

**BUILDING STRONGER UNIVERSITIES, PHASE III
(BSU 3)**

PROGRAMME

APPRAISAL REPORT

ABBREVIATIONS

AT	Appraisal Team
BSU	Building Stronger Universities
CDP	Council for Development Policy/Udviklingspolitisk Råd (UPR)
CN	Concept Note
DAC	Development Assistance Committee (OECD)
DANIDA	Danish International Development Cooperation
DKK	Danish Kroner
EoD	Embassy of Denmark
EVAL	Kontoret for evaluering og udviklingsforskning/Department for Evaluation and Development Research
FFU	Consultative Research Committee for Development Research
HRBA	Human Rights Based Approach
KCMUC	Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College
KFU	Kontoret for Kvalitet og Faglighed i Udviklingssamarbejdet/Department for Technical Quality Support (TQS)
KNUST	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MTR	Mid Term Review
PBL	Problem Based Learning
PD	Programme Document
SOP	Standard Operating Procedures
SUA	Sokoine University of Agriculture
SUZA	State University of Zanzibar
TCU	Tanzania Commission for Universities
UG	University of Ghana
USD	United States Dollar

TABLE OF CONTENT

<i>Abbreviations</i>	ii
<i>Executive Summary</i>	v
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 THE PROGRAMME	1
2.1 Summary of proposed engagements	1
2.2 The preparatory process	4
2.3 Programme documentation	6
3 PROGRAMME/PROJECT ASSESSMENT	8
3.1 Policy and strategy frameworks	8
3.2 Theory of change, objectives and results framework	8
3.3 Choice of partners and modalities	11
3.4 Development effectiveness agenda	11
3.5 Programme management, reporting and monitoring	12
3.6 Budget, financial management and flow of funds	13
3.7 Risk management framework	14
3.8 Sustainability and continuation/exit scenarios	14
4 SUPPORT TO KWAME NKRUMAH UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (KNUST), GHANA	15
4.1 Engagement design and rationale	15
4.2 Partner commitment and capacity	15
4.3 Results framework and partner monitoring systems	16
4.4 Risk assessment and management	16
4.5 Budget, flow of funds and financial management	16
4.6 Recommendations	16
5 SUPPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY OF GHANA	17
5.1 Engagement design and rationale	17
5.2 Partner commitment and capacity	17
5.3 Results framework and partner monitoring systems	17
5.4 Risk assessment and management	18
5.5 Budget, flow of funds and financial management	18
5.6 Recommendations	18
6 SUPPORT TO GULU UNIVERSITY, UGANDA	18
6.1 Engagement design and rationale	18
6.2 Partner commitment and capacity	19
6.3 Results framework and partner monitoring systems	19
6.4 Risk assessment and management	19
6.5 Budget, flow of funds and financial management	19
6.6 Recommendations	20
7 SUPPORT TO KILIMANJARO CHRISTIAN MEDICAL UNIVERSITY COLLEGE (KCMUC), TANZANIA	20
7.1 Engagement design and rationale	20

- 7.2 Partner commitment and capacity 21
- 7.3 Results framework and partner monitoring systems 21
- 7.4 Risk assessment and management 21
- 7.5 Budget, flow of funds and financial management 22
- 7.6 Recommendations..... 22
- 8 SUPPORT TO STATE UNIVERSITY OF ZANZIBAR (SUZA), TANZANIA**
22
- 8.1 Engagement design and rationale 22
- 8.2 Partner commitment and capacity 23
- 8.3 Results framework and partner monitoring systems 23
- 8.4 Risk assessment and management 23
- 8.5 Budget, flow of funds and financial management 23
- 8.6 Recommendations..... 23
- 9 SUPPORT TO SOKOINE UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE (SUA),**
TANZANIA 24
- 9.1 Engagement design and rationale 24
- 9.2 Partner commitment and capacity 25
- 9.3 Results framework and partner monitoring systems 25
- 9.4 Risk assessment and management 25
- 9.5 Budget, flow of funds and financial management 25
- 9.6 Recommendations..... 26

- Annex 1 Summary of recommendations
- Annex 2 Process action plan
- Annex 3 Terms of Reference
- Annex 4 Meeting schedule/persons met. Available on F2: 2016-45640

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Concept Note for the programme Building Stronger Universities, Phase III, 2017-2021 was on the agenda of Danida's Programme Committee 5 December 2016. In first half of 2017, draft programme documentation was appraised by an appraisal team (AT) led by a team leader from the Department for Technical Quality Support (TQS). The appraisal included meetings with Danish university partners in February as well as field appraisal missions to Ghana, Uganda and Tanzania in March. Final programme documentation is envisaged to be tabled to Danida's Council for Development Policy at its meeting planned for 5 September 2017.

The overall conclusion of the appraisal is that the proposed programme is recommended for presentation to the Council for Development Policy taking the recommendations of this report into consideration.

The programme is the third phase of the Building Stronger Universities (BSU) programme that was initiated in 2011 with a focus on strengthening research capacities (rather than research per se) at a number of partner universities in the South. BSU needs to be seen in the light of the research grants issued via the Consultative Research Committee for Development Research (FFU) which is the other main Danish aid channel to universities and research institutions in the South. While the latter provides support to research directly, BSU is focused on enhancing capacity for research.

With a budget of DKK 90 million over four years (2017-2021), BSU 3 builds upon the framework and lessons from its predecessor, although its scope is somewhat more focused and the number of partner universities has been slightly reduced.

The six universities proposed for support are as follows. In Ghana: University of Ghana (UG) and Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST). In Tanzania: Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA), Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College (KCMUC), and the State University of Zanzibar (SUZA). In Uganda: Gulu University (GU).

The appraisal identified a total of 16 pertinent recommendations at the overall programme level with additional 21 at the level of the six university partnerships. The summary of recommendations is in Annex 1.

Each of the six partnerships has developed a separate partnership proposal (akin to a project document or an engagement document) and these form part of the programme documentation.

Separate formal Development Engagement Documents have not been prepared. The AT considers, however, that the partnership proposals are sufficient for this purpose provided that they are strengthened in line with the suggestions and recommendations included in this report.

As in the previous phases, the Southern universities will be partnered with consortia of Danish universities in various constellations. Each consortium is led by a coordinator and there is a corresponding coordinator within the partner institution in the South. It is planned that overall programme management will continue to be provided by the Danida Fellowship Centre (DFC).

In addition to the formal recommendations, the report contains a series of actionable suggestions. This is especially the case at the level of universities/engagements.

The specifics of each partnership vary, although all of them include elements of administrative capacity building, research capacity building, and research. The latter is generally regarded as a means to strengthen research capacity by engaging senior researchers in the programme, developing and practicing new research methodologies in combination with support to a limited number of PhDs and Post Doc positions (i.e. early career researchers).

The AT has some suggestions regarding how to further strengthen mutual learning (e.g. through an annual BSU seminar), strategic oversight (through employment of a monitoring consultant in addition to DFC's administrative role), and synergies (through linkages to Danida country programmes where feasible).

The AT assesses that some of the aspects raised by the Danida Programme Committee on 5 December 2016 require further reflection in the programme document (PD); notably risks and assumptions – especially related to responsibilities for their monitoring and mitigation - and linkages to Danish embassies/country programmes.

The programme preparation process has been participatory and largely driven by the South. The PD is generally well written and provides much of the overview required for the programme. However, the PD would benefit from a more succinct theory of change that articulates the role that research activities play in relation to the programme's capacity development objectives. Against the background of BSU 3 potentially being the last phase of the programme, there is need to further outline sustainability and exit. The actual role of the Danish partner institutions is not sufficiently described in the draft PD. This should also be addressed, ensuring that there is clarity amongst both sets of partners regarding their roles. This report also contains pertinent findings and further recommendations regarding the theory of change, results framework and budget. With a view to align the PD even more with Danish policies and guidelines, youth and gender equality concerns should be even more explicit.

In addition to the improvements to the PD that are raised in this report, the appraisal team considers that further work is required to bring the partnership proposals up to a standard whereby they can guide the programme inception and implementation. The appraisal team's suggestions and recommendations in this regard are included in the appraisal of the individual partnership proposals.

1 INTRODUCTION

The appraisal of the proposed programme “*Building Stronger Universities, Phase III, 2017-2021*” was fielded during March 2017. It provided an independent assessment and quality assurance of the design and documentation of the programme in accordance with DANIDA’s Aid Management Guidelines. See Terms of Reference (ToR) in Annex 3 for further description of the scope of work of the appraisal.

The appraisal mission included field trips to Accra and Kumasi in Ghana, Kampala and Gulu in Uganda, and Moshi, Zanzibar, Morogoro and Dar es Salaam in Tanzania. Consultations were also held with prospective Danish partners. Field missions included meetings with Danish embassies and national authorities involved in support and regulation of universities.

During the mission, the Appraisal Team (AT) met with key stakeholders amongst all the partner institutions and also with the Danish embassies in the three countries (see annex 2). The appraisal was carried out by Henrik Vistisen (chief adviser, team leader, MFA, KFU) and Julian Brett (external consultant, Tana). In addition, Lars Christian Oxe (MFA, EVAL) joined the team as a resource person. The AT thanks everyone met during the assignment, for allocating their time and sharing their knowledge and experience with the team.

This report presents the findings and recommendations of the AT, based on the institutions and persons consulted during the visit and on the documents consulted prior to and during the visit. The proposals and recommendations provided in the report reflect the position of the AT. The views expressed may not necessarily be shared by the Management of the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs/DANIDA or the partner institutions concerned.

The overall conclusion of the appraisal is that the proposed programme is recommended for presentation to the Council for Development Policy taking the recommendations of this report into consideration.

2 THE PROGRAMME

2.1 Summary of proposed engagements

The programme under consideration is the third phase of the Building Stronger Universities (BSU) programme that was initiated in 2011 with a focus on strengthening research capacities (rather than research per se) at a number of partner universities in the South. BSU needs to be seen in the light of the other main Danish aid channel to universities and research institutions in the South, which is research grants issued via the Consultative Research Committee for Development Research – FFU. While the latter provides support to research directly, BSU is focused on enhancing capacity for research.

The current phase (BSU 2) has used a partnering modality whereby Southern universities have identified needs and priorities and Danish universities have formed consortia and expressed interest in assisting them to improve their research environments (research

policies, standards & procedures, research methods and supervision, teaching capacity and facilities, grant management etc.). Initially, BSU 2 experienced some challenges due to the focus on institutional capacity development without accompanying research projects. A compromise was to include limited pilot research studies and a limited number of PhD scholarships – thus recognising the need for academic incentives as well as the nexus between actual research and capacity for research.

With a budget of DKK 90 million over four years (2017-2021), BSU 3 builds upon the framework and lessons from its predecessor, although its scope is more focused (with fewer thematic areas) and the number of partner universities has been reduced slightly.¹ The six universities proposed are: University of Ghana; Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST), Ghana; Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA), Tanzania; Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College (KCMUC), Tanzania; the State University of Zanzibar (SUZA); and Gulu University, Uganda. The AT observes that the capacity of these six universities varies considerably (notably, Gulu and SUZA are smaller and have a more limited research basis than the others) and their relative strengths and weaknesses are reflected in the programme documentation.

Each of the partnerships has developed a separate partnership proposal (akin to a project document or an engagement document) and these form part of the programme documentation. The specifics of each partnership vary, although all of them include elements of administrative capacity building, research capacity building, and research. The latter is generally regarded as a means to strengthen research capacity by engaging senior researchers in the programme, developing and practicing new research methodologies in combination with support to a limited number of PhDs and Post Doc positions (i.e. early career researchers). The modality adopted by the majority of partners is to integrate the programme objectives into two or more thematic work packages (e.g. malaria, climate change) and use these as vehicles for improving research capacity.

The following provides an overview of the six partnership proposals:

- **Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST)**, with its lead Danish partner Aarhus University, will continue with the three thematic areas from BSU 2 (agriculture/environment, entrepreneurship and health). A strategic prioritization of cross-disciplinary research groups will boost research quality, research capacity and outreach. Outreach will be demand driven through the involvement of industry and other stakeholders that can secure innovation and problem-based research. A focus will be to disseminate experiences from BSU internally with a view to secure university-level adoption. KNUST will not use funds to fund individual full PhDs but will rather use resources on facilitating PhDs' involvement in interdisciplinary research groups and training of PhDs in generic research-related topics e.g. through a Doctoral College. Compared to BSU 2, the proposal has a stronger focus on innovation and entrepreneurship with support for the university's incubation center and establishment of networks boosting cooperation between

¹ Kathmandu University will not participate in BSU 3

industry and academia. A fourth work package on research support services and facilities caters for further strengthening the office for research grant management. Under BSU 2, SOP software and system for grants accounting and research management information were produced in beta. BSU 3 will populate the systems and see them rolled out to the entire university.

- The partnership proposal from **University of Ghana** with its lead Danish partner Aarhus University is a further focusing and consolidation of the project from BSU 2. The most significant change is the reduction in the number of thematic areas from four to two (malaria and climate change). Within these two work packages, BSU 3 will support thematic research groups with PhD/post doctoral teams collaborating on pilot research. This will include support to PhD education, outreach, and to four PhDs. A common research platform, coupled with PhD courses, research-based training and outreach is expected to produce a stronger research base that has societal, university and individual benefits. A third work package will provide institutional capacity building, including improved e-access to literature, VDC facilities, improved grant management and financial information systems, stronger grant application processes, and post-doc career paths. Certain of these elements (e.g. PhD courses) were initiated during BSU 2 and are being integrated into the standard curriculum at UG.
- **Gulu University (GU)**, and its Danish partners led by Aalborg University, will also pursue three work packages: Work package 1) on research and teaching infrastructure, services and facilities; work package 2) called Transforming Education and work package 3) under the heading Rights, Resources and Gender in Post-War Development. GU proposes to continue developing e-learning and problem-based learning approaches from BSU 2, albeit seemingly on a lower scale. Furthermore, the proposal introduces collaborative ‘action research’ in relation to issues relevant for the communities and in partnership with communities, government and the private sector. The proposal furthermore includes outputs enhancing university services and facilities and support to cross-cutting PhD- courses as well as support to the implementation of individual PhD’s through funding of PhD-students’ research projects.
- **Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College (KCMUC)**, and its Danish partners led by Copenhagen University, will focus on three work packages addressing 1) improved administrative procedures for research, 2) improved research facilities and systems; and 3) research practices and outreach relating to the thematic areas of reproductive health, malaria, and HIV respectively. This will include support to PhD education, collaborative research teams, and to three PhDs and three Post Doc positions. Peer to peer collaboration between KCMUC and Danish counterparts provides a qualitative edge and momentum to these efforts. The main changes from BSU 2 are an increase in research activities and a further thematic focusing (the area of neglected tropical diseases will no longer be pursued).

- **State University of Zanzibar (SUZA)**, and its Danish partners led by Copenhagen University, will also focus on three work packages: 1) environmental public health, 2) marine and coastal ecosystem health, and 3) cross cutting issues supporting university wide research capabilities. Specifically BSU 3 will focus its research on a) waste management, b) mosquito control and c) food safety. BSU 2 saw the TCU accreditation of an environmental health degree at the bachelor's level. BSU 3 will work towards accreditation at Masters level. Resources have gone into developing a state of the art laboratory to support prioritized sciences. The laboratory is seen as a key component in SUZA's business model for provision of consultancy services and related income generation. BSU 3 will support additional efforts. SUZA proposes full funding for 1 PhD in environmental public health and – as outlined in the meeting the AT had with SUZA - 9 months of Post Doc funding under the marine and ecosystem health work packages.
- **Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA)**, and its Danish partners led by Copenhagen University, has initiated development of a PhD-programme in agro-ecology, a PhD-programme in agribusiness and an MSc-programme in Aquaculture. At university-level, introduction of a computerised financial management system has been supported. The thematic areas are suggested to continue in the third phase by fully establishing the three new post-graduate programmes and advancing each of them further by establishing research groups undertaking pilot research activities and education of individual PhDs. Furthermore, an outreach component has been added to the programme. Training and promoting the use of the computerised financial management system will also be included in the third phase.

Separate formal Development Engagement Documents (DEDs) have not been prepared. The AT considers, however, that the partnership proposals are sufficient for this purpose provided that they are strengthened in line with the suggestions and recommendations included in this report.

As in the previous phases, the Southern universities will be partnered by consortia of Danish universities, these being the Universities of Copenhagen, Odense, Roskilde, Aarhus, Aalborg, and the Danish Technical University in various constellations. Each consortium is led by a coordinator and there is a corresponding coordinator within the partner institution in the South. It is planned that overall programme management will continue to be provided by the Danida Fellowship Centre (DFC).

2.2 The preparatory process

The preparation process has built on the foundations established by the previous programme phases and lessons learned from these have been incorporated. A Mid Term Review was undertaken in March 2016 and this was followed by a Mid Term Seminar in April 2016. Inter alia, the Mid Term Review found that:

- There was a need for DFC and MFA to consider how to ensure that learning and strategic outcomes are documented and shared and used in future planning
- There was a need to strengthen strategic oversight, supervision of institutional learning and financial management in the Southern universities

- Some Danish consortia were struggling with too many small yet time-consuming administrative tasks
- Synergy effects and stronger links and coordination between BSU and other Danish instruments could be strengthened, and
- Southern partners' outreach opportunities were not sufficiently addressed.

The AT finds that responses to these issues are partly reflected in the programme documentation. The AT has some suggestions regarding how to further strengthen mutual learning (e.g. through an annual BSU seminar), strategic oversight (through employment of a monitoring consultant in addition to DFC's administrative role), and synergies (through linkages to Danida country programmes where feasible (the Uganda Country Programme does this to some extent). The programme response needs to be more explicit in these respects.

The preparation has also been informed by a Concept Note prepared by the Danish MFA/EVAL setting out the programme's intervention logic and an indicative budget frame. Inter alia, this foresees a programme that is leaner and more thematically focused than its predecessors and with a continued focus on building research capacity and a stronger approach to outreach.

The Concept Note (CN) was discussed in the Danida Programme Committee on 5 December 2016 and received positive feedback. Recognising the level of ambition (especially in relation to outreach), the Committee recommended that risks and assumptions be further spelt out and the results framework be further developed (especially in relation to outreach). It was also suggested that innovative ways be found to involve Danish embassies and country programmes where feasible. The AT assesses that some of these aspects require further reflection in the PD; notably risks and assumptions – especially related to responsibilities for their monitoring and mitigation - and linkages to Danish embassies/country programmes.

The AT has the impression that the subsequent preparation process has been participatory and largely driven by the South. Partners have taken their starting point in the Concept Note and have integrated lessons learned and experiences from BSU 2. EVAL contracted a process consultant to assist the formulation process and draft the overall PD and annexes. The consultant has also been familiar with the programme, having been involved in supporting the implementation of BSU 2. While the CN has generally been followed, the AT understands that certain deviations were proposed (notably in relation to the intervention logic). Partners appear to have experienced difficulty responding to both the old and the new sets of outcomes and, as a result, a uniform approach is not reflected in the partnership proposals. This issue is discussed further below. The AT considers that closer coordination between the consultant and EVAL would have been beneficial and could have promoted greater alignment between the CN and the draft PD.

The preparation process has also included dialogue with BSU 2 Danish university partners, all of whom are expected to continue into BSU 3 with some minor adjustments within consortia.

The AT was informed by the partners that the preparation process had been extensive and had involved considerable discussion, drafting and redrafting of partnership proposals (in some cases up to nine drafts were produced). The AT observes that this has involved relatively high transaction costs for a programme entering its third phase with relatively minor adjustments from its direct predecessor.

2.3 Programme documentation

The PD is generally well written and provides much of the overview required for the programme. In the opinion of the AT, certain areas (especially the description of partner engagements – section 3.3) would benefit from some expansion and greater depth so that a clearer picture of the expected focus areas and results is provided. Against the background of BSU 3 potentially being the last phase of the programme, there is also a need to cover additional areas (especially sustainability and exit). The PD would also benefit from a more succinct theory of change (section 3.2) that articulates the role that research activities play in relation to the programme's capacity development objectives.

It would also be informative to have a concise illustration of the overall progress achieved towards BSU objectives since 2011. While section 2.4 provides some of this at overall level, there is a need to know how far along the continuum towards effective research capacity the individual partners have travelled? The PD indicates that there has been progress but it is not easy to place this in context and the partnership proposals display a similar challenge. As BSU 3 is likely to be the final phase of the programme, it is important that there is a focus on consolidation and that any new initiatives are able to deliver results within the programme period. Inclusion of a matrix (at annex) could, for example, show the key results achieved in BSU 2 and the priorities for BSU 3 according to each university.

While they are mentioned briefly (in section 3.3), the actual role of the Danish partner institutions is not sufficiently described in the draft PD and the AT consider that this should also be addressed, ensuring that there is clarity amongst both sets of partners regarding their roles. This could be achieved through use of a table or diagram.

The AT also has some comments regarding the results framework and the budget (see relevant sections below).

In addition to the improvements to the PD that are raised in this report, the AT considers that further work is required to bring the partnership proposals up to a standard whereby they can guide the programme inception and implementation. The six partnership proposals take different approaches to reaching the programme goals and in general would benefit from further strengthening to improve their readability, reduce overlap between different sections, and improve the clarity of the actual outputs (and related activities) that are envisaged. The AT's suggestions and recommendations in this regard are included in the individual partnership proposal assessments.

Common to the majority of the proposals is the need to:

- Improve the description of outcomes and outputs so that the intervention logic is easier to follow. The aim here should be to provide sufficient information to explain what will be undertaken and how or why this will contribute to achieving the intended outcome. Strengthening the intervention logic in this way will also assist the partners to produce robust implementation plans. In a number of cases, the outcome and output statements could also be sharpened in line with Danida standards.
- Improve the theories of change presented so that they explain the rationale and logic of the proposals more succinctly, including important pre-conditions and assumptions. The AT recommends using a simple if we do X, then Y is expected because of Z assumptions. The role of research (pilot research projects, research groups etc.) in contributing to research capacity development should be more in focus.
- Describe the expected roles to be played by the Danish partners.
- Describe exit and sustainability scenarios.

In order to reflect these improvements, some further editing and strengthening of the PD and the individual partnership proposals is required. The AT considers that this should be achieved before submission of the programme to the CDP. Given the effort that has already been expended on the partnership proposals, the AT suggests that consultancy support be provided to assist the partners and that attention be directed to critical areas only.

The AT notes that, once approval has been given, a short inception phase will be required during which the partners will develop the concrete implementation plans for the partnerships and that this is likely to benefit from a period of process consultancy from a suitable individual - ideally combining familiarity with the programme and experience in results based programming.

- Recommendation 1: Make reference to the necessary procurement of technical assistance (TA) to support the inception phase.
- Recommendation 2: Adjust the programme document (PD) in line with the comments made in the appraisal report, in particular relating to the theory of change (3.2), assumptions and risks (3.4), programme management (3.6), and sustainability and exit (the latter to be a new section that needs to be developed in the PD).
- Recommendation 3: In the programme document include a short (10 line) outline per partnership of content of main work packages. In practice, this means extending the current descriptions by 3-4 lines. Wording from appraisal report's section 2.1. could inspire.
- Recommendation 4: Adjust the partnership proposals in line with overall programme as well as individual proposal related recommendations.

3 PROGRAMME/PROJECT ASSESSMENT

3.1 Policy and strategy frameworks

The AT considers the BSU 3 design to be relevant to the national development (and research) contexts in the three countries and to the individual universities in the South. Research is one of the priorities mentioned in the three countries' national development plans and BSU is regarded as playing a unique role in its focus on capacity building rather than support to research *per se* as is the case with most other externally funded programmes. The average level of national investment in research remains relatively low, however, and the BSU partners face challenges in relation to infrastructure, systems and processes, research education, and teaching/supervising staff. These challenges are relatively more pronounced in certain of the universities, particularly Gulu, SUZA, and SUA.

BSU 3 is also aligned with a number of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), in particular SDG 5 (gender equality), SDG 7 (affordable and clear energy), SDG 8 (decent work and economic growth), SDG 13 (climate action), SDG 16 (peace, justice and strong institutions), and SDG 17 (partnerships)

In relation to Danish policy, BSU is well aligned with the new development strategy – *The World 2030* - and with the *Strategic Framework for Development Research, 2014-2018*. The programme has a clear focus on transition and growth, and on partnerships. By supporting critical thinking and evidence-based decision-making, the programme will also contribute to human rights and democracy. It also offers considerable scope to further promote youth and women's empowerment and gender equality. However, the PD and partnership proposals should be even more explicit in this respect. With its focus on capacity building for research, BSU complements the research grants issued via the Consultative Research Committee for Development Research – FFU.

The AT notes that certain of the partnership proposals will directly contribute to improving knowledge on climate change and its effects (e.g. University of Ghana, KNUST). The PD also highlights (section 2.3) a number of synergies with other Danish engagements, including private sector development and climate change (Ghana), health and agriculture (Tanzania), and political inclusion/peacebuilding (Uganda).

- Recommendation 5: Highlight youth and gender equality in the PD (e.g. in section 3.1). The AT notes that relevant indicators are gender sensitive.

3.2 Theory of change, objectives and results framework

The PD includes an overall *Theory of Change*, which, while extensive, is not particularly clear and would benefit from greater linkage to the programme outcomes. The ToC describes a number of hypotheses and pre-conditions, including the assumption that improvements in research administration and in research approaches and organisation will lead to stronger research products, peer based partnerships provide incentives at management level (generating buy-in to BSU), and that shared research interests provide incentives amongst researchers leading to results in teaching, research and outreach. These assumptions are relevant and will need to be monitored in relation to the individual

partnerships. The AT notes that assumptions are spread across various sections of the PD (notably sections 3.2 and 3.4) and that a consolidation of them would improve the focus of the document.

The justification for the programme thus hinges on the role that capacity building for research and stronger systems for administration can lead to stronger research deliverables in the South universities. The AT notes that, while the potential for this exists in all of the universities, the capacity of the six universities to absorb support at the same level and rate varies considerably (SUZA and Gulu are considerably weaker than the others) and the partnership proposals have needed to align themselves with the specific contexts and needs relating to each partner. Coupled with the thematic differences between the universities, this has led to partnership proposals that vary in terms of content, approach and the degree of alignment with the PD's intervention logic.

The AT considers that a further effort is required to harmonise the partnership proposals with the programme's result framework. While the partnership proposals attempt to utilise the intervention logic provided by the PD (which itself differs from that proposed in the CN – see below), in practice they adopt a mixed outcome/work package approach whereby three or more thematic work packages in each proposal contribute to the PD's outcomes. While all partners have strived to achieve as much alignment as possible, it is obvious that there is not a perfect match; a review of the partners' results frameworks shows that the language used in outcome statements is inconsistent and that outputs (as currently described) often contribute to more than one outcome at programme level. This is especially the case with KNUST and SUZA. As a consequence, it will not be possible to directly correlate outcome results from the university with the outcomes expected in the PD.

The AT also notes that the outcomes proposed in the CN differ from those used in the PD. The main difference is that the PD separates research related education, PhDs and smaller scale research activities (outcome 2) from outreach (outcome 3). In the CN, research and outreach are combined (outcome 3).

On the basis of the output descriptions provided in the partnership proposals, the AT has attempted a distribution of outputs according to the outcomes described in the PD and CN respectively. The conclusion from this is that the CN outcomes provide a more even distribution of outputs because they allow for research to be combined with outreach. However, the AT would like to add that these distinctions are rather blurred in practice and that research capacity development is often intertwined with research activities.

Given that the partners' output descriptions require further refinement to enable them to be accurately allocated to individual outcomes, the AT considers that the PD should revert to the intervention logic originally described in the CN. Moreover, under each outcome statement, a clear and concise description of the outcome area should be provided to ease the alignment of outputs.

In relation to the outcomes and outputs in the individual partnership proposals, the AT is conscious that considerable effort has been made to develop arrangements that are

meaningful for the partners involved and that these will be further expanded during the implementation planning. The AT does not wish to disrupt these arrangements but considers that refinement of the outputs (so that they (a) link as clearly as possible to a single outcome area and (b) reflect the results of the concrete activities to be planned) will assist the partners (and DFC and/or EVAL) during implementation planning as well as subsequently during implementation and reporting. The AT considers that further process consultancy will be required to achieve this; indeed, the process will probably need to be strongly facilitated by the consultant while ensuring that the changes made maintain the scope and prioritisation included in the individual proposals. BSU2 benefitted from considerable process consultancy input. This model was replicated in the preparation and formulation of BSU 3. Continued application of process consultancy inputs in BSU 3 especially during inception – but also implementation (e.g. monitoring inputs) - appear relevant and necessary to ensure continued quality and consistency in delivery of programme results.

The AT has considered the optimum timing for this adjustment of the intervention logic and believes that there would be advantages in undertaking it prior to submission to the CDP and in order to provide a robust framework for the development of the implementation plans.

In order to help facilitate monitoring of results at programme level, the AT believes it will also be necessary to include a matrix or table illustrating how the individual outputs relate to the overall programme outcomes. This should be attached to the PD as an annex. Such a means of allocating partner outputs to programme outcomes will also provide a way to construct an outcome-based budget (see also below).

The results framework in the PD includes baselines drawn from information provided in the partnership proposals. The AT notes, however, that none of the partnership result frameworks yet includes a clear baseline and that these will need to be developed at the same time that implementation plans are produced.

- Recommendation 6: Strengthen the TOC in the PD emphasizing a) how research based training and individual capacity building in the form of PhDs and Post Docs contribute to institutional research capacity, b) how the feedback loops are between (pilot) research and capacity building and c) how they mutually strengthen each other. A short summary TOC would be useful (as in the original CN).
- Recommendation 7: Use the definition of outcome areas provided by the original CN in the PD. Refine outputs and outcomes at partner level in accordance with this intervention logic. Sharpen outcome and output statements in line with Danida guidelines. Add baselines to the partnership results frameworks once the implementation plans are clear. Arrange for consultancy support to assist this.
- Recommendation 8: Include a matrix illustrating how the individual outputs in each partnership proposal relate to the programme outcomes. Summarize in an annex to the PD. This matrix will provide a primary vehicle for overall programme monitoring.

3.3 Choice of partners and modalities

The AT finds the choice of partners to be generally relevant, although the criteria for their selection are not spelt out. As previously highlighted, the capacity and needs of the partners varies considerably. However, in all cases, there is scope for relevant improvements to research administration and research organisation. In certain universities, there are also extensive needs in relation to research infrastructure and, in some cases, quite basic infrastructure (e.g. in Gulu where there is a shortage of lecture facilities).

Two of the partners in the South (Gulu and SUZA) have limited capacity for research and thus the outcomes of the programme in this respect (i.e. strong research capacities developed) are likely to be relatively modest. That said, the design of the support to these universities appears well tailored to their needs and capacities and is in high demand. The other four universities in the South all have some more research capacities (in part as a consequence of BSU 2) and therefore represent more robust platforms upon which to build.

Although the partnership model is simpler than in previous phases, it remains complex and extensive (all the South universities have three or four Danish partners) and this requires careful coordination on both sides. The administrative role taken by DFC adds a further layer, as does the policy overview provided by EVAL. As such, the partnership model - compounded by the DFC (admin) EVAL (policy) interface - represents high transaction cost, institutional complexity and challenges in terms of manageability.

The partners in the South reflect a rationalisation of the seven partners in BSU 2 (Kathmandu is no longer included) and this will contribute to efficiency. All of the partners build on existing relationships with Danish universities, also through the earlier phases of BSU. The arrangement whereby coordinators are appointed in the North and South to manage the individual peer relationships appears effective. However, the actual relationships and modalities are not clearly spelt out in either the PD or the partnership proposals and this should be improved. One way of doing this would be to provide a table or diagram showing the overall programme approach in the PD and the relative roles of the two sets of partners.

- Recommendation 9: Include – both in the PD and the individual partnership proposals - more information on the partnering arrangements so that it is easier to understand the role of the Danish partners.

3.4 Development effectiveness agenda

The programme as a whole is well aligned with national development strategies and policies in the three countries relating to research and tertiary education. The programme is also well aligned to each university's own strategic plans, which the AT finds is a reflection of the South driven nature of the programme formulation.

Donor coordination in the research area is limited or non-existent. The BSU programme documentation does however include overviews of relevant programmes supported by other donors and efforts have been made to avoid overlap. The AT notes that other

donors provide support to limited research agendas and that BSU is thus unique given its primary focus on research capacity.

The AT finds that the renewed focus on outreach in BSU 3 to be particularly useful from a development effectiveness perspective because it draws attention to the need to anchor initiatives (e.g. research projects, pilot research, research practices) in the local, national or regional context. As a result, a number of the universities in the South specifically highlight linkages to authorities, the private sector, and local communities – both in relation to anchoring research findings but also regarding subsequent uptake and utilisation (action orientated research/applied research).

3.5 Programme management, reporting and monitoring

The AT considers that programme management arrangements need more comprehensive description in the PD especially concerning decision making at programme level, the role of DFC, and in relation to monitoring (incl. the partners' own monitoring). At the partnership level, these aspects are described in the partnership proposals, albeit to varying degrees. KNUST is a good example. UG and SUA are rather weaker.

At the programme level, there is a strong need of clearer division of labour between DFC (e.g. financial-administrative issues) and EVAL (e.g. policy and strategic direction). It should be clear what the arrangements are for the following important programme management functions: a) communication of results, b) monitoring of results of partnerships and accountability, c) procurement, management and monitoring of process consultancy input, d) monitoring and mitigation of programme level risks and assumptions, and e) responsibility for end of programme situation, exit and sustainability.

It also needs to be considered whether the division of labour between DFC and EVAL should be changed. For example, provided DFC has the right resource and skills-mix, or access to them via procurement, DFC could play a larger role in terms of the functions outlined above.

However, the possibility of further outsourcing of programme management to DFC will need to be balanced with the development policy considerations of MFA/EVAL e.g. to what extent – and if so - which aspects of programme management (e.g. policy and strategy) are to be retained by EVAL/MFA.

DFC programme management has so far been aligned with DFC's administration of FFU projects. Although the AT concurs with the effectiveness and efficiency of common administrative guidelines for both programmes, the programmes are inherently different. FFU is a research programme. BSU is a development programme with a stronger need for alignment with Danida's policy and results agenda. Consequently, closer monitoring especially on risks, assumptions, and overall programme outcome results as well as annual plans, budgets and reports appear necessary. Consequently, it is recommended that the programme (DFC under EVAL's oversight) develops a programme implementation manual with a view to enhance transparency on how the programme is administered and managed.

Also in relation to the partners, the AT has noted that positive South-South cooperation is emerging and the scope for building and expanding on this should be considered with the aim of exchanging lessons learned and knowledge; for example, along the lines of the April 2016 Mid Term Seminar where a particular thematic issue or issues could be discussed (e.g. e-learning). Possibilities could be explored to organise an annual learning event on a programme-wide level or country level. This could also be a way of involving Danish embassies where relevant.

Since BSU 3 is a centralised programme under EVAL's portfolio, involvement of Danish embassies in BSU remain a challenge – but also an opportunity. The three embassies (Accra, Dar es Salaam, and Kampala) expressed general interest in the programme. However, local differences in country programmes, country policies, and embassy resources produce variations in embassy interest. Moving forward it will be important for EVAL and DFC to approach embassies with adequate cognisance and respect for these differences. Encouragingly embassies expressed general keenness to be involved if and when necessary in BSU - and a strong interest in being kept informed. Consequently, two-way communication between EVAL/ DFC and embassies continue to be relevant – and in demand by embassies. It continues to be important for BSU 3 partners (both South and North) – as well as FFU-partners - to keep in contact with embassies and avail themselves for briefing and debriefing meetings with embassies. During the appraisal process, the AT received a range of good ideas and examples from all three embassies as to how and when partners could benefit from reaching out to the embassies. This communication has been shared with EVAL.

Synergies, cooperation and harmonization between BSU and country programmes continue to be an area of possible improvement, although possibilities are described adequately in the PD.

- Recommendation 10: Undertake annual BSU country-wise progress review meetings with involvement of embassies, FFU research projects and national regulatory university institutions.
- Recommendation 11: Clarify division of labour between DFC and EVAL including clarification of responsibility for monitoring and mitigation of programme level risks.
- Recommendation 12: During the inception phase, DFC (under EVAL's oversight) to develop a programme implementation manual which minimum outlines procedures and formats for annual activity plan, budgets and reporting.

3.6 Budget, financial management and flow of funds

The overall budget is DKK 90 M over four years and allocated equally between the South universities (DKK 13 M) with the exception of Gulu University, which receives DKK 10 M on account of its lower absorption capacity. In addition, DKK 4 M is set aside for administration by DFC and DKK 3 M for reviews and a mid-term seminar. DKK 8 M is included as unallocated funds.

The budget in the PD is presented at outcome level, although this must involve some caveats given the AT's concerns about the challenge of allocating outputs to outcomes

across the programme. A more precise outcome budget distribution will be possible after the implementation plans have been developed.

The budget needs alignment with CN outcomes. It would be useful to see the split between partners in the South and the North.

- Recommendation 13: Harmonize programme budget with the original CN outcomes and outline the split between South and the North.

3.7 Risk management framework

The PD includes a basic risk assessment in the main text (section 3.4) and an expanded version (using Danida format) as an annex (Annex 8). Key contextual risks include weakened political commitment to independent universities, loss of key researchers, bureaucratic delays, and lack of incentives. Programmatic risks include weak staff incentives and weak senior management attention. Institutional risks include the effects of bureaucracy and lack of synergy. None of these risks are regarded as show-stoppers and, while a number are assessed as being “likely” most are expected to have “minor” impact.

The AT finds that the risk analysis in the PD is very general and should be expanded, particularly in relation to more concrete examples of mitigating measures and the modalities for monitoring and managing risks. Is financial mismanagement not a risk? While the AT gained the impression that there is a high degree of commitment to BSU amongst the partners, there is a real risk in certain cases that BSU-supported developments do not have the momentum needed so that they are sustainable by the end of BSU 3. The AT was concerned, for example, that delays continued to affect the full commissioning of the laboratory at SUZA.

The risk assessment at annex should also be reviewed – in particular relating to the assessment of impact, which the AT finds may be overly optimistic in certain cases. Risks should also be assessed more thoroughly at partner level.

- Recommendation 14: The assessment of risks and risk mitigation in the PD and at partnership level should be reviewed and strengthened.

3.8 Sustainability and continuation/exit scenarios

The AT finds that the approach to sustainability and exit in the PD and partnership proposals is weak and should be improved, ideally through the inclusion of a separate section covering the issue. BSU’s sustainability depends in large part upon the ability of the partner universities to incentivise and institutionalise the improved research administration and organisational approaches promoted under BSU (e.g. research groups, outreach) – which requires uptake beyond BSU’s specific thematic focus areas. While this understanding underpins the PD and the partnership proposals, it is often implicit and/or vague and there would be benefit in ensuring that progress towards sustainability is monitored (possible through a special indicator for this purpose).

Partners in the South were alerted by the AT to the possibility that BSU 3 may be the final phase of the programme and that consideration should therefore be given to

sustainability issues so that programme gains are consolidated and maintained. Inter alia, this also has implications for the timing relating to PhDs planned under BSU 3.

- Recommendation 15: In the PD include a section elaborating exit and sustainability concerns and scenarios.
- Recommendation 16: Each of the partnership proposals to include a new section on sustainability showing how the partnership will lead to sustainable results, e.g. in terms of research practices, training and education that are likely to exist beyond the lifetime of BSU 3.

4 SUPPORT TO KWAME NKRUMAH UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (KNUST), GHANA

4.1 Engagement design and rationale

The thematic areas of a) agriculture, b) entrepreneurship and c) health appear relevant to both Ghana's development plans, the SDGs, the overall strategy of KNUST, and Denmark's country programme support. The proposal's references and alignment with the SDGs is noted.

4.2 Partner commitment and capacity

KNUST has benefitted substantially from BSU 2 with the production of a range of tangible outputs – the research commons inaugurated by Denmark's ambassador to Ghana standing out as a prime example. Likewise, the Office of Grants and Research appear much stronger now as compared to 2014 and the university-wide systems, procedures and quality assurance mechanisms - either under last phases of development or already put in place - are promising. However, it was difficult for the AT to assess from both the site visit and the written proposal as to whether all BSU 2 related outputs – at this stage - have actually been achieved. Indeed some of the computerized fin/admin and grant admin systems have only just been finalized and are still in beta versions awaiting QA and wider roll-out. The proposal could benefit from stronger clarity on what has been achieved and what needs additional support. The computerized systems are such examples.

It is commendable that KNUST in its approach refrains from seeking support for individual PhDs or Post Docs (individual capacity building) but rather prioritises the limited support window vis a vis activities that hold the potential of benefitting more beneficiaries (e.g. generic PhD courses and the Doctoral College). Cross disciplinary research groups feature prominently in the proposal; however, it would benefit from a stronger and clearer narrative on the benefits in terms of efficiency, effectiveness and impact as well as tangible outcomes associated with this approach.

The partner set-up in BSU 3 remains complicated. The proposal is refreshingly candid about the challenges posed in this respect. With a total of 5 Danish partners (p.43) and the outlined challenges and experiences from BSU 2 (p.35), the AT recommends additional elaboration on management and coordination issues. Some mitigation is mentioned (p.43) in the form of ambitions to make the structure leaner and more focused. The AT would like to see additional and convincing wording on how

management and coordination will be improved in BSU 3. If indeed additional alignment with KNUST management structures is envisaged, additional wording on this would strengthen the chapter on coordination and management (p.43).

4.3 Results framework and partner monitoring systems

It is unclear how the theory of change (p.38) relates to the overall theory of change and intervention logic in the CN. There could be a case and a need to harmonize them better with the overall programme guiding documents.

It is encouraging the proposal makes reference to “increase female involvement” (p.40). Wording on how much and how, would strengthen the proposal. In both WP1 (Agri) and WP3 (Health), making a clearer distinction between outputs 1.1 against 1.3 and 3.1 against 3.3 would make it clearer which output support research groups and which output supports PhD training. The concept of “pre-incubation” is unclear/under-described. Consider either rephrasing the WP related outputs to just incubation or explain the concept of pre-incubation (p.41).

4.4 Risk assessment and management

The outline of risks and assumptions (p.42) would benefit from clarity on who monitors and mitigates the risk throughout the lifetime of the project. At KNUST, the relationship between overall project accountability by the Vice Chancellor and the daily management and coordination roles of the Office of Grants and Research (p.43) could be further clarified. If this aligns with KNUST mechanisms and established procedures, outline how. How “the management structure across the South and North will be leaner...be characterized by more focus and...efficiency” (p.43) should be outlined.

4.5 Budget, flow of funds and financial management

The larger budget items of interdisciplinary research groups (WP1 and WP2) and their actual content, should be described (p.44). The budget lines on both “inception” and “stay in Denmark” (p.44) would benefit from additional description.

4.6 Recommendations

- Recommendation 17. Elaborate coordination and management mechanisms. If this aligns with university mechanisms, outline how.
- Recommendation 18. Align KNUST’s TOC and outcome-hierarchy with that of the original CN.

In addition, the AT suggests revising the KNUST proposal as follows:

- Provide convincing explanations as to how cross disciplinary, cross-theme and cross-college research groups lead to capacity building for research. By this, strengthen the internal logic of output 1.1 and 2.1.
- Explain how KNUST will apply a more demand-driven approach in BSU 3 compared to BSU 2 (p.35).
- Explain how the proposal will promote jobs (p.36).
- The reference to consultancy/research based advice is promising (p.36). Explain how and outline the merits of the associated business case for KNUST.

- Outline gender approaches (p.40).
- Distil the difference between output 1.1 against 1.3 and 3.1 against 3.3.
- Rephrase pre-incubation as incubation or explain the concept of pre-incubation (p. 41).
- Outline management responsibility for risk monitoring and mitigation (p.42).

5 SUPPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY OF GHANA

5.1 Engagement design and rationale

The AT assesses that the partnership proposal from University of Ghana (UG) is relevant and generally sound and can be supported, subject to the adjustments described below.

Some further adjustment of the proposal is required in order to strengthen its overall clarity, including its alignment with Danida's Concept Note. For example, the proposal's approach to *capacity development* for research (as opposed to *research per se*) could be stronger, particularly in work packages 2 and 3. These sections should make clear how the proposed research teams will contribute to capacity development that can have wider benefit. This logic should also feature prominently in the theory of change.

The AT agrees with the decision to structure the BSU 3 activities according to three interlinked work packages, although such cross-cutting linkages could be demonstrated more clearly (e.g. via a table or diagram). The proposal has a relevant thematic focus (malaria and climate change), although the rationale for the research team modality needs clearer explanation with respect to its contribution to the capacity development goal underpinning the MFA's Concept Note. The focus on institutional capacity development (WP 1) is relevant and in line with UG strategies and policy.

5.2 Partner commitment and capacity

BSU appears well anchored at UG and is managed and discussed at an appropriate level. The AT assesses that UG has the capacity to produce the expected results as described and is already some way towards this in BSU 2.

UG has a high level of commitment to the BSU programme and has the capability to manage it. As noted above, the precise coordination arrangements with the Danish partners are unclear and needs demonstrating, perhaps via a table or diagram.

5.3 Results framework and partner monitoring systems

The three work packages (outcome areas) require adjustment so that they link more clearly with the BSU 3 programme outcomes (see CN). Inter alia, the outcome 1 (WP1) text could be shortened. It would also be useful to expand slightly on each of the output areas under WP 1 so that the rationale for them is clearer. Regarding WP 2 & 3, the contribution of the research team approach to research capacity improvements should be made clearer. Baseline data as well as indicators are not yet available but will be provided as UG and its partners develop the implementation plan.

5.4 Risk assessment and management

The risks assessment should be expanded to include sustainability issues, including the risk that PhDs might leave and that capacity improvements may not be sufficiently anchored. Mitigation measures should be mentioned.

5.5 Budget, flow of funds and financial management

A relatively high amount of the budget that be absorbed by the 4 PhDs and by research orientated activities in general (although the precise percentage is not clear). It is therefore important that maximum use is made of the research team modality as part of the approach to research capacity development, in line with the Concept Note. The overall balance between UG and its northern partners is not the 50/50 balance envisaged in the CN.

5.6 Recommendations

- Recommendation 19: Focus the theory of change (sections 2 & 3) on how capacity for research will be strengthened, including the role that research groups, pilot projects, PhDs etc. play in this.
- Recommendation 20: In the results framework provide clearer linkages to the outcomes in original Concept Note. Utilise shorter outcome statement for work packages to ensure that the individual outputs relate as directly as possible to one of the outcome areas in the Concept Note.
- Recommendation 21: Consider additional risks and mitigating measures (section 4), e.g. that PhDs will leave.
- Recommendation 22: Explicitly outline management, partnership and coordination arrangements (section 5), both at UG and with the university partners in the North (i.e. who will do what and how will it be coordinated?)

6 SUPPORT TO GULU UNIVERSITY, UGANDA

6.1 Engagement design and rationale

The AT finds the continued focus on cooperation with two faculties and one institute at GU well-argued and sound. The proposed scope and budget distribution between the outputs consolidating gains from BSU 2 (such as output 1.5 on PBL and e-learning) and new pilot initiatives (such as the output 2.3 and output 3.2 on action research) appear ambitious, and perhaps too risky in terms of feasibility and sustainability, against available capacity and resources at GU. The logistical challenges in widespread field-based action research should not be underestimated. GU has yet to resolve a number of infrastructure challenges at campus. At the same time, introducing problem-based learning and e-learning has only just started, and GU indicates that there is much to do in relation to this important agenda. It would be a missed opportunity if this work is not continued, consolidated and sustained. These continuing elements should be strengthened in the proposal, while still leaving (smaller) space for experimenting with action research, which is a pertinent and promising endeavour.

The approach to supporting PhDs is sound as is the emphasis on non-discrimination and transparency when awarding projects to students.

The partnership proposal contains a number of terms and concepts, which are mentioned, but not further defined or explained. In the further scrutiny of the proposal, it could be considered to either remove such expressions or be more specific about what they entail.

The proposal could do more to enhance and seek synergies with the Danish country programme. Especially work package 3 (Rights, Resources and Gender in Post-War Development) is an opportunity to enhance collaboration with other Danida supported partners in Uganda. The AT suggests GU contacts the embassy for possible points of contact and synergy.

6.2 Partner commitment and capacity

BSU appears well anchored at GU and seems to be well integrated with the university's overall management. There is a high commitment to this programme. The steering committee for the partnership under BSU 3 will be enlarged and may thereby have an even greater leverage at university level.

6.3 Results framework and partner monitoring systems

The intervention logic and distinction between outputs and outcomes is of an acceptable level. Output statements could in some instances be clarified by adding a couple of lines of explanation below each output. During the meetings, GU explained how the outputs would lead to enhanced capacity, but these explanations are not always coming out clearly in the proposal. For instance how will piloting action research enhance researchers' capacity, strengthen the master education, and boost community outreach – all at the same time?

The outputs of the partnership proposal are organised in three work packages. Work package 1 is well aligned to outcome area 1 of the concept note, whereas the other two work packages are related to both outcome area 2 and 3 of the concept note. It is necessary for the presentation in the overall BSU 3 PD that outputs in the partnership proposals are clearly attached to one or the other outcome area. This could be done while maintaining the structure in the proposal with outputs organised according to work packages by introducing a matrix where the outputs are distributed between the three outcome areas of the concept note.

6.4 Risk assessment and management

The risk and mitigation measures of the proposal are pertinent. However, some risks seem not to be addressed, notably the risk that PhDs might leave and that capacity improvements may not be sufficiently anchored. Mitigation measures for these should be mentioned e.g. through reference to GU's established HR policies.

6.5 Budget, flow of funds and financial management

The framework budget indicated in the proposal will need to be specified further during the preparation of implementation plans. As indicated above, the AT finds that the amounts allocated to pilot research outputs are too substantial compared to the amounts for outputs more directly linked to institutional capacity building.

6.6 Recommendations

- Recommendation 23: Clarify the description of the work packages. The two overall thematic areas of work package 2 and 3 are described in a very general manner in the proposal. Some examples could be mentioned and the proposal should indicate the process whereby these specific issues will be selected and perhaps how many such groups would be running concurrently. It could be considered to include output 2.2. (researching the implementation of PBL and e-learning at GU) as one of the topics under output 2.3 instead of having it as a separate topic.
- Recommendation 24: Further indicate how overlap will be avoided and coordination enhanced with other forthcoming donor investments (such as the planned programme on e-learning with the University of New South Wales, the infrastructure investments by AfDB and the Swedish support).
- Recommendation 25: Strengthen the formulation of outputs clarifying their content by adding lines under each output indicating intended activity areas.
- Recommendation 26: Rebalance the proposal by adjusting the emphasis on pilot research activities in a downward direction, as indicated above, and enhancing emphasis on outputs which are a continuation and consolidation of BSU 2 achievements.

In addition, the AT has the following suggestions to improvements of the partnership proposal:

- The proposal could be strengthened by a more careful and selective use of various concepts and/or a more comprehensive explanation of their meaning (such as triple-helix collaboration, ‘research and teaching teams’).
- The proposal could be strengthened by including direct references to the priorities in GU’s newly revised strategy. Although this strategy is not yet approved, some of the thinking behind it could perhaps be reflected and related to the proposal.
- GU to interact with the embassy with a view to identify and develop synergies with the Danish country programme to Uganda.

7 SUPPORT TO KILIMANJARO CHRISTIAN MEDICAL UNIVERSITY COLLEGE (KCMUC), TANZANIA

7.1 Engagement design and rationale

The AT finds that the proposal is generally well-written and has a good logic. However, there is a substantial amount of narrative (7 pages) prior to the core of the proposal (section 3) where the BSU 3 objectives and expected results are outlined and the description of these areas is relatively brief. Shortening of the introductory sections and greater depth in relation to the output description would be beneficial.

The proposal has a relevant thematic focus (reproductive health, malaria and HIV) and is aligned with KCMUC strategy and national priorities. The removal of the neglected tropical diseases work package from BSU 2 reflects the availability of other sources of funding for this area.

The reproductive and maternal health focus is particularly well aligned with the Danish country programme. This produces an opportunity for increased collaboration and knowledge sharing between BSU 3 partners, the Danish embassy and development partners associated with Denmark's country programme.

7.2 Partner commitment and capacity

BSU appears well anchored at KCMUC and is managed and discussed at an appropriate level. KCMUC has the capacity to produce the expected results as described and to manage the partnership. The AT was informed that the development of the draft BSU 3 proposal had reflected an assessment of progress made during BSU 2 as well as of KCMUC's capacity constraints. Inter alia, the shortage of PhDs and limited capacity for research leadership is the rationale for funding three PhDs and involving Post Docs in the research groups (WP3-5).

KCMUC commented that the relationship with the Danish partners and with DFC was good and that regular contact was maintained. However, the precise coordination arrangements with the Danish partners are unclear in the proposal and need demonstrating, perhaps via a table or diagram.

7.3 Results framework and partner monitoring systems

KCMUC has accommodated the outcome logic presented in the CN and a diagram illustrating this is included in the proposal. WP 2 will involve improvements to key research facilities (e.g. remote monitoring), research teaching (e.g. action research and communication skills), and monitoring systems with the logic being that these improvements will underpin and make more effective the research and outreach aspects of the three thematic areas (WP 3-5). Thematic research groups (each with the attachment of a Post Doc) will provide a mechanism for taking this forward. The research group concept is relatively new and KCMUC is therefore encouraged to ensure that opportunities for learning from them (i.e. feedback loops) are in place so that other departments in the college can benefit.

The partnership proposal provides parts of a theory of change but it is spread over several sections (1.2 & 2.1) with the consequence that its explanatory value is diminished. The sections dealing with theory of change could be amalgamated into a single section with an emphasis on explaining *why* and *how* change is expected to occur. The five work packages are clearly linked with the BSU 3 programme outcomes (see CN); however, the individual output descriptions should be expanded slightly to provide a better indication of exactly what is proposed. Examples of indicative activities would be one way of doing this. In addition, the quality of the outcome and output statements varies (they should be simplified and worded as results).

7.4 Risk assessment and management

The proposal includes a short risk assessment – key risks being delays in research and external factors hindering improvement in procurement practices. This should be expanded to include sustainability issues, including the risk that PhDs/Post Docs might leave and that capacity improvements may not be sufficiently anchored in KCMUC structures. Mitigation measures should be mentioned.

7.5 Budget, flow of funds and financial management

A relatively high amount of the budget will be absorbed by the 3 PhDs and the three Post Doc positions - and also by research orientated activities in general (although the precise percentage of the latter is not clear). It is therefore important that maximum use is made of the research team modality as part of the approach to research capacity development, in line with the CN.

The budget needs revision to remove the discrepancy between the number of PhDs/Post Docs presented in the budget and in the proposal text. The AT has some concerns whether the budgetary provision for these PhDs is realistic and urges KCMUC to revisit the basis on which they have been costed during the development of the BSU 3 implementation plan.

7.6 Recommendations

- Recommendation 27: Shorten and refocus the theory of change (sections 2.1 & 2.2) so that focus on how capacity for research will be strengthened is clearer and to reduce overlap. The ToC could be reduced to a single paragraph that is linked to the results logic and explains why the expected results will occur and what the pre-conditions for this might be.
- Recommendation 28: Simplify and rephrase outcome and output statements as results. Include a clearer indication of how the outputs will be produced. Including some indicative activities as examples would be one way of helping this.
- Recommendation 29: Consider additional risks, e.g. that PhDs and/or Post Docs will leave.
- Recommendation 30: As part of management (section 5), set out more explicitly the partnership arrangements envisaged (i.e. who will do what?)

8 SUPPORT TO STATE UNIVERSITY OF ZANZIBAR (SUZA), TANZANIA

8.1 Engagement design and rationale

Continued support to SUZA is relevant against SUZA's ambition to adhere to and meet TCU standards. The strong emphasis on university systems, policies and frameworks is testament to the university's research capacity building aspirations – and thus eligibility for support under BSU. Proposed research foci of a) waste management, b) mosquito control and c) food safety appear to be equally relevant. Likewise, the university in its proposal - and during meetings with the AT - outlines clear aspirations to provide relevant education that mirrors societal needs. Effectiveness, efficiency and impact appear merited against the ambition – and possibility – that BSU will increase SUZA's capacity to - and skills in –securing research funding from national research boards and other donors.

The proposal is less vocal on upstream communication vis-à-vis the Ministry of Health (MoH). The proposal could benefit from activities that could support health sector-wide approaches, dissemination of results to, and capacity building of MoH. Perhaps the support to PhD/post-docs could include work-streams working with and disseminating results to MoH. This should only be entertained if it does not complicate delivery and/or limit the focus of the proposal.

8.2 Partner commitment and capacity

The AT takes note of the project management skills built under BSU 2 as well as the South ownership of the proposal. The proposal is seen as SUZA's proposal in terms of concepts and priorities – but improved through the process of collaboration and partnership with the DK university partners.

It appears some deliverables, activities and outputs under BSU 2 remain unfinished. The major laboratory investment is a case in point. Improvements against the 2014 situation are obvious and BSU 2 inputs are acknowledged. However, the AT is concerned that the laboratory remains unfinished. This questions the effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of this investment.

8.3 Results framework and partner monitoring systems

The proposal's TOC should clearly outline how the education is research based – and how BSU support will enhance research based education. This is obviously a challenge in a university with limited research capacity. At the same time the narrative - as well as the distribution of outputs across WPs and the associated explanations - should provide additional clarity on which aspects are (pilot)research and which are capacity building efforts. If the merit for support is based on possible feedback loops between (pilot)research and capacity building – and how they mutually strengthen each other – the proposal would benefit from a stronger narrative in support of this claim and how this is done and secured in practical terms.

8.4 Risk assessment and management

The risk of lack of retention of the supported PhD and associated mitigation (e.g. university-wide staff retention policies) could be outlined. Risk and mitigation in respect of the unfinished laboratory – especially against the income generating consultancy services business case which hinges on i.a. laboratory services – needs careful description, mitigation and follow-up.

Reference is made to a TOR to be described outlining management responsibilities. At the meeting, SUZA outlined verbally intentions and plans in this respect. It is recommended that the management arrangement is described now - and as an integrated element of the proposal.

8.5 Budget, flow of funds and financial management

At the meeting, SUZA indicated that WP2 and associated output 2.1 contained provision for 9 months of Post Doc. If this is the case and to be maintained, it will be key to describe the logic behind the investment and also divide the output between Post Doc and research group/stakeholder engagement lines.

8.6 Recommendations

- Recommendation 31: Outline management and decision making structure at SUZA as well as coordination measures between SUZA and DK university partners.
- Recommendation 32: Make further support to the laboratory (output 3.5) contingent on either a) proof of full functionality and commissioning e.g. with MFA or embassy involvement or b) a PAP adequately securing this.

In addition, the AT suggests revising the SUZA proposal as follows:

- As a risk outline that the one (1) Ph.D suggested for support under BSU 3 could leave SUZA. Outline how this risk is mitigated - e.g. through university policies.
- Clarify – possibly by splitting – which budget elements of output 1.1 are in support of the one (1) Ph.D and which are in support of the research team.
- If it is the case, stress and outline how outputs 1.3 and 2.3 on student case competitions are PBL, innovation and entrepreneurship oriented.
- As an indicator for the success of output 1.3 stress the capacity to successfully win – rather than just apply for – research grants.
- Split output 2.1 with a view to clarify what will be used to Post Doc and what will be used for research group and outreach activities. If the Post Doc is only to be supported with a nine (9) month salary input, describe how such a limited input will be able to support the research group and the attainments of its outputs.
- In output 3.5 outline the solidity of the business case of attracting paying customers. If the business case is not solid, provide a sober and realistic outline of risks and their mitigation.
- In output 3.7 outline which entity within SUZA will be responsible for the deliverables associated with this output. Change heading from “strategies and synergies” to “quality and control” which better captures the content of the output.
- More can be done to outline how the BSU 3 investment contributes to overall SUZA capacity building. Describe how BSU 3 supported activities and approaches are spread to other SUZA departments and entities.

9 SUPPORT TO SOKOINE UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE (SUA), TANZANIA

9.1 Engagement design and rationale

The AT finds the proposal to be of a good overall quality in terms of presentation, consistency and justification of the support. The proposal explains how the various activity areas are intended to lead to enhanced institutional capacity. The linkages between proposed outputs and the overall CN are well indicated. However, some of the outputs are not clearly described and could benefit from further explanation in the proposal, e.g. output 3, which is not formulated as an output. The AT notes that the pedagogical aspects of the programme from BSU 2 are not mentioned in the new proposal despite this aspect figures prominently in SUA’s own corporate strategic plan.

The proposed funding of individual PhD-education – consuming a third of the budget – is unbalanced compared to the other priorities in the proposal. Some of the other partnerships have included partial support to PhDs on a competitive basis, thereby allocating less cost per PhD-student.

In terms of the third outcome area related to applied research of direct value to the society, more could be done to ensure SUA’s extensive knowledge on agricultural value-

chains (e.g. sunflower) is disseminated to relevant actors. Synergies with the Danish country programme could be investigated and developed.

9.2 Partner commitment and capacity

SUA receives considerable external funding and the BSU support constitutes only a small fraction of this. The AT noted the high commitment to the BSU partnership among the involved staff, but did not find evidence that the project is anchored at university management level.

A considerable part of the BSU 2 targets have not yet been met, including a) fully functional fish ponds, b) a fully operational electronic document management system (EDMS) and c) securing approval of two of the three post-graduate programs (the remaining two awaiting university senate approval). The delays call for attention to the level of ambition in BSU 3. It is important to secure the sustainability of the interventions in the coming phase.

9.3 Results framework and partner monitoring systems

The outputs of the partnership proposal are organised in four work packages. Work package 1 is well aligned to outcome area 1 of the concept note, whereas the other work packages are related to both outcome area 2 and 3 of the concept note. The linkages to these are well described. The results framework will be further developed when implementation plans are developed.

As this may be the final phase of BSU, it is important that the sustainability of results beyond BSU 3's lifetime is in focus, i.e. that capacity improvements are fully anchored in SUA systems and being expanded to other areas of the university. This requires that sustainability issues are described more clearly in the proposal and addressed through the work package outputs.

The Danish Country Programme in Tanzania includes a strong emphasis on agriculture and agri-business and it would seem pertinent that SUA explores possibilities for closer linkages between BSU-supported SUA activities and the institutions funded under the Danida country programme, such as the Agricultural Markets Development Trust.

9.4 Risk assessment and management

The AT finds the risk and mitigation measures of the proposal not fully developed and some risks seem not to be addressed, notably the risk that PhDs could leave the university and that capacity improvements may not be sufficiently anchored. Mitigation measures for the risk of delay do not seem to fully mitigate that risk.

9.5 Budget, flow of funds and financial management

The framework budget indicated in the proposal will need to be specified further during the preparation of implementation plans. The amounts allocated to individual PhDs seem too substantial compared to the amounts for outputs more directly linked to institutional capacity building.

The budget includes DKK 406.350 for 'basic infrastructure' which is not related to any of the outputs. All budget lines have to be linked to outputs both in the presentation and in

practice. Furthermore, coordination cost cannot – as suggested – be included on the Danish side, since this is covered by the overhead.

9.6 Recommendations

- Recommendation 33: Reconsider whether the budget allocated for PhDs can be justified in light of the emphasis on institutional, rather than individual, capacity strengthening.
- Recommendation 34: Undertake budget changes in relation to infrastructure cost and coordination cost at Danish side.
- Recommendation 35: Include consideration of additional risks and how they are mitigated.
- Recommendation 36: Outline management arrangements and partnership oversight more explicitly.
- Recommendation 37: Strengthen the formulation of outputs clarifying their content by adding some lines under each output with a brief outline of intended activity areas.

The AT has furthermore the following suggestions to improvements of the partnership proposal:

- The proposal could be strengthened by including direct references to the relevant priorities in SUA's new corporate strategic plan.
- The proposal could be strengthened by indicating how overlap will be avoided and perhaps coordination enhanced with the areas where other investments are forthcoming.

ANNEX 1

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Title of (Country) Programme	Building Stronger Universities, Phase III, 2017-2021	
File number/F2 reference	2016-45640	
Appraisal report date	3 July 2017	
Council for Development Policy meeting date	5 September 2017	
Summary of possible recommendations not followed (to be filled in by the responsible unit)		
<p>Overall conclusion of the appraisal</p> <p>The proposed programme is recommended for presentation to the Council for Development Policy taking the recommendations of this report into consideration.</p> <p>The appraisal identified a total of 16 pertinent recommendations at the overall programme level with additional 21 at the level of the six university partnerships.</p> <p>The draft Programme Document (PD) was generally well written and provided much of the overview required for the programme. However, the final PD would benefit from a more succinct theory of change that articulates the role that research activities play in relation to the programme's capacity development objectives. Against the background of BSU 3 potentially being the last phase of the programme, there is need to further outline sustainability and exit. The actual role of the Danish partner institutions is not sufficiently described in the draft PD. This should also be addressed, ensuring that there is clarity amongst both sets of partners regarding their roles. With a view to align the PD even more with Danish policies and guidelines, youth and gender equality concerns should be even more explicit. The appraisal also contains pertinent observations and recommendations regarding the results framework and budget.</p> <p>Separate formal Development Engagement Documents (DEDs) for the six university partnerships have not been prepared. The appraisal team considers, however, that the individual university partnership proposals are sufficient for this purpose provided that they are strengthened in line with the outlined recommendations.</p>		
Recommendations by the appraisal team	Follow up by the responsible unit	
Programme Level: Building Stronger Universities, Phase III, 2017-2021		
Programme documentation		
1. Make reference to the necessary procurement of technical assistance (TA) to support the inception phase.		

2. Adjust the programme document (PD) in line with the comments made in the appraisal report, in particular relating to the theory of change, assumptions and risks, programme management, and sustainability and exit (the latter to be a new section that needs to be developed in the PD).	
3. In the programme document include a short (10 line) outline per partnership of content of main work packages. In practice, this means extending the current descriptions by 3-4 lines. Wording from appraisal report's section 2.1. could inspire.	
4. Adjust the partnership proposals in line with overall programme as well as individual proposal related recommendations.	
Policy and strategy frameworks	
5. Highlight youth and gender equality in the programme document (PD). The appraisal team notes that relevant indicators are gender sensitive.	
Theory of change, objectives and results framework	
6. Strengthen the Theory of Change (TOC) in the programme document emphasizing a) how research based training and individual capacity building in the form of PhDs and Post Docs contribute to institutional research capacity, b) how the feedback loops are between (pilot) research and capacity building c) how they mutually strengthen each other. A short summary TOC would be useful (as in the original Concept Note).	
7. Use the definition of outcome areas provided by the original Concept Note in the programme document (PD). Refine outputs and outcomes at partner level in accordance with this intervention logic. Sharpen outcome and output statements in line with Danida guidelines. Add baselines to the partnership results frameworks once the implementation plans are clear. Arrange for consultancy support to assist this.	

8. Include a matrix illustrating how the individual outputs in each partnership proposal relate to the programme outcomes. Summarize in an annex to the programme document (PD). This matrix will provide a primary vehicle for overall programme monitoring.	
Choice of partners and modalities	
9. Include – both in the programme document (PD) and the individual partnership proposals - more information on the partnering arrangements so that it is easier to understand the role of the Danish partners.	
Programme management, reporting and monitoring	
10. Undertake annual BSU country-wise progress review meetings with involvement of embassies, FFU research projects and national regulatory university institutions.	
11. Clarify division of labour between DFC and EVAL including clarification of responsibility for monitoring and mitigation of programme level risks.	
12. During the inception phase, DFC (under EVAL's oversight) to develop a programme implementation manual which minimum outlines procedures and formats for annual activity plan, budgets and reporting.	
Budget, financial management and flow of funds	
13. Harmonize programme budget with the original CN outcomes and outline the split between South and the North.	
Risk management framework	
14. The assessment of risks and risk mitigation in the programme document (PD) and at partnership level should be reviewed and strengthened.	
Sustainability and continuation/exit scenarios	
15. In the programme document (PD) include a section elaborating exit and sustainability concerns and scenarios.	

16. Each of the partnership proposals to include a new section on sustainability showing how the partnership will lead to sustainable results, e.g. in terms of research practices, training and education that are likely to exist beyond the lifetime of BSU 3.	
Engagement Level: Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST), Ghana	
17. Elaborate coordination and management mechanisms. If this aligns with university mechanisms, outline how.	
18. Align KNUST's Theory of Change (TOC) and outcome-hierarchy with that of the original CN.	
Engagement Level: University of Ghana, Ghana	
19. Focus the theory of change on how capacity for research will be strengthened, including the role that research groups, pilot projects, PhDs etc. play in this.	
20. In the results framework provide clearer linkages to the outcomes in original Concept Note. Utilise shorter outcome statement for work packages to ensure that the individual outputs relate as directly as possible to one of the outcome areas in the Concept Note.	
21. Consider additional risks and mitigating measures e.g. that PhDs will leave.	
22. Explicitly outline management, partnership and coordination arrangements (section 5), both at UG and with the university partners in the North (i.e. who will do what and how will it be coordinated?)	
Engagement Level: Gulu University (GU), Uganda	

<p>23. Clarify the description of the work packages. The two overall thematic areas of work package 2 and 3 are described in a very general manner in the proposal. Some examples could be mentioned and the proposal should indicate the process whereby these specific issues will be selected and perhaps how many such groups would be running concurrently. It could be considered to include output 2.2. (researching the implementation of Problem Based Learning (PBL) and e-learning at GU) as one of the topics under output 2.3 instead of having it as a separate topic.</p>	
<p>24. Further indicate how overlap will be avoided and coordination enhanced with other forthcoming donor investments (such as the planned programme on e-learning with the University of New South Wales, the infrastructure investments by AfDB and the Swedish support).</p>	
<p>25. Strengthen the formulation of outputs clarifying their content by adding lines under each output indicating intended activity areas.</p>	
<p>26. Rebalance the proposal by adjusting the emphasis on pilot research activities in a downward direction, as indicated above, and enhancing emphasis on outputs which are a continuation and consolidation of BSU 2 achievements.</p>	
<p>Engagement Level: Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College (KCMUC), Tanzania</p>	
<p>27. Shorten and refocus the Theory of Change (ToC) so that focus on <u>how</u> capacity for research will be strengthened is clearer and to reduce overlap. The ToC could be reduced to a single paragraph that is linked to the results logic and explains <u>why</u> the expected results will occur and <u>what</u> the pre-conditions for this might be.</p>	
<p>28. Simplify and rephrase outcome and output statements as results. Include a clearer indication of how the outputs will be produced. Including some indicative activities as examples would be one way of helping this.</p>	
<p>29. Consider additional risks, e.g. that PhDs and/or Post Docs will leave.</p>	

30. As part of the section on partnership management, set out more explicitly the partnership arrangements envisaged (i.e. who will do what?)	
Engagement Level: State University of Zanzibar (SUZA), Tanzania	
31. Outline management and decision making structure at SUZA as well as coordination measures between SUZA and DK university partners.	
32. Make further support to the laboratory (output 3.5) contingent on either a) proof of full functionality and commissioning e.g. with MFA or embassy involvement or b) a process action plan (PAP) adequately securing this.	
Engagement Level: Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA), Tanzania	
33. Reconsider whether the budget allocated for PhDs can be justified in light of the emphasis on institutional, rather than individual, capacity strengthening.	
34. Undertake budget changes in relation to infrastructure cost and coordination cost at Danish side.	
35. Include consideration of additional risks and how they are mitigated.	
36. Outline management arrangements and partnership oversight more explicitly.	
37. Strengthen the formulation of outputs clarifying their content by adding some lines under each output with a brief outline of intended activity areas.	

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

Signed in Copenhagen on 3 July 2017: **Henrik Vistisen (signed)**
Appraisal Team leader/TQS representative

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

Signed in.....on the.....
 Head of Unit/Mission

ANNEX 2

PROCESS ACTION PLAN

Time line	Programme	Documentation
April 2016	BSU II mid-term seminar and initial discussions with partners on a possible phase III.	Mid-term seminar report.
October-November	Drafting Concept note and annexes.	Draft concept note and annexes.
November	Public consultation of Concept note.	Concept note with annexes.
December	Meeting in Danida Programme Committee.	Concept note and annexes. List of received responses from the consultation and summary conclusions from Danida Programme Committee.
December	Deadline for submission of outline project proposals from existing partnerships.	6 outline project proposals.
January - Early February 2017	Preparation and submission of detailed implementation plan. Country visits by process consultant.	6 detailed implementation plans.
February	Deadline for submission of BSU III Draft Development Engagement Document (DED).	Draft DED.
February	Draft ToR for appraisal forwarded to KFU.	Draft ToR.
	All draft documentation for programme forwarded to TAS.	Development engagement Documents and associated partner documentation.
May	Appraisal process finalized.	Appraisal Report, recommendations summary.
Before 1 August	Revise programme documentation according to appraisal recommendations	Final Programme Document and Partnership Proposals
5 September	Presentation for Danida appropriation and Minister approval.	Appropriation Note and Programme Documentation
Before 1 September	Partnership Implementation Plans developed and submitted to DFC/MFA for approval	Draft Partnership Implementation Plans
Before 20 September	Final partnership implementation plans approved	Final Partnership Implementation Plans
Before 30 September	Signing of agreements (commitments)	DFC-MFA agreement and DFC agreements with implementing universities.
1 October	BSU III Start	

ANNEX 3 TERMS OF REFERENCE

File: 2016-45640
Version: 26 Jan 2017

Terms of Reference for the Appraisal of Building Stronger Universities (BSU) Programme, Phase III

Background

Universities in developing countries are important players for sustainable national development. They train students to the highest levels of formal qualifications, with emphasis of science and research principles and methodologies. Research from developing countries is a part of the global knowledge pool, and research-based, contextualised knowledge is necessary to address existing and emerging local, national, regional and global development challenges, to support social as well as technological innovation, and to provide evidence for better political decision-making.

The overall objective of Danish support to development research is to strengthen research capacity in developing countries and to create new knowledge capable of solving development problems. In the new Draft Strategy for Development and Humanitarian Assistance, the role of development research in enhancing cooperation within Danish core competence areas is recognised, especially as developing countries reach middle income status. Development research constitutes a link between development cooperation and the wider foreign policy agenda by promoting Danish values and by promoting Danish know-how and technologies in developing countries.

Together with the Danish universities, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) initiated the Building Stronger Universities (BSU) programme in 2011, with a deliberate focus on strengthening research *capacities* at partner universities in the South. That is, the programme is not focused directly on tertiary education or on research, but concentrates on supporting the development of university capacities that will, when applied, strengthen research and the use of research in education and university outreach activities.

The programme will contribute to enhanced research-based learning for Master and PhD students, better and more research contributions to science and more uptake and use of research-based evidence and knowledge at community, regional and national levels, by different stakeholder groups (governments, civil society, and private sector).

The approach adopted by the BSU programme is to achieve specific capacity-level results through partnerships between Danish universities and universities in the partner countries. These partnerships are eventually expected to develop joint research undertakings, funded by research grants from other sources. In the first phase of the

programme (2011-2013), partnerships were formed with eleven (11) universities in the Kenya, Ghana, Tanzania, Uganda and Nepal. Each partnership would align to one or more of three thematic platforms set up in Denmark. While this approach yielded good results in several cases, it was administratively cumbersome and did not leave sufficient room for active substantive and managerial ownership by the Southern partners.

Without changing the overall objectives of the programme, Phase II of the programme (2013-2016) therefore introduced a number of changes to the approach. First, to focus on fewer partnerships in the South and concentrate of those with the greatest potential to benefit from the programme, the number of partners was reduced. The remaining seven (7) programme partners in the South were: University of Ghana (UG), Ghana; Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST), Ghana, Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA), Tanzania; Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College (KCMC), Tanzania; State University of Zanzibar (SUZA), Tanzania; Gulu University (GU), Uganda and Kathmandu University (KU), Nepal. With the exception of Kathmandu University, all these partners also participated in the first phase of the programme.

The thematic platforms were abandoned, and instead, partnerships were formed through a matchmaking process where the Southern universities developed individual project outlines. Danish universities then formed consortiums that responded to the project outlines from partners, leading to the formation of seven (7) partnerships led by the Southern university.

Following the matchmaking process, the partnerships went through an inception phase (mid-2014) where detailed activities were planned and subsequently approved as basis for the implementation. This was initiated in the last quarter of 2014. Activities were planned to end in 2016, but a slower than expected implementation has made it possible to approve a no-cost extension for the partnerships until mid-2017. Following a mid-term review early 2016, a mid-term seminar for the seven (7) partnerships was undertaken in Denmark in May 2016, which enabled sharing of experience and discussions regarding possible future phases.

The BSU II programme was designed based on the Strategic Framework for Danish Support to Development Research 2014-18. Although this strategic framework is still used for guidance, following the new strategy for Danish development and humanitarian assistance, the strategic framework, which was elaborated under the former development strategy, is formally no longer in effect.

Since March 2016, the Evaluation Department (EVAL) is the MFA unit responsible for the BSU-programme. Administrative support to the partnerships and learning of lessons across the partnerships in BSU II is being facilitated by Danida's Fellowship Centre (DFC); an arrangement which will continue in BSU III.

Following a period of uncertainty regarding the future of Danida's support to development research, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was in October 2016 in a

position to initiate preparations for preparation of the third phase of BSU, which would constitute a continuation of the university collaboration in Ghana, Tanzania and Uganda. A concept note was discussed in the Danida Programme Committee on 8 December 2016 and the selected six (6) partnerships submitted a first draft partnership proposal on 21 December. Subsequently, a process consultant is working with the six (6) African universities to discuss and prepare further the partnership proposals in January-February 2017 resulting in a new draft of the partnership proposals and a draft programme document, which is subjected to this appraisal. As for BSU II, there has been a strong emphasis on the fact that the Southern universities should take lead in defining the contents of the partnerships.

The participating six (6) African universities are:

- University of Ghana
- Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana
- Sokoine University of Agriculture, Tanzania
- Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College, Tanzania
- State University of Zanzibar, Tanzania
- Gulu University, Uganda

The BSU III is planned as a four-year programme with a total budget of DKK 90 million. The overall objective of BSU III is that *the partnering African universities have enhanced their role as providers of scientific knowledge and research-based education and advice to society*. This will be reflected in the research and educational output from the universities as well as their direct engagement with external partners. In the larger universities, it is not expected that overall changes can be attributed to the Danish support, but only at faculty level.

Three outcome areas have been proposed under which the partnerships will prepare their outputs and activities:

Outcome area 1: University capacity is improved by strengthening administrative frameworks for university research.

The administrative framework includes services and facilities to support research activities, such as administrative and financial processes, library and laboratory facilities, etc. Many of the administrative systems are university-wide and it will be important to focus the partnership on those areas that influence most on the work under outcome areas 2 and 3.

Outcome area 2: University capacity is improved by strengthening organisation and systems for researcher education and research processes.

This involves the academic aspects at faculty level of the university research capacity, such as establishment of thematic research groups, faculty-wide enhancement of research methodologies and approaches, etc. It also involves further work on strengthening the Ph.D. education within specified areas.

Outcome area 3: University capacity is improved by strengthening research and outreach practices and networks.

The increased emphasis on research practices and outreach in the third phase is a reflection of the improved capacity for planning and undertaking research established in earlier phases. The activities include for instance pilot research activities, dissemination of research results and mechanisms for strengthening cooperation and linkages with private sector, civil society and public sector research users.

The Concept Note for BSU III furthermore emphasises the importance of consolidating the results of BSU II and focusing the programme further, ideally to fewer thematic areas of cooperation. The purpose of focusing is to enhance the volume of support within the areas that seem to have best potential (based on BSU II experience) and ease the administrative burden by having fewer faculties and individuals involved, especially on the Danish side.

Compared to BSU II, BSU III puts more emphasis on pilot research and outreach activities in order to strengthen university capacity through strengthening practices and direct research collaboration which could lead to further funding from other sources.

Objective

The objective of the appraisal process is to ensure that the appropriation documents prepared for the Danish authorities adhere to the formal requirements and that the programme design and documentation is of a satisfactory quality.

Outputs

The following outputs are envisaged from the appraisal:

- Mission preparation note, which will be discussed with EVAL and DFC
- Draft appraisal report, including updated process action plan, and input to a) HRBA and gender screening note, b) risk management matrix, and c) Climate Change and Green Growth Screening Notes - bearing in mind the applicability, adequacy, usefulness, and relevance of the tools in relation to this specific programme (cf. Danida guidelines)
- Final appraisal report including annexes and a “Summary of Recommendations of the Appraisal Report”

Scope of work

The appraisal will be prepared on the basis of the available documentation, including the draft programme document and partnership proposals submitted. It will involve discussions with both Danish partners and the partner universities in Ghana, Tanzania and Uganda as well as the relevant authorities in the three countries. Furthermore, EVAL, DFC and the Danish embassies will be consulted. Visits to all three countries are envisaged.

It should be emphasised that the Danida Guidelines do not fully cater for a programme like the BSU III Programme, especially in relation to which aspects of the national or thematic context it is relevant to consider. Due to the partnership

approach, the BSU III Programme could be considered as six projects and as such the approach chosen may have limitations for the extent to which the partnership activities can be integrated in on-going efforts at the universities. The demand-driven approach to the formulation is an attempt to mitigate this and ensure Southern ownership of the capacity development. A possible further limitation is the degree to which a programmatic approach can be taken – i.e. one in which the various elements are mutually supportive and utilise synergies and lessons learned.

As point of departure, the appraisal team will utilize the most recent set of Danida Guidelines for Projects and Programmes (January 2017) taking due note of the outlined caveats.

At a general level, the appraisal should consider the five OECD/DAC quality criteria for evaluation: Relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact. The BSU III appraisal process includes but is not necessarily limited to the tasks listed below:

At programme level:

- Assess relevance of proposed programme, including its objectives and outcomes vis-à-vis the strategic direction of the involved universities in both Denmark and the partner countries;
- Assess the programme's contribution to the sustainable development goals as well as its role in the national context of research and higher education;
- Assess the programme's alignment to Danish development strategies and guidelines, including HRBA and gender quality, climate change and green growth;
- Assess the relevance of the programme and its possible synergies with Danida country programmes in Uganda, Tanzania and Ghana;
- Assess the risk assessment and the mitigating responses identified;
- Assess the monitoring and reporting arrangements;
- Assess the coordination and the risk of overlap with other donor support;
- Assess the experience and lessons learned from previous programme phases and the extent to which this has been incorporated into the programme design;
- Assess adequacy of the preparation process of the proposed programme, including quality assessment of the partnership proposals and of consultations between partners in the preparation process;
- Follow-up to the recommendations of the Danida Programme Committee;

Assess the partnership proposal as regards:

- The quality of the proposal in relation to e.g. intervention logic and assumptions, consistency and realism;
- Consider strategic focus of the partnership proposals, avoidance of institutional complexity, and manageability in terms of size and the number of partners;
- The capacity and quality of the partner to reach the envisaged results and the adequacy of the partner's own assessment of what may block or facilitate achieving the results and steps to mitigate this;

- Partner’s capacity and commitment to absorb and manage the support. This should also include their capacity to undertake financial management, monitoring and reporting;
- Measure of risks involved – both relating to the achievement of the expected results and to the sustainability of the envisaged capacity strengthening and the future university cooperation;
- Assessment of management and administration arrangements, including financial management;
- Assess results framework, including relevant and reliable baseline data. Are the indicators sufficient to give valid and reliable information on output and outcome?;
- Assess the partnership proposal budget, including budget allocations, expected efficiency and costing;
- Economic and financial aspects, as for example an assessment of “value for money”, possibilities for partnerships to leverage other research funding;
- HRBA and Gender aspects;
- Climate change and green growth aspects.

Appraisal Team (AT) Composition and Timing

- Henrik Vistisen, teamleader, chief adviser, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark (Danida), Department for Technical Quality Support (TQS/KFU).
- Julian Brett, team member, senior consultant, Tana Copenhagen
- Lars Christian Oxe, resource person, chief adviser, MFA’s Evaluation Department (EVAL)

The external consultant is recruited against the following qualifications:

General experience:

- *Higher academic degree in a relevant field or equivalent exposure;*
- *A profile with major emphasis on development issues, with 10 years or more of relevant international experience from development cooperation;*
- *Experience as consultant and team member in comparable missions.*

Adequacy for the Assignment:

- *International experience from technical assistance or cooperation with African research institutions or universities;*
- *Experience with capacity development, preferably in relation to research or tertiary education;*
- *Experience from review, appraisal or evaluation of comparable programmes;*
- *Proven ability to report writing.*

Country experience and language:

- *Solid experience from Africa, preferably including Ghana, Tanzania and Uganda*
- *Proficiency in spoken and written English*

Furthermore, a resource person from Danida Fellowship Centre (DFC) will participate in the process.

Consultancy input

Consultancy input for the assignment is estimated at a maximum of DKK 250.000 (one offer/forvaltningsretlige principper). Contract to include provision of DKK 5.000 for local mission costs e.g. land transport.

Task	Days	Notes
Preparation	4	
Travel	4	
Mission	15	
Drafting	5	
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>28</u>	

Calendar:

25. January 2017	Draft mission programme prepared by DFC/EVAL submitted to AT
20. February 2017	Initiation of assignment (draft programme documentation will be available on this date).
20.2	Final mission programme prepared by DFC/EVAL submitted to AT
27.2	Mission preparation note (MPN) by AT to EVAL
27.2 – 1.3	Discussions with EVAL, DFC and Danish university partners including a meeting with the formulation team
5.3 – 10.3	Visit to Ghana (Accra and Kumasi)
19.3-30.3	Visit to Tanzania (Moshi, Zanzibar, Morogoro and Dar es Salaam) and visit to Uganda (Kampala and Gulu).
21.4	Draft appraisal report
1.5	Final appraisal report

Documentation

- Verden 2013. Danmarks udviklingspolitiske og humanitære strategi
- Strategic Framework for Danish Support to Development Research 2014-18 (verbal instruction refers)
- BSU Phase II Programme document
- BSU performance indicators

- Inception reports
- Progress reports
- BSU mid-term review report
- Notes from the BSU II mid-term seminar
- BSU III Concept Note
- Summary from the programme committee
- Draft BSU III Programme Document, including annexes
- Draft Partnership proposals for each partnership
- Danida Guidelines for Programme and Projects above DKK 37 million
- Updated Process Action Plan for BSU III Preparation

Relevant BSU II documentation available at DFC webpage:
<http://dfcentre.com/research/building-stronger-universities-bsu/>

Henrik Vistisen, Chief Adviser, Technical Quality Support (TQS), Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark (Danida)

ANNEX 4
MEETING SCHEDULE AND PERSONS MET

Available on F2: 2016-45640