers themselves. Their ability to mobilise resources, to develop and draw on a wide range of research linkages and networks, allow them to permeate and navigate their way around the complexity of the conflict dynamics – to work with and around the multiplicity of actors, the density of local organisations, to interpret the various lexicons deployed and to respond to the high levels of mistrust – to gain access to local communities and carry out their research in an engaged, principled manner without putting researchers or local communities at risk or exacerbating the conflict dynamics.

The third element is the importance of pre-existing trust and ability to mobilise networks of researchers. This is underplayed in the PCD guidelines and yet constitutes one of the single most important factors of success that need to be secured even prior to the launch of the research initiative. This was apparent for instance in Palestine, thanks to the reputation for independent policy analysis, or in South Asia because of the recourse to researchers immersed in their own communities, where they are known and trusted (for example in north and north-eastern Sri Lanka, where they are able to live in conflict affected areas).

These three minimum conditions need to be met during the selection phase of projects, but could be further cultivated over the cycle of the research, through feedback from visiting PCD personnel, but also through a reformulation of the criteria deployed by PCD in assessing and monitoring projects. In particular this could be expressed as explicit guidance, where currently it would appear more as tacit knowledge among the program officers.

This implies giving a much stronger role to external project monitoring, similar to the level of engagement provided in the formulation of research proposals. As tends to be the case with IDRC as a whole, PCD staff are most involved in the project development phase. Currently, monitoring of a project is heavily reliant on the self-reporting of the lead researchers in their 'technical reports', which are often submitted late constraining the PO's ability to have a firm sense of how a project is proceeding.

As PCD does not rely on 'results based management' system, it needs to explore and develop alternative modalities which can be built into project design, such as mid-term formative evaluation and monitoring.

Moreover, more monitoring of projects in conflict settings would play to the strengths of PCD given the background, expertise and experience of its staff. This would be relatively straightforward as it dovetails from the regular monitoring tasks assigned to the responsible Program Officer, but may also require more systematic direct engagement with local researchers. This could take the form of a participatory, collaborative process which can revisit and review elements of the project design, research methodology, and initial findings and make any needed adjustments.

An additional option could be to ask researchers to detail their own framework for monitoring as part of the project design. This would make evaluation an integral part of the project management but also build in a developmental, learning component to the project for both PCD and the research partner.

In more volatile or difficult contexts, other modalities could be put into place. Currently, PCD works on a case-by-case basis when making decisions to supporting work in such contexts. It some cases, PCD may decide not to fund research because of lack of monitoring capacity, which is an appropriate decision. Occasionally, however, PCD will fund a capable research team who will send researchers in countries where Program Officers may themselves not go (such as Iraq). To balance the need for closer monitoring with these travel restrictions the notion of lateral monitoring by a third party could be developed. This might entail PCD making use of non-PCD resources and expertise in the form of trusted individual researchers or institutions (either external or local peer capacities), who are able to access these situations, to provide capacity in mid-term project monitoring. Such mechanisms would need to be properly systematized rather than developing on an ad hoc basis. One option which PCD might wish to explore is the modality of research project 'advisory committees' which could include local and outside peers who could provide regular monitoring and feedback.

Security in particular provides a strong sense of how these three broad principles are translated pragmatically into the national context. While security levels can be finely graded between countries, it is apt to change, and calls above all on local perception.

In spite of being flexible with deadlines, research partners sometimes felt that PCD was not as accommodating in providing supplemental funding to help cover the associated additional project costs. This seemed paradoxical to partner organisations as the need to shift project deadlines was often direct consequence of a conflict situation, and the constraints on funding had potentially adverse consequences on the quality of the research and the ability to maintain a project team. There is a risk to the loyalty to the project when funding drops, since it is very difficult to secure local resources. In addition, local research capacity may be tempted to shift their time and energy to other projects – particularly well-paid but short term consultancies.

At the time of the inception report workshop, there has been discussion in PCD about linking project guidance to types of situations and partners. The overall conclusion from the case studies is rather that it would be tricky to design such a conflict typology, as it would risk leading to an excessively rigid focus on initial conditions, possibly misinterpreted by external visitors. All the studies point to the fact that the risk assessment is very difficult, particularly at the outset, and that risk management has been done in an optimal manner at the local level by lead researchers over the course of the projects.

Possible events need to be prepared for, and a response scenario could be included in the proposals. There is currently scope to do this in the project assessment and design phase where Project Officers are prompted to assess potential risks to the project and outline mitigation strategies. Unfortunately, practice in this are is uneven and needs to be strengthened.[24] Such risk assessment could prove beneficial in allowing for supplemental budgets to cover interruptions, and for informed adjustments to deadlines.

3.2   Research Intents and Achievements

Some evaluation methodologies have attempted to bridge the gap between the specific results achieved by a project and the broader dynamics of peace in a country by identifying the theories of change which underlie the design and objectives of the project. A theory of change hence describes the set of assumptions that explain both the intermediary steps that lead to the long term goal, and the connections between program or research activities and outcomes that occur at each step. IDRC has asked the team to review whether the testing of these theories of change could be a way of assessing the effectiveness of the projects.

A theory of change describes the types of outputs (in the case of research, these are for example publications, advocacy, policy influence) that bring about the outcomes depicted in a change map. Each outcome is tied to an intervention, revealing the often complex web of activities that is required to bring about change. A theory of change also demonstrates the articulation of the assumptions that are used to explain the change process represented by the change framework. Assumptions explain both the connections between early, intermediate and long term outcomes and the expectations about how and why proposed activities will bring them about.

As this concern is relatively new in IDRC, it has not been reflected in the guidance given by PCD to the formulation of the research, and is found only implicitly stated in the documents. The country case studies highlight the fact that the intended results are often (re)formulated over time (for example, the addition of the linkages between disarmament and human rights abuses in Karamoja, Uganda) and are often quite well articulated by the researchers themselves (albeit informally and orally, and not necessarily in the reporting). Implicit theories of change are in fact an important

---

[24] In this context it is worth noting that IDRC has recently established a new risk management unit which might usefully play a role in consolidating and enhancing practice in this area.

element of discussions, bearing in particular on notions of policy outcomes and capacity building.

The complex and even chaotic nature of the outcomes of research is described by the evaluator of the south Asia projects as a "dynamic process" that draws "on a range of reservoirs of knowledge", relying above all on innovative interconnections to achieve its purpose. For example, in both the East Africa and the South Asia projects we find that the projects deployed theoretical, conceptual and methodological frameworks that were outside the dominant discourses in their respective areas of research and to engage in field work with communities often marginalized in dominant analysis of the conflicts. Although there is no explicit theory of empowerment at play, there was the intention of documenting the histories, the experiences of those marginalised within the ongoing political and economic dynamics.

The deployment of conceptual and methodological frameworks situated outside the dominant discourse is a notable feature of the research in all the case studies, shifting the research away from a linear cause and effect analysis. To a degree in all the case studies, we find a willingness to destabilise prevailing conceptions, and, by promoting and enabling critical dialogue, achieve a change which is hard to foresee at the outset of a project, and even harder to pin down into a proposal.

The distinctive feature of the research produced is that it is cautious about the degree to which an improvement of conflict dynamics can be expected from the funded research, an orientation the follows from the profoundly grounded nature of the research itself. The determination of the researchers to adhere to local norms and concepts, to understand alternative world views, and especially to reach understanding of the marginalised or isolated groups, is striking. While this can have a limiting effect on the comparative nature of the research (admittedly more successful in eastern Africa on pastoralism than in South Asia where differences between researchers and methodologies undermines comparativeness), it results in a greater efficiency in tackling political issues.[25]

To date, the Aceh-Sri Lanka comparative element of the post-tsunami project has not generated the intended insights. There are several different explanations for why this is the case. First is the research design itself. A researcher associated with the project felt that the research questions themselves were never formulated in a way that would generate real comparative analysis. Second, the methodological orientation with its focus on the local makes difficult the generalizations necessary for comparative analysis. Third is the composition of the research teams. While each contained individuals who were knowledgeable about their respective country of research, it didn't contain researchers who were deeply knowledgeable about both. There was an effort to compensate for this in the two workshops where the researchers presented drafts of their research findings. The format was that the research team of one country

---

[25] Given the limited number of cases reviewed for this evaluation, there is a need for caution in drawing generalised conclusions. Even the cases under review point in different directions. The South Asia project on diasporas have lent itself to rich comparative work cross regionally. The eastern Africa research on pastoralism also had a successful comparative element. In the case of the South Asia post-tsunami project, comparative insights were relatively limited.

would make presentations while the other country team served as discussants. While this did foster some shared insights, the general consensus of some participants and the PCD/IDRC program officers is that there are essentially two parallel projects which have yet to intersect.

The ability to extend research into novel areas is an appropriate response to opportunities, or to the reduction in political space, and is even in some cases the result of considerations on personal security of partner personnel. In the case of the Sri Lanka diaspora project (where researchers increasingly had to operate outside Colombo where political pressure became intense) this resulted in a greater emphasis on the Canadian dimensions of the diaspora, whereas in Uganda it led to renewed interest in issues of disarmament, an effect of the political economy of the peace process which had not been detected early on.

The dissemination and policy influence aspects of the research projects are still very hard to predict and even to track. While the emphasis in the PCD Palestine projects is on authorities, experience over the course of the research project has shown that important topics that are not part of the current political debates may have even greater influence. Debating these issues within society may have a greater impact than attempting to influence, for example, a non-functional legislative council or an authority that controls only parts of a very fragmented territory. One could conclude that the implicit theory of change (which sees elite groups as key) would need to be revised to take into account the full range of political actors and issues at play.

In Sri Lanka the research project on the conflict impact of the tsunami relief and reconstruction operations opted to nominate a single person in charge of translating academic research into policy-relevant findings. However, this ran into problems of defining who were the relevant target audiences and the deployment of the appropriate discourses, for example those that would be accessible to donors and aid agencies. At a one-day workshop organized in Colombo to discuss preliminary findings the participants were largely those responsible for management of implementation strategies rather than those who made decisions on strategic policy. Similarly, a multi-donor evaluation of the post-tsunami assistance carried out over a six months period from late 2008 to early 2009 by a team of 18 national and international consultants failed to hear about the research project, in spite of the fact that the handling of the risk of conflict was one of the questions set out in the Terms of Reference.[26]

The research projects have performed very differently in terms of their capacity building aims. While in Sri Lanka there was a deliberate push to work outside the Colombo-centric community and engage with different language communities, in Colombia and especially in Uganda the use of local networks was even more striking. There the approach was to build up from the local capacity. Decentralizing the research process proved beneficial for example in terms of practical applications of

---

[26] Part of the explanation for this may be the internal crises which confronted ICES at the time limiting its ability to provide a platform for projecting the project's findings.

standard research methods for junior researchers in Palestine, and developing the skills of young researchers outside Bogota.

There is also an observable difficulty in avoiding a certain centralization of the research effort on known and experienced research centers, and consequently in penetrating key areas, such as Gaza, the Tamil Tiger areas of Sri Lanka, or Aceh, for political and capacity reasons. This calls for a priority focus on outreach and capacity building. Long-range relations (carried out by electronic media – still a very difficult albeit increasingly promising channel) naturally will have an effect on quality. This implies that PCD could consider focusing more on capacity building, at least in these conflict settings.

The research and organizational capacity of Southern research institutions can be weakened by prolonged conflict. In some cases, such as in the East Africa projects, this resulted in capacity building taking place at the level of individual researchers dispersed across a range of institutions rather than at the level of institutions themselves, which often served only as temporary conduits for research. While this produced a cadre of independent researchers whose skills and methods developed over the course of the project, it leaves open the question of long-term sustainability. In other cases, such as in Aceh, this resulted in the research project relying predominantly on external researchers. Where Northern researchers and/or research institutions were a significant presence in a research project, the nature of their impact was variable. In some cases it successfully contributed to capacity building. In others, an asymmetrical relationship between researchers from the north and from the south was detrimental capacity building.

Capacity building doesn't take place in an abstract, context-free environment – it is grounded in a specific situation. In seeking to promote capacity building is it important to differentiate between the different types of capacity that PCD is attempting to build and support, who and what it is for, and whether this can be done from inside the country or the extent to which this will necessitate outside support. It is also important to be careful in assessing the nature and extent of existing indigenous research capacity. If criteria and skills sets are deployed which are not relevant to a particular context (but are to the needs of the external community, such as an ability to work in English) this may create artificial barriers to research. To this extent, it is better to let lead researchers identify the possible researchers and networks as they are better placed to navigate the specificities of the conflict context; they are unlikely to see the 'problems' that prevent someone from being a 'researcher' in the way that external actors might.

3.3   Programming Modalities

The strengths of the IDRC approach to support for research clearly lie in ensuring an appropriate degree of presence. This can take multiple forms, such as working with a strong intermediary partner, such as a well established NGO in Colombia, or Tufts in East Africa when the local researchers would be otherwise too isolated, or agreeing to

the movements of lead researchers in Sri Lanka in spite of potential security risks. The progressive building up of capacity (learning by doing) in financial management, is very real and appreciated by the partners. This is a little appreciated form of capacity building with direct connections to sustainability, and risk reduction for future projects, as good practices are known and better understood. In all cases PCD has managed to maintain the integrity of the research chain,[27] and created the conditions that allow good quality work to emerge.

This is paradoxically not directly related to the written guidance provided by PCD to its staff. While in some cases the finely graded institutional capacity assessment tools have operated well, in others, adjustments were brought in to amend failures (in particular in the case of ICES, researchers designed their own research network outside the institution).

The willingness to take on innovative and even audacious research projects created a strong interest in IDRC support amongst partners, and increased their adaptability potential in case of force majeure. The research contributions made by visiting PCD staff, in particular in Palestine, was also considered an asset. This distinguished IDRC from many other research donors.

There is however beyond this continuity a number of absent linkages that weaken performance. These linkages, if introduced by IDRC, would increase the resilience of research projects that have to operate in difficult environments.

1. The most striking (and obvious) of these is the disconnection between a strong concern for good reports and an equally but unrelated concern for the financial audit trail. While financial accountability should be maintained, it is problematic in a conflict environment, over and beyond the classical issues of weak management capacity in developing countries. The absence of an induction training on administrative requirements was mentioned in Colombia as a possible source of risk to the local financial and administrative oversight of the project and the quality and integrity of the reporting mechanisms to PCD.

2. The second inconsistent linkage is that between Program Officers and the partners of IDRC. The relationship between Program Officers and research partners is critical.[28] For country-specific PCD-funded research, having an involved Program Officer with good area expertise contributes very significantly to the success of a country programme. However, the evaluation found that practice at this level to be inconsistent, with some Program Officers usefully engaged in advising on research proposals and the subsequent monitoring of the research project, including pushing back and seeking revisions to inadequate 'technical reports' by partners, while others tend to focus on the administrative dimensions of these reports. While some Ottawa-

---

[27] By integrity of the research chain we mean that all partners complied with both the contractual stipulations and with the research objectives set out initially.

[28] This is similar to the findings of a recent strategic evaluation of IDRC on capacity development.

based program staff travel frequently and remain engaged over many years in a particular region, others are affected by turnover, and are absorbed by tasks at headquarters.

3. A third and less easily defined cleavage is that which has developed between what one of the evaluators has labelled the 'global north' of research (which perceives itself as stepping out from the research agenda and yet exercises a predominant influence) and the researchers from the south. In Sri Lanka it has been described as the 'north-south power-knowledge nexus'. The privileging of the academic and policy discourses of the global north with their tendency towards constant semantic change, the perception of a superiority of relatively known figures in international academic circles, and even in some cases the linguistic primacy given to English in project documentation, all contribute potentially to weakening the position of southern researchers.[29]

Where Northern researchers and/or research institutions were a significant presence in a research project, the nature of their impact was variable. In some cases it successfully contributed to capacity building. In Uganda, for example, the presence of western institutions in legitimising and protecting the local researchers was important. In others cases, such as Aceh, asymmetrical relationships between researchers from the north and from the south was detrimental to capacity building.

A final area of consternation for partners is the perceived expectation that the research outputs will influence policy – which is difficult to achieve at the best of times but problematic, contentious and potentially dangerous in the context of an ongoing conflict. In such contexts, rather than deploying a narrow, linear conception of 'influence', it may be more appropriate to use the more diffuse terminology and goal of 'policy engagement'. Linking back to the early discussion of 'theories of change', this would encompass creating, maintaining and expanding the critical space for dissonant voices within the often narrowing political discourses and dynamics that characterise conflict situations.

---

[29] The manner in which the 'north-south power-knowledge' dynamics play themselves out in the South may be conditioned both by the country situation and its academic culture. In settings which are more stable and in which there is a degree of self-confidence within and among the academic community, its impact and perceptions of its impact may be less pronounced.

3.4   Thinking Ahead

The implication of the above is that the IDRC preference for south-south cooperation in research is not always easily transposed in fragile situations. The strengths and weaknesses of a development research donor agency working on conflict relate to many broader issues which cannot be easily influenced. However some aspects are amenable to influence. These we have identified as three fundamental components: the qualities of a partner, the methods to be cultivated to penetrate the political filters of conflict, and finally three areas where linkages are still weak.

We would list as overriding strengths of PCD the importance given to flexibility in implementation, while attention is also given to the need to maintain a dialogue; institutional capacity combined with an emphasis on networks; capacity building and the importance of financial management systems; the appropriate importance given to local knowledge, and the relative merits of the balance between 'insider' vs. 'outsider' researchers; ethical issues of security and power-knowledge structures; expectations regarding policy relevance; and the nature and extent of external commitment and support. We return to these in the following sections.

3.4.1   *Flexibility and Innovation*

The fluid dynamics of conflict and fragile contexts have an adverse impact on the ability to carry out the research according to the plans, timetables and budgets set out in initial project documentation. This constant challenge encountered by researchers is facilitated on the part of IDRC by flexibility on deadlines and research design.

PCD combines this with a willingness to address innovative issues or to work with marginalised groups or outside centres of power over the course of the project. While providing important elements of structure to the research project and process – notably in the initial rigour of the project design and agreement phases as well as in the reporting mechanisms – there was a general view that PCD/IDRC provides 'space' in which researchers can get on with their research.

3.4.2   *Institutional capacity*

Ensuring that there is adequate and capable institutional capacity to both enable the successful implementation and completion of a research project and to provide a basis for building and sustaining long-term research capacity is an important component in enabling programming in the context of violent conflict. It is also a major challenge in that the very context of ongoing political violence and its underlying causes militate against the establishment and ongoing viability of this capacity. All too often (and this is a general constraint, not just for IDRC projects) the capacity built is that of individuals, whose career may as a result actually diverge from the institution in which they were at first identified. Local institutions and civil society remain severely under pressure in conflict situations.

Opportunities should be developed further than they are currently to identify and support key individuals, groups of individuals, or organisations, as they attempt to develop this institutional capacity and in identifying smaller organisations which would benefit from external support. In the cases reviewed here, this would lead to a greater focus on institutions residing in social or geographic enclaves, and the consequent adaptation of the project proposal to build in the sufficient flexibility for them to thrive. Possibilities exist in developing strategic partnerships between stronger, more established organisations and institutions situated outside a given region, even maybe internationally. By establishing linkages with partners outside the region, one can capture discourses and analyses that will challenge accepted wisdom.

The key, however, will be to maintain contact through visits. Mentoring (in the broad sense of the term), as is currently practised in Palestine, could then take place through the existing feedback on proposals, but also through methodology workshops, and visiting field research areas in order to get a good sense of the reality, especially in remote areas. This mentoring process could include areas related to the research design (methodologies and dissemination strategies) and project management (monitoring and reporting processes, financial oversight, budgetary accounting and reporting), as well as to the substantive research itself. PCD should ensure that as a standard operating procedure all interim reports and final outputs be given written as well oral feedback.

This would allow PCD to explore new research partnerships outside circles of the 'usual suspects', while maintaining links to existing partners and geographically expand outside the 'metropole' and the dominant country locales. It would also allow researchers from different conflict settings to share and compare their experiences. It would also strengthen the comparative dimension to the research being conducted – issues that will be further developed in the following section on 'networks'.

While this flexibility through proximity would obviously have to be counter-balanced by the need to ensure quality research outputs, it would enhance capacity at both the institutional and individual level through chains of researchers where some could focus on quality assurance, management and dissemination, while others could focus on penetration of complex areas and achieving trust locally. In doing so, however, PCD/IDRC would need to be attentive to the power-knowledge dynamics and structures at play in any such mentoring process and respond to these dynamics on a case-by-case basis.

Even where institutional capacity exists, auditing mechanisms and procedures should continue to be used to ensure that the research institutes have the appropriate capacity and procedures to take on their fiduciary responsibility for budgetary management of large multi-year, possibly multi-location projects. PCD/IDRC should refine its capacity assessment profiling to reassure itself that research partners are robust enough to manage the project and manage the risks surrounding research in the context of an ongoing conflict. As discussed below, this may mean that PCD/IDRC will need to explore modalities for mid-term formative monitoring that would also

allow for a 'health check' on the financial management, auditing and reporting of funded projects. There should be a dual process of substantive dialogue alongside robust, regular review process of existing partners' capacities and potential new institutional partners.

3.4.3 *Network building*

The notion of networks is well developed in IDRC, but could be further operationalised in the conflict environments by PCD. The development of sustainable research networks across conflict periods and regions is crucial to enabling and sustaining both small-scale and larger research projects with cogent objectives. The challenges here are several: the concentration of research influence and resources in a few institutions in the metropole; the multiple institutional obligations that the most able researchers will have which constrains their ability to devote time and energy to a particular project; the financial lure of lucrative short-term consultancy work; cashflow constraints that risk compromising the research cycle; and the flight of academics, researchers and intellectuals to more secure research posts.

The objective should be to build up indigenous, non-metropole research networks with access to, and the trust of, local populations. This would foster an awareness and understanding of local dynamics, enable interpretation of information/findings within a local context to give it more global meaning, and assist in giving voice to the local and powerless, as a counter-balance to official and/or, metropole-centric view of the societal dynamics at play. In pursuit of its network building objectives, PCD may need to develop a closer monitoring role with regard to how extensive the network is, how deep it is and how sustainable it is, rather than leaving this to reporting by lead researchers and lead research institutes.

The opportunity exists in the very presence of PCD/IDRC funding itself. Its support for more academically-oriented research and its willingness to fund multi-year, large-scale projects is seen as providing an important counterweight to the attraction for younger scholars of working for NGOs or doing short-term consultancies. Its proximity to a large donor government could also extend a form of cover to the partners.

There are obvious tensions between PCD/IDRC wanting good quality research outputs, seeking to identify researchers and institutions beyond the 'usual suspects' and operating in areas where research skills are weak. However, the emphasis on methods training, and the mentoring of younger scholars into research projects will help to sustain this capacity.

An important area for PCD to explore is the opportunities to develop linkages within and across regions in the global south and develop comparative learning across funded projects. In fostering comparative learning it would be important to distinguish between different types of network modalities. The most prominent is 'top down' in which southern researchers are drawn into northern-designed research projects. While needing to be sensitive to the power-knowledge dynamics alluded elsewhere in the

evaluations, these arrangement can be valuable in allowing southern researchers to engage with cutting-edge policy research, project their own work on an international platform (and contribute to shifting northern defined academic and policy discourses), and develop and gain solidarity and support for their work.

A second approach is enabling 'bottom-up' southern lead and designed projects in which southern research engage in comparative learning on designated themes. These could be organised along the four major thematic areas that PCD has identified. This would offer scope for researcher in one setting to make connections and learn from those in a different setting but confronting similar challenges in conducting research. Such networks would also encourage researchers who tend to be caught up in the day-to-day issues confronting their research project to connect these with wider research issues, to locate their locally engaged research with wider comparative or global norm-setting research.

A third would be to foster networks and research spaces negotiated between northern and southern researchers with a possible focus on policy engagement.

Alongside this there is the need to develop strategies for identifying new, capable researchers, particularly in areas where PCD does not yet have a significant profile, who can work in appropriate configurations. Opportunities might exist in conducting regular reviews and visits, meetings with individuals located at universities or other educational institutions, within the NGO sector, within government or international agencies, or by asking established researchers with solid research track record to identify those with relevant and appropriate research skills, producing interesting pieces of work and working with them to develop viable research projects.

3.4.4 *Local knowledge and 'insider' vs. 'outsider'*

In conducting research in the context of conflict and post-conflict situations, the advantages of the IDRC practice of using indigenous researchers are fairly self-evident, and have been strongly reinforced in the case studies. They will have detailed knowledge of local contexts and threats, a network of contacts that they can draw on, as well as often being able to establish the level of trust necessary to get individuals to respond to questionnaires, surveys, or participate in focus groups in an open and honest manner. They will have a sense of when the timing is right to push forward with a project, and when the context is such that proceeding with the research might put individuals and/or the research project at risk.

The challenge that confronts PCD/IDRC is how and whether to proceed when this local capacity is limited and weak, or when access to an area is problematic. The value of having such grounding is preeminent. One option, as discussed above, is to put in place mentoring mechanisms. This could extend to drawing in researchers from 'outside' – either from within the region or from the global north – who are knowledgeable about the country and conflict context, and can complement and track local skills. This could be part of a framework agreement which complements the existing project contract trail.

A major challenge of conducting research in the context of ongoing conflicts is the personal security risk to individual researchers. While these risks need to be taken seriously, it is often the case that they look worse to external observers than they do to internal researchers. In the case of the South Asia projects covered by this review, the operating modality was for PCD/IDRC to make the lead researchers aware of their concerns, but to allow the lead researchers to use their common sense and more detailed knowledge of the situation to make judgement calls on when and where to allow the research to proceed. The use of researchers with detailed knowledge of the locales in which they were being asked to conduct research and the research methodology of participant observation where the researcher lived for a period of time amongst the community she/he was researching developing adequate levels of trust with the community also went some way towards mitigating these risks.

3.4.5 *Power-knowledge structures and Policy Influence*

In funding research in the south, and particularly on projects where research institutes or researchers from the north are significant components of the project, there is a need to be aware of the power-knowledge dimensions in the setting of research frameworks. Simply because a project is south-south does not mean it has necessarily overcome north-south power-knowledge dynamics.

The view from some within the projects reviewed (and it may be more of a general view than one that characterises PCD) is that conceptual thinking is still being driven by and dominated by Ottawa, London or wherever, while the empirical work is being carried out in the south, on the south, sometimes instrumentally using research and researchers from the south. PCD should be aware of this perception, which reflects not so much the fact that it is pushing a particular world view (indeed PCD is extremely responsive to research needs from the frontlines), but rather that the current lexicon of 'peacebuilding' is still largely Northern defined and driven and current guidelines tend to favour researchers who are better at using the language of northern research and project management. A further dimension of this is constantly shifting academic and policy discourse in the north – from empowerment and building social capital, to good governance then to security sector reform – which leaves researchers in the global south disadvantaged, in a 'second class' position, and potentially marginalised in global research and policy discourses.

Opportunities need to be mobilised to foster a deeper conversation on the selection of the researchers and structures of communication, in which the south plays a more active role rather than merely being 'consulted' and 'listened to'. This requires debate on what is entailed in the very idea of a research community and on research partnerships which are open to critical engagement with the north-south power-knowledge nexus built into the current ideas and practices of research.

The transmission of academic research into policy insights and influence is a challenge that characterises much of academic research – not just in the global south. The perceived expectation that PCD/IDRC funded projects are meant to produce

policy-relevant insights is an aspiration that partners find difficult to meet, particularly given the diverse range of potential consumer of the research findings and the issue of the time frame within which such impact might be assessed. The pressure to produce 'policy-relevant research' can lead to generalised findings loosely disseminated to a poorly-defined group of organisations and individuals which is unlikely to foster processes of change. It might be sensible to dampen expectations regarding the likely policy impact of the research and to think through the differing means of dissemination of research findings as well as the meaning of 'policy relevance' itself. As noted above, a shift away from thinking in terms of 'influence' to 'engagement' would go some way to shifting and managing expectations in a more realistic and attainable direction.

Drawing on the experiences reviewed here, it would be useful to explore strategies which develop a more targeted approach, identifying key individual policy and decision makers and articulating the research findings in an institutional and policy discourse that makes sense to them. Another strategy is to map areas of debate at the outset, and identify the stakes, stakeholders, issues or geographic areas that a research project has empowered to intervene, so creating a new dynamic in the conflict.

It is also important to recognise that the research findings themselves need to be sensitive to the wider context – as is the case with the post-tsunami project which recognised that the focus on the 'post-tsunami moment' may be passing but that there are other contexts concerning rehabilitation where their findings may have some resonance and relevance. This, in turn, means that successful dissemination and policy influence may be as reliant on the network of personal contacts that researchers and institutes have as on the quality of the research findings themselves.

PCD should recognise the importance of research in conflict where value exists without a primary focus on 'policy' impact. For many interviewees, this was seen as one of the real strengths of PCD/IDRC funding – that it provided the space to explore questions, ideas, create a space for dialogue, without pressures to produce anodyne policy statements; that there was a recognition of the importance of, a shift away from a 'project orientation/mentality' that produces poor research and is of limited value in developing policy insights.

3.4.6 *External commitment and support*

Given the difficult political context of the fragmentation and multipolar nature of conflict generally around the world, as well as the financial and managerial issues surrounding a number of partner research institutes, PCD/IDRC could be forgiven for thinking about putting its limited resources to better use in other sectors. Yet given the growing importance of reliable evidence from the ground in conflict-affected countries, and the increasing importance given to social and political conflict, such a move would be detrimental to research, researchers and research capacity.

In their current context, what researchers and institutes are looking for is continued intelligent support from external bodies in order to weather their current situation and

learn on a growing body of experience, as well as a degree of solidarity in efforts to maintain some political space in which critical voices can be heard.

Because no two situations are exactly the same, PCD/IDRC should continue to be as flexible and adaptable in working within and around these issues and constraints with partner organisations in different stages of institutional development and variable capacities. Each situation will have to be strategised, in a culture of trust with partners and their environment. In some contexts there will be existing local capacity which can be sustained and enhanced. In other contexts, there is no pre-existing intellectual social capital to connect to.

Where there is no institutional capacity, and where there are only limited skills to build on, PCD/IDRC may need to continue to look for opportunities to locate research projects within a regional or multi-country project as a way of capacity building over time and use these as a means of identifying individuals with potential as researchers. In other contexts, there may be the need to engage support form independent, external researchers and organisations.

4   Annexes

4.1   Annex 1. Terms of Reference

Evaluation of Peace, Conflict and Development (PCD) Research Support in Countries and Regions affected by Violent Conflict

REVISED TERMS OF REFERENCE (April 2008)[30]

1.   Background:

The International Development Research Centre (IDRC)'s Peace, Conflict and Development (PCD) program initiative has a long history of involvement in countries experiencing active violent conflict or war-to-peace transitions, including Guatemala, Colombia, Palestine, Sri Lanka, Kashmir, Sudan, Uganda, and South Africa. In many cases, PCD initiated programming during a time of war-to-peace transition, but the violent conflict did not always cease. In fact, PCD's name change from "Peacebuilding and Reconstruction" in 2005 is a recognition that "the peace-to-conflict is not linear, and frequently sees recidivism to violence and uneasy, unstable and partial peace". Currently, PCD is "programming in select contexts marked by armed violence (Palestine, Colombia), and will carefully consider engagement in additional such contexts"[31].

With this in mind, PCD wants to learn more on how PCD-supported research can be effectively conducted, managed and communicated in environments in which the effects of violent conflict have a significant impact upon the research process. This evaluation was first outlined in the 2005-2011 Prospectus. Also, the 2003 external review for the program initiative, then called Peacebuilding and Reconstruction (PBR), noted: "While the review found no research ethics problems in any of the projects reviewed, there is a need for PBR to develop guidelines, procedures, or "lessons-learned" addressing the particular ethical challenges of research programming in conflict-prone areas."[32] This evaluation will address some of those ethical challenges as well.

This evaluation also reflects IDRC Centre-wide programming and policy. In recent years, IDRC has become increasingly concerned about reflecting on the complexities of supporting researchers and their research institutions in politically difficult environments, including contexts where there is unstable peace or risks of recidivism to political violence. In 2005, the Centre examined its involvement in countries in transition[33]. The transition study invited Centre staff to assess the prospects for change in transition contexts and to consider "the wider political, research and institutional environments […and] to think strategically on how changing contexts may impact programming and require responsiveness and flexibility"[34]. This concern is, in part, a

---

[30] The ToR have been adjusted following the methodological workshop that was held in Ottawa on the 29th and 30th of April 2008 with IDRC staff and Channel Research team.
[31] PCD Prospectus 2005-2011, p. 17.
[32] Brynen, Fox-Decent, and Brown, 2004
[33] Smyth, Nancy and Maggie Gorman (2005). Corporate Assessment Framework: Strategic Intelligence Performance Area "Understanding Local Realities in Countries in Transition", Policy and Planning Group, IDRC.
[34] *Ibid*, p. 35

reflection of the Canadian Foreign Policy community's increasing humanitarian, military and development assistance in conflict contexts and "fragile states".

This calls for more careful reflection on the conditions in which the diverse types of research support typically provided by IDRC is appropriate and viable, as well as determine how, when, and under what conditions PCD's programming can extend to additional countries where conflict is ongoing. The broader topic of IDRC support of research in conflict settings will be explored as part of IDRC's next environmental scan; and the PCD evaluation will feed into this Centre-wide discussion. The Evaluation of PCD Research Support in Countries affected by Violent Conflict will also explore questions of security and risk management to staff and project partners, which is a key concern for IDRC. Finally, the evaluation will explore some of the ethical issues involved in supporting peacebuilding research in violent conflict contexts. This evaluation should assist PCD in managing the tension between the need to be responsive in areas affected by violent conflict and being realistic in terms of both financial and human resources and political capital required.

Principles and Approaches to Programming
The **International Development Research Centre (IDRC)** is a public corporation created by the Parliament of Canada in 1970 to help developing countries use science and technology to find practical, long-term solutions to the social, economic, and environmental problems they face. Support is directed toward developing an indigenous research capacity to sustain policies and technologies that developing countries need to build healthier, more equitable, and more prosperous societies.
In carrying out its mission, IDRC provides funds and expert advice to developing-country researchers working to solve critical development problems. IDRC:
- **funds applied research** by researchers from developing countries on the problems they identify as crucial to their communities. Most projects supported result from direct exchanges between the Centre and developing-country institutions;
- **provides expert advice** to those researchers;
- **builds local capacity** in developing countries to undertake research and innovate.

Peace, Conflict and Development (PCD) is an IDRC program initiative which supports research *for* specific peacebuilding processes, as well as research *on* key peacebuilding challenges. PCD mainly responds to requests from research institutes, universities, policymakers, South-South and North-South networks, and civil society organizations. PCD encourages multidisciplinary approaches, encompassing economics, political science, anthropology, law, and social and gender analysis, as well as participatory/action research and other qualitative and quantitative methodologies.
PCD aims:
- to generate evidence-based findings that can be used to inform policy and programming decisions on root causes of violent conflict, the prevention of conflict, and equitable and sustainable development
- To build domestic ownership of peace processes
- To open spaces for discussion and dialogue
- To influence global policies and practices
- To build capacity for more rigorous, methodologically creative, and collaborative research.

2.   Objectives:
General Objective:

The main objective of this evaluation is to identify the factors (conditions and programming modalities) that facilitate or hinder the research process for PCD-supported projects in countries and regions affected by violent conflict, and the advantages and disadvantages of PCD programming modalities in achieving PCD objectives in those conflict settings.

Specific Objectives:
1. <u>On the Conflict Context:</u> Get a better understanding of what conditions (security, research infrastructure, community of researchers, etc.) need to be in place, especially when a return to violence seems imminent, so that 1) PCD can feasibly support research and 2) partners can feasibly conduct research in line with PCD's program objectives.
2. <u>On "What Happened" - the Partners' and PCD's Intents and Achievements:</u> Build a body of learning around the contributions PCD supported research can make in influencing policy, building research capacities, and increase domestic ownership of peace processes when taking into account the prevailing environmental conditions surrounding the research process and ethical considerations.
3. <u>On the "How"- Programming Modalities:</u> Increase learning around the strengths and weaknesses of PCD programming modalities and its relationships to its research partners in contributing to the achievement of PCD objectives in countries and regions affected by violent conflict.
4. <u>Forward Thinking:</u> With a better understanding of prevailing conditions, challenges and opportunities surrounding PCD supported research as well as PCD's programming modalities: explore the implications (in terms of resources, security, institutional risks, policy influence, how we partner, etc.) of potential expansion of PCD programming into countries and regions affected by violent conflict.

3.   Users and Uses of the Strategic Evaluation:

Primary Intended Users:
- PCD program staff

Secondary Users:
- IDRC senior management and IDRC program staff
- PCD's partners
- Other agencies/donors working in conflict contexts

Uses
PCD program staff can use the evaluation to:
- Learn how to improve its programming approach (project and program identification and development, programming modalities, monitoring, reporting and evaluation.) in contexts of active conflict where PCD already programs;
- Build on previous and current programming experience to assess how, when, and under what conditions PCD could expand programming;
- Identify PCD's comparative advantage in supporting the management and dissemination of research in conflict contexts, including capacity building;
- Assess how and when can PCD-supported research can influence policy, and what particular capacities PCD can/should be supporting in such environments;

- Identify the ethical issues surrounding programming in conflict contexts, as well as assess security and risks for PCD staff and its project partners.

IDRC senior management and other IDRC program staff can use the evaluation to:
- Learn about programming in conflict contexts with a wide variety of programs, IDRC's comparative advantages, and "lessons learned" from PCD's experience;
- Assess security and risks for IDRC staff and its project partners with any project in a conflict context;
- Assess how IDRC can/should address the particular challenges of working in a conflict context, including risks to IDRC's partner organizations, in particular when expanding programming into countries affected by violent conflict.

PCD partners can use the evaluation to:
- Increase their understanding of the value, utility and reach that research might have in contexts of conflict;
- Assess the utility of different programming modalities and better understand the strengths and limitations of PCD;
- Clarify PCD and IDRC's role, and the expectations of what PCD and IDRC can and cannot do to support partners in conflict contexts.

Other agencies/donors working in conflict contexts can use the evaluation for:
- Reflection on their own programming in conflict contexts.
- Get a better understanding of PCD's comparative advantage in programming in countries and regions affected by conflict.

4. Range of Issue and Evaluation Questions to be Considered

Specific objective 1: On the Conflict Context
Get a better understanding of what conditions (security, research capacity, institutional strength, ethical considerations etc.) need to be in place, especially when a return to violence seems imminent, so that 1) PCD can feasibly support research and 2) partners can feasibly conduct research in line with PCD's program objectives.

Lead questions: What kind of challenges and opportunities did the conflict context present to the research project? What kinds of dynamics were present at the political and institutional level? What were the capacities on the ground?

Range of potential sub-questions:
- What is/was the nature of the conflict context at the time of the research? Did PCD staff and/or partners conduct a conflict and/ or risk assessment as part of the project design process?
- Was the timing of the research assessed in terms of the political context, the policy environment, etc.?
- Did the conflict context change significantly during the course of the research? If so, did this affect the research process and how?
- Was there an assessment of the sustainability of the project's objectives and/or sustainability of the institution/network?
- Did the research project encounter potential or actual ethical and/or security risks, including: risks to the researchers, including differential risks to team

members in regions with varying levels of conflict, and interference or pressure by political or armed entities; risk to the research participants, including participants' right to maintain anonymity, informed consent, the safe storing of data, and the use of tapes/filming.

- Are there particular issues regarding institutional risks that are particular to conflict context, including institutional fragility, uncertain resource flow, excessive workloads, and staff turnover? How are these addressed by PCD and PCD's partner organizations?
- What kinds of challenges, if any, are present in getting country clearance for a project, and what is the effect on the research project?

Specific objective 2: On "What Happened" - the Partners' and PCD's Intents and Achievements
Build a body of learning around the ways in which PCD research partners adapt to the prevailing environmental conditions in conflict settings and address ethical considerations, and what contribution PCD-supported research can make in these conditions to influencing policy, building research capacities and increasing domestic ownership of peace processes.

Lead questions: What did the research partners and PCD set out to do (intents)? What actually happened? Why did it happen that way? What were PCD and its partners' coping strategies? In which ways did the research partners and PCD develop and adapt research questions, methodologies and approaches, capacity building and dissemination in a conflict setting? Are there particular strategies which where more successful?

Range of potential sub-questions:
- What kind of change in the environment is envisioned in the project (i.e. the project's theory of change)? For example, would change occur through individual change? Institutional change? By addressing root causes? By withdrawing resources for the conflict, etc?
- How did the suggested research methodology take into account the conflict context? Was the methodology adapted or modified if the context changed? What is PCD's role in developing the methodology? The research partners' role?
- Were there difficulties in accessing and collecting primary and secondary data? Did the research methodology include gender and/or generational analyses, multidisciplinary or comparative approaches, and/or worked with marginalized communities?
- Were there risks highlighted (institutional, personal security, objectives maybe not attainable), and if so, in which ways were these handled by PCD and its partners?
- During the course of conducting the research, what were the other practical, financial, political, methodological and ethical challenges related to the conflict context? These could include risks and challenges associated with potential unintended uses of research findings, for example.
- Was there an aspect of capacity building (individual or institutional) build within the research project, and what was the research partners' and PCD's role in developing that capacity building element?

- What has been PCD's role in dealing with research ethics challenges from the outset of the project? How have ethical challenges (if present) affected the research process?
- How was the research team composed? Has the conflict context affected the research composition? If it was composed of researchers both in and outside of the conflict context, was there a different level of risk between the researchers?
- How was the research disseminated and communicated? Were policymakers part of the target group? What kinds of challenges and opportunities in dissemination and policy influence were present because of the conflict context? What political sensitivities existed, and how were those dealt with?
- Were there unintended consequences of the research process?

Specific objective 3:On the "How"- Programming Modalities:
Increase learning around the strengths and weaknesses of PCD programming modalities and its relationships to its research partners in contributing to the achievement of PCD objectives in countries and regions affected by violent conflict.

Lead questions: What are the different programming decisions that PCD and its partners make regarding research taking into account a context of violent conflict? What modalities seem more successful, and under what conditions? What can PCD learn about this?

Range of potential sub-questions:
- How do PCD criteria for involvement in conflict contexts fare in terms of feasibility and flexibility in conducting, managing and disseminating research, especially considering the potential "instabilities" in the context?
- How does the research team assess the strengths and weaknesses of PCD's programming approach?
- What kind of programming modalities were considered and chosen by PCD partners and PCD staff (e.g. supporting an institution inside or outside of the conflict zone, composition of research team, research project vs. research support project, working in networks, capacity building, etc.). What adaptations have been/need to be made in design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of results? Does it differ from programming in any other contexts, and if so, how? What modalities seemed to be more successful, and under which circumstances?
- To what extent did PCD partners and PCD staff act with flexibility and responsiveness under changing circumstances? What institutional tools, mechanisms or constraints (e.g. financial constraints, institutional policies, etc.) were taken into consideration?
- During the course of managing the research, what practical, financial, political, methodological and ethical challenges came up? How were they dealt with? Are there particular strategies which where more successful?

Specific objective 4: Forward Thinking
With a better understanding of prevailing research conditions as well as PCD's programming modalities, explore the implications (in terms of resources, security,

institutional risks, policy influence, how we partner, etc.) *of potential expansion of PCD programming into countries and regions affected by violent conflict.*

Lead questions: What conclusions can be drawn from how external dimensions affect the research process? What are the manageable factors, through the partnership between PCD and its research partners? What are the strengths and weaknesses of PCD programming approaches to research in conflict settings? What lessons can be drawn in terms of the opportunities, challenges, and obstacles to potentially expanding PCD's programming into context of violent conflicts where it has not previously programmed significantly?

5. Methodology

The evaluation will consist of two components:
- Four case studies that examine the challenges and opportunities of PCD's programming in countries or regions affected by violent conflict;
- A fifth paper consolidating case study findings and providing strategic forward planning on the feasibility of expanding PCD's programming, both in countries where it already programs and in new countries/regions.

Case Study Sampling:

Case study countries/regions are selected to reflect:
- Significant recent PCD involvement: several projects ongoing or approved in those regions since the start of the 2005-2011 PCD Prospectus
- Balanced geographic coverage to the extent possible
- Selected case study countries/regions: **Colombia, Palestine/Middle East, East Africa, and Sri Lanka**
-

Case study projects are selected based on:
- Ongoing or approved in current Prospectus period
- Research was managed or conducted, all or in part, in a country or region with violent conflict
- Projects that present learning opportunities on the development, conduct, management and dissemination of research in conflict contexts
- NOTE: A list of selected projects will be available to the selected consultants once hired

Evaluation Methodology:
The evaluation methodology and instruments will be developed in discussion with PCD staff and the consultants, and this will be the focus of a methodology workshop (to be held before the start of the evaluation – date TBD).

Case study authors are expected to use qualitative methods as the primary source of data collection, including semi-structured interviews with staff, partners and beneficiaries. Document review of key project documents will also be critical to gain an in-depth understanding of the research problem and of PCD/PCD partners' perceptions of how peace can best be supported through research. The case study methodology will include a desktop review of relevant project documentation, interviews with relevant PCD staff, project leaders and relevant stakeholders.

A final workshop will bring together relevant project participants to discuss the draft report and exchange experiences and insights gained from conducting, managing and dissemination research in conflict-affected countries.

6. Roles and Responsibilities

Consultants Will:
- Be available for a Methodology workshop (before the beginning of the study, date TBD) **and** a Results workshop (date TBD, after the study is completed) in Ottawa
- Develop and use high quality methods:
    - Well done surveys, interviews that follow protocols, outputs that are insightful and well-written; these instruments/methods should be detailed in the workplan developed by the author for review by the evaluation manager.
    - Conduct all communications including interviews with respect for our partners and their work.
- Produce high quality outputs:
    - Workplan (with instruments/methods, survey questions, etc.)
    - Iterative process with report draft
    - Full report and a short summary/brief of findings
- Be resourceful:
    - Search for:
        - Additional documentation
        - Additional potential interviewees
    - Get general information on:
        - The case study organization
        - Its other donors
        - Its other projects
        - On capacity development and organizational capacity

Evaluation Manager (PCD):
- PCD will provide:
    - A list of case study project
    - An initial list of contacts and documents (Project Completion Reports, project proposals, etc.)
    - Support on travel logistics
    - Input on workplan and drafts of report
    - Background documentation

7. Expected Outcomes and Outputs/Report Requirements for Complete Evaluation:
- Participation of all consultants in a methodology workshop with PCD staff and other consultants (early 2008);
- Four case studies, 20-25 pages in length each;
- A 25-30-page paper to consolidate case study findings and provide strategic forward planning assessing the feasibility of expanding PCD's programming, both in countries where it already programs and in new countries/regions.
- A total of five briefs (2-4 pages each) on studies – one for each of the four case studies and a fifth summing up the findings of the consolidating/strategic planning paper;

- Participation of all consultants in a results workshop with IDRC staff, project partners, and other donors.

9. Estimated timeline and activities (in 2008 – dates TBD with availability of hired consultants):
Case Study Authors (Per Case Study – 4 case studies total)

Activity	Timeline (by month from beginning of contract)	Billable days per activity
Methodology workshop	1st month	Days, as follows: -1 day of workshop -1.5 days in transit
Workplan	Submitted in 2nd month	2 days for workplan development
Background research	2nd month	3 days
Field Work	3rd month	7 days, as follows: -5 days in field -2 days in transit
Writing report and summary/brief	3rd and/or 4th month	6 days
Submission of report and brief/summary	5th month	
Revision of report and brief/summary	6th month	2 days
Participation in results workshop and submit final report	8th month	2.5 days, as follows: -1.5 days in transit, -1 day of workshop
Total Billable Days per Case Study:		25 days

Author writing consolidating/strategic planning paper

Activity	Timeline (by month from beginning of contract)	Billable days per activity
Methodology workshop	1st month	Days, as follows: -1 day of workshop -1.5 days in transit
Workplan	Submitted in 5th month	3 days for workplan development
Developing and Writing report and summary/brief	5th and 6th month	20 days
Submission of report and brief/summary	End of 6th month	
Revision of report and brief/summary	7th month	2 days
Participation in results workshop and submit final report	8th month	2.5 days, as follows: -1.5 days in transit, -1 day of workshop
Total Billable Days:		30 days

10. Quality of the Evaluation Report
The quality of the evaluation report produced by the evaluators will be judged by IDRC's Evaluation Unit on four internationally recognized standards: utility, feasibility, accuracy, and propriety. A copy of IDRC's Evaluation Guideline 3

"Formatting Evaluation Reports at IDRC" and Evaluation Guideline 4 "Quality Assessment of IDRC Evaluation Reports" will be provided to the evaluator/ evaluation team.

4.2 Annex 2. Biography of the consultants

Emery Brusset

Mr Emery Brusset is a veteran evaluation team leader and has developed a number of specific analytical tools to ensure full coverage of a complex subject. Mr Brusset is a consultant specialised in impact assessments and performance evaluations for conflict related aid programmes or interventions in fragile environments. Over the last twenty years he has been working full time in programmes in conflict prevention, the rule of law, and humanitarian aid. Mr Brusset combines expertise in a range of analytical methodologies based on the systematic use of indicators and mapping methods, and evidence testing of the links between programmes and broader outcomes. He has a confirmed track record of successful achievement of complex and sensitive assignments for a variety of clients in the public and private sector

Mr Brusset is a political scientist and sociologist with tried and texted competence in carrying out assignments for research institutes (such as Collaborative for Development Associates) and of institutions working on conflict environments (Norwegian Red Cross, NOREPS). He has a reputation for engaging and persuasive interventions with high relevance to sensitive organisational change. He is of French nationality and is the director of Channel Research based out of Belgium.

Mark Hoffman

Mark Hoffman teaches in the Department of International Relations at the London School of Economics. He served as Dean of Undergraduate Studies from 2000-2006. His research and teaching has concentrated on two connected areas: conflict and peace studies, and contemporary international theory. He has also served as Director of the Conflict Analysis and Development Unit, which engages in policy research, evaluations, provides support to facilitated peace dialogues and contributes to training in conflict prevention and peacebuilding for a range of intergovernmental, governmental and nongovernmental organisations. His scholar-practitioner work has focused on the former Soviet Union, particularly Moldova, and south Asia, particularly Sri Lanka and Nepal.

Clotilde Gouley

Mrs Clotilde Gouley holds a Master degree in International Conflict Analysis from the University of Kent at Canterbury, England. She specializes in evaluation of peacebuilding interventions and natural resource (oil and mining) conflicts. Over the past 7 years, she has carried out long term research projects and short-term consulting assignments on these conflict-related issues.

Mrs Gouley has worked four years for an NGO in Peru (2002-2006), conducting research on mining conflicts, and now works as an associate consultant with Channel Research (Belgium), covering issues in peacebuilding, conflict-sensitivity, community relations and Social Impact Assessment (in Colombia, Guatemala, Peru and New Caledonia). She combines strong research experience (desk studies and field research) and expertise in a range of analytical and participatory methodologies, such as risk, stakeholder and conflict mappings.

As a researcher, she took part for example in the Project "Conflict and Collaboration in the management of natural resources in Latin America and the Caribbean", led by the United Nations University for Peace and financed by IDRC. As a consultant, she took part in studies and evaluations related to conflict, human rights and peacebuilding in Latin America (for example in Colombia with the Swedish Agency for International Development (Sida) and in Africa (Uganda and the Democratic Republic of Congo with the OECD). Mrs Gouley is a French national and speaks fluent French, English and Spanish.

Annina Mattsson

Mrs Annina Mattsson holds a Masters degree in Violence, Conflict and Development from the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) at the University of London, England. She has proven knowledge and hands-on experience of conflict and development settings as she has lived and worked in Ramallah in the Palestinian territories for 16 months. She has extensive research experience of the different issues development initiatives in conflict settings are faced with, especially in the Palestinian territories, having written her Masters thesis on the various aspects of donor funding present. As a consultant for Channel Research, she has taken part in studies and evaluations related to conflict, human rights and peacebuilding in the Middle East (for example in Palestine with the Swedish Agency for International Development (Sida)) and has been involved in a number of evaluations in active conflict settings such as Sudan and Sri Lanka.

Mrs Mattsson is a Finnish national and speaks fluent Finnish, Swedish, English, Spanish and French, and can converse in colloquial Arabic.