
Review of Danida Funded Research in the Social Sciences

M. A. Mohamed Salih,
Institute of Social Studies, The Hague, The Netherlands

Caroline Thomas,
Department of Politics, University of Southampton, UK

Table of Contents

Summary of Conclusions	175
1. Introduction	178
Key Questions	178
Working Definitions: Hard and Soft Development Research	178
2. Policy Framework: Salient Features and Changing Patterns	181
Danida's Research Policy in Context	181
Changes in the Global Landscape	183
3. Danish Research Milieu	185
The Danish Council for Development Research (RUF)	185
Centre for Development Research (CDR)	186
International Development Studies (IDS)	188
Department of Political Science (University of Aarhus)	189
Development Economics Research Group (DERG)	190
Institute of Anthropology	192
The North-South Initiative	193
Copenhagen Peace Research Institute (COPRI)	194
Rehabilitation and Research Centre for Torture Victims (RCT)	195
The Danish Centre for Human Rights	196
Private Consultancy Firms	196
COWI: Evaluation Research	201
Sample of Danish NGOs as Stakeholders:	
Investigative Research for Empowerment IBIS	199
MS	200
4. Magnitude and Diversity	202
Grey Areas	203
Danish Research: Making a Difference by Making it Different	204
5. Relevance and Utility	206
6. Networks and Partnership	208
7. Research Capacity Building	210
8. Opportunities	212
9. Recommendations	214
 Annexes	
1. List of Documents Consulted	216
2. Terms of Reference, Social Science Team	218
3. Interviews and Persons Contacted	220

Summary of Conclusions

Danida's total input of financial resources to development-related social science research is noteworthy. This must be commended. However, the achievement of a better return on this input requires an improvement in Danida's own research absorption capacity, and more attention to building both instrumental and incremental synergies between research and development policy, processes and intervention. The current situation may be attributed to the fact that Danida is too liberal. It seems unable to exert demands on institutions it has created to serve its development policy objectives, and it fails to give clear guidance as to its requirements.

1. Danida's research department is small relative to the high expectation put on its staff. Its structure and scale of operations is not conducive to absorption, monitoring, quality control of research results and proper feedback on whether it has got value for money. We are doubtful whether the current structure is capable of absorbing the multitude and variety of the research results it in fact has procured in the Danish research milieu.
2. Danida-funded research is lacking an adequate institutional mechanism for synthesizing, debating and controlling the quality of development-related research results. The absence of a body specialised in using development research to influence development policy, has created a gulf between policy and research. Typically, policy makers complain about the lack of contact points between research and development policy and conversely, researchers complain about the lack of a platform where their research results can be discussed.
3. The Danish research milieu is diverse, with a wide range of institutions and researchers. The researchers and the institutions are engaged in diverse fields of development-related research, advisory and evaluation research, as well as capacity building in the field of graduate training and sometimes teaching.
4. Clearly there is a tension between Danida's need for immediate solutions, and the desire of some researchers to undertake basic, long-term research. The majority of the research carried out by Danida-funded research institutions falls within the domain of soft development research, therefore leaning towards being of an incremental and intrinsic value. The elements of instrumental research (mainly consultancy and commissioned reports) are demand-driven, in terms of development policy, process and evaluation, and as such fall within the domain of hard development research.
5. The Danish research institutions and researchers are dependent on Danida funding for development-related research and therefore have little room for manoeuvre. However, the lack of concrete steps to ensure what role development research can play to support the development processes and development policy adds to the confusion.
6. The capacity of Denmark's resource base in development-related research is large, but under-utilised for Danida's purposes. This is largely due to the expansion of development research industry and the inability of the overarching development research institutions to synthesise and control research quality, coverage and grey areas assessment.

7. There is an apparent complementarity between academic (incremental and intrinsic) research and applied policy-cum-evaluation research (instrumental and hard research and development) conducted by private consultancy firms. Researchers and consultants move between the two domains, which provides the opportunity for either a better synergy or a much clearer division of labour. For instance quite a number of researchers are involved in consultancy work in cooperation with or employed by consultancy firms.
8. Danish NGOs and civil society activists are at the very forefront of the international debate on contemporary global development issues. They are engaged in development work and advocacy, and are increasingly reliant on services provided by researchers to investigate policy issues and agendas relevant to their activities. Reports provided by researchers are often complemented by field visits where, using friendly and trusting relations, they can verify information through contacts with those in positions of influence (parliamentarians, political parties, trade unions etc).
9. However, there is no appropriate structural or organisational set-up between NGOs and development research institutions, except in the case of commissioned research. NGOs, as major recipients of Danida's financial support need to be supported by the research community by enhancing the dialogue and reflecting on the development issues relevant to the global development policy debate.
10. The development research scene and its organisational structure is patchy and fragmented. There needs to be dialogue regarding how the research base can best support Danish development policy. For increased effectiveness, there is an urgent need for an overarching national strategic research design for development related social science research. The process of creating this design needs to be inclusive, involving Danida as the key funder of the development research resource base and representatives of the full spectrum of the Danish research base. This ranges from the research community in Danish research institutes, to the Danish university sector, to NGOs, and even a limited role for consultancies.
11. Although Danida-funded research institutions are involved in capacity building in the developing countries as well, a number of questions have to be addressed: first, whether research and human resources capacity building objectives are properly targeted and extended to areas where they are most needed? Second, whether regular university training alone is the best way for developing capacities in the hard development research and development policy management domains.
12. The recently re-affirmed focus in of Danida's development policy framework will require changes in the organisation of research funding. The emphasis on the role of developing countries driving the research agenda will require changes in funding structures and priorities. The policy premises put on partnership have to be followed by action to ensure increased responsiveness to developing countries needs and demands.
13. In sum:
 - Development research fragmentation contributes to the lack of focus and co-ordination. Danida-funded development-related research is generally soft, supply-driven. The relationship between hard and soft development research on the one

hand and development processes and development policy on the other leave much to be desired

- Given the absence of demands from policy makers to make development research findings policy-relevant, the research milieu diverges into different research interests
- Danida has certain legitimate expectations of the research community, which by and large, the research community has so far failed to meet
- There is the need for bold restructuring of Danida-funded research mechanisms and institutions in terms of structures, objectives, strategic thinking, funding priorities in order to avoid fragmentation and enhance relevance, greater dialogue between diverse stakeholders, co-ordination of efforts, identify grey areas and explore new research areas.

1. Introduction

Key Questions

In conducting this review we were mindful of certain key questions: Are Danida's objectives in funding development-related social science research within Denmark achieved? (These objectives are outlined in *A Developing World, 1994*; *The Role of Research in Danish Development Assistance, Partnership 2000 Paper 22, May 2000*; *Partnership 2000: Denmark's Development Policy*, draft, May 2000; and alluded to in the Guidelines for Sector Programme Support, Revised May 1998). Is Danida's funding policy positive/neutral/negative for particular categories of research active individuals or institutions? How does this affect outcomes? Are Danida's objectives appropriate, and are the outcomes of Danida funding desirable and optimal?

Working Definitions: Hard and Soft Development Research

In order to clarify what constitutes development research in the context of this review, reviewers re-visited the basics of the development research endeavour. The working definition used here purports that, generally, development research encompasses a broad area. It is concerned with preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of development projects and sector strategies; policy processes, outcomes and impacts; comparative development policy; global strategic research and theoretical speculative research.

For the purpose of this review, we introduce two notions of development research: hard and soft. First, *hard development research* refers to research that leads to the production of knowledge and ideas that can be converted to products i.e. goods and services. In the particular case of social sciences, the hard definition of development research is action or practice-oriented research, where the researchers work with organisational actors, policy makers, NGOs and civil society organisations to find practical solutions to constraints. It also involves developing concepts and theoretical frameworks to guide present and anticipate future directions of change. This type of research is political as well as policy-informed. Therefore it responds to major policy, social, political or economic problems, within multi-layer (global, national, regional and local) levels of development interventions and consequences. Policy research and policy analysis are used to inform the policy process, legitimise, justify and rationalise decisions or evaluate policy outcomes. As a form of hard development research, development policy research also includes the conception of new policies appropriate to changing circumstances, the development of specific policy proposals and the drawing of plans for implementing new policies or improving the quality of the policies already in place.

Second, *soft development research* is broad and includes theoretical, fundamental or basic research, not necessarily oriented towards action but it can be innovative and explanatory. Among the main characteristics of soft development research is its orientation towards comparative methodologies in order to produce new theories and innovative ways to interrogate emergent development issues, consequences and potential future trends. One of the main objectives of soft development research is the articulation of the debate on development theory and practice, to challenge simple policy assumptions and constructively elucidate chances of policy success or failure (but not in an exact

cost/benefit analysis). Because it is not prescriptive in nature, soft development research identifies if only implicitly (or at a high level of abstraction) potential solution(s) to impending social problems or potential policy shifts or re-orientation. The emphasis here is on the production of knowledge, where research could be an end in itself, a privileged activity with no social consequences or purpose beyond articulating the researcher's theoretical or ideological stand.

It is widely accepted that hard, targeted context-specific, development research deals with at least four prominent areas of intervention:

1. Preparation, implementation monitoring and evaluation of development projects and programmes
2. Research on development strategies and policies, including agriculture, industrialisation, the social sector, trade and economic restructuring
3. Global strategic agendas, including environment, world trade, democracy, human rights, security etc.
4. Technology development and transfer, as well as new technologies (including information technology etc).

The reviewers gave particular attention to the contribution of Danish research in the social sciences to these four generic, universally accepted areas of development-cum-development research interventions. If research co-operation between Danish and developing countries institutions is to be relevant, this relevance should be judged by how much it contributes to building research and research-related capacities in these fields. However, this should not mean that complementary research in other areas is not important. However, it indicates clearly that for development and development research to be an aid to development co-operation, it should have an impact where development co-operation intends to produce tangible results in its overall mission of poverty alleviation.

Danish Development Research in the Social Sciences *or* Danida-Financed Development Research in the Social Sciences

The fact that Danida funding exists in various forms in various development and development research-related institutions made it very difficult for the reviewers to deal only with the four institutions under Danida appropriation Bill. We therefore decided to cover a wide-range of institutions that have received direct or indirect (through RUF and other mechanisms and Denmark-wide Projects) Danida financial support. Our choice of the institutions relied very much on discussions with Directors and individual researchers in Danish research institutions and a consultative meeting with the Director of Danida's research Department. We have not let out any institution intentionally, although as some comments have pointed out we have unwittingly failed to include Business School and the Institute of Ethnography and Social Anthropology of Aarhus University.

The Report takes consonance of the fact that development research is defined differently by different actors, although it seems to us from the outset that Danish researchers have not exacted much thinking in defining the variety of niches and concerns with which the Danish development research milieu deals. Our use of concepts such as hard and soft

development research is defensible because it crystallises the differences between the two sharply while accommodating overlapping elements. Instead of a simple definition of applied and theoretical research or the like we opted for a more fundamental distinction. We are aware of the possibility of running the risk of stripping soft development research institutions off the mask of pretending to fulfil both missions equally well without undermining their capacity to excel in what they could have otherwise done better. We therefore explain any resistance to the distinction between soft and hard development research in relation to its potent in interrogating the essence of the general leaning of development and development related institutions.

If some institutions that are, for instance, university based found themselves under review, it is only because they fall within the general rubric of indirectly financed institutions. The second reason is to give, although not in great detail, a sense of comparative edge to what performance, capacity and operational style the various development and development-related institutions have. We found this exercise rewarding and far-reaching than, for instance, if we confined ourselves, to the four institutions under Danida appropriation Bill.

In conclusion, this review is about institutions that are directly or indirectly funded by Danida in the field of development research in the social sciences. It attempts to paint the larger picture and offers an insight into the variety of capabilities, skills and knowledge they contribute to Danida's development policy framework.

2. Policy Framework: Salient Features and Changing Patterns

Danida's Research Policy in Context

The research resource base is fundamental to the enhanced effectiveness of Danida's development assistance. Danida research Department is a relatively small operation, with only 4 full time staff in Copenhagen. Staff has been divided according to country rather than sector. In the field, embassies are being given increasing responsibility and resources in the implementation of Danish country development assistance programmes. However, they still have to answer to Copenhagen-based country desks that wield political and administrative control. In a broad sense policy is increasingly geared towards devolution of responsibility to the country level. In line with multilateral institutions such as the World Bank, there is increasing emphasis on a stronger presence in the developing countries.

Danida's primary objective as far as support to research is concerned is to support the development of a knowledge base that can be utilised to enhance the effectiveness of the Danish contribution to the development process. A secondary objective is to facilitate the important role played by Danish development researchers in building research capacity in developing countries, which is central to the sustainability of the development effort.

The concluding remarks of the Danida paper *The Role of Research in Danish Development Assistance* (2000: 30) provide a key insight. There, it is noted that in line with recent international trends, '...research should be seen in the broad context of "knowledge". It is the creation, adaptation, dissemination and utilisation of knowledge, which is in focus in today's development thinking, not research on its own merit. It is knowledge enhancement, across borders and across society, for solving specific problems, for informed policy-making and for participation, which should be a main pillar of a strategy for development'.

Danida identifies the development-related social sciences research community within Denmark as a resource base "for planning and implementing Danish development assistance". (*SPS Guidelines*, 1998, point 25, page 9; also *A Developing World*, 1994). Instrumental development and development research should be seen as part of Danida's objective to strengthen research infrastructure in developing countries through building up research capacity.

From the vantage point of the current context of development, poverty alleviation through the promotion of economic growth stands out. The linkages between this orientation, the development of the social sector and the need to promote respect for human rights and the rule of law are explicitly defined as areas relevant to Danida research policy.

In order to fulfil the role identified above, the research community must provide support for Danida's policy framework, in addition to lending a critical eye to the framework itself. Since 1994, that policy framework has emphasised poverty reduction as the guiding principle of Danish development assistance, which is focused on a limited set of twenty countries. Most other bilateral and multilateral donors share this aim.

A Developing World portrays Danida's poverty reduction strategy as having three central aspects:

- The promotion of sustainable economic growth, including redistributive policies
- The development of social sectors, including health and education
- The promotion of popular participation in the development process and the development of a society based on the rule of law and good governance.

In addition, three cross cutting themes must be attended to at all levels of assistance. These are:

- The promotion of equal opportunities for women and men to participate in the development process
- The promotion of environmentally sustainable development, and the protection of the global environment
- The promotion of respect for human rights, good governance, democratisation and popular participation.

In 1994, Danida launched a new Sector Programme Support (SPS) strategy in response to dissatisfaction at the unsustainable nature of many donor driven and donor managed 'project islands'. In contrast to the project approach that preceded it, the SPS has a longer time horizon, and offers broader based Danish assistance to a specifically national endeavour in a dedicated sector. This new emphasis would increase sustainability, and thus the effectiveness of Danish assistance would be enhanced.

In the words of the *Guidelines for Sector Programme Support* (revised, 1998, point 29, page 10): 'This represents a significant shift in Danida's strategy compared to the traditional way of defining projects. The project approach focuses on short and medium term results and pays less attention to comprehensive and sector wide policy development and institutional, organisational and financial issues (the process and sustainability factors). SPS strategy emphasises the processes necessary to achieve sustainable results and impacts.' Within this new approach, assistance is offered to two to four sectors defined in the individual Country Strategies. Poverty alleviation, macroeconomic, structural and cross cutting issues are expected to enjoy an increasing profile within Country Strategies.

As well as sector programme support, Danida is committed to the continued provision of project support, especially in relation to the three cross-cutting themes highlighted above.

In addition, the *Partnership 2000* document highlighted some additional themes requiring special attention and support:

- Promotion of employment through development of the business sector
- HIV/AIDS prevention/combats
- Effective co-ordination of external assistance
- An enabling global economic environment in relation to trade, investment and debt relief
- Prevention of armed conflict
- Urban-rural relationships
- Children/youth as a resource
- Partnership as the starting point.

In part the specific changes in method and focus of Danish bilateral assistance outlined above, are shared by multilateral institutions. To some extent these reflect changes taking place in the global social landscape in the 1990s.

The cumulative indices of Danida's policy framework lend themselves to a number of researchable areas in the field of development and development research, as enumerated earlier in the introduction and in the research policy context.

Changes in the Global Landscape

Changes in the global social landscape and in the method and focus of Danish co-operation assistance will impact on the Danish development research agenda. The 1990s witnessed the intensification of global economic integration, and the intensification of the global technological divide. It also witnessed the deepening of inequality between states, within states and between corporations.

Liberalisation of trade, finance and investment formed three pillars of the integration project in the 1990s. The structural reform of national economies that had been well underway since the early 1980s provided a receptive environment for these liberalisations, and a concentration on privatisation. The World Trade Organisation became a key player on the global development scene, though development is not at the heart of its agenda yet. Financial liberalisation continued apace, with supervision lagging far behind. There was a major push within the OECD for investment liberalisation through a Multilateral Agreement on Investment.

At the same time, the unequal distribution of the benefits of the globalisation process resulted in mounting social and political opposition to neo-liberal economic policies espoused by the World Bank, the IMF, the WTO and major Western donors. Protests at the Seattle meeting of the WTO in November December 1999, and the Prague meetings of the IMF and World Bank, September 2000, indicate that many sectors of global society are dissatisfied with the pace of globalisation and with the marginalisation which seems to ensue from it. Social concerns such as the environment, gender and labour issues appear to many to be sidelined in the drive for global economic integration.

These protests, coupled with the financial instability that came to characterise the global financial system in the late 1990s, are a cause for concern amongst global governance institutions that play a major role in setting the global development agenda. They are also a cause for concern amongst bilateral donors. They indicate an urgent need to expand ownership of the agenda, and this will require modification of it. The importance placed on governance issues suggests a need to re-evaluate not only the site of development interventions, but also the nature of the external institutions involved in those interventions. The decision-making structures of the global financial institutions are a case in point. These involve not only the public institutions of governance, but also the often forgotten and increasingly powerful private institutions of governance. Also, public/private partnerships, which are proliferating across many domains, are becoming important sites of global sectoral governance. Discussions are underway, most notably in the US and in the South, on the reform of the global governance architecture. These include issues of legitimacy, transparency, accountability and equity. Danish researchers may well want to input into these important discussions.

The global landscape of the 1990s has also been affected quite profoundly by new challenges, such as the impact of the spread of HIV/AIDS. While the African region suffers the most acute devastation from this problem, the challenge is growing in India, China and other regions of the world. So far the global response has been inadequate, suffering from narrowness that fails to address the linkages between ill health, poverty, debt repayment, trade and so forth. Access to drugs is a case in point.

At a larger synthesis, development research is also, if only implicitly, influenced by global governance development agendas (multilateral development organisations and agencies, such as WB, IMF, WTO, UNDP, UNEP, WHO, FAO etc.). The presence of any measure of engagement in researching topics relevant to Danida's research priorities, would structurally lead to researching multilateral organisations, largely responsible for setting the global research agenda. A question that we will try to grapple with in the conclusions of this report is: where has Danish research contributed to setting or influencing the development research agenda at the global-scale? Ultimately and because of the internationalisation- even globalisation- of development and development-related research, one important area of relevance is the ability of researchers to contribute to the agenda-setting debate. Unfortunately some development issues requiring the intervention of instrumental research, may not be developed either by the researchers themselves or even by the development co-operation agencies that expect them to produce instrumental research.

3. Danish Research Milieu

Development-related social science research in Denmark is carried out individually and collectively via a wide range of research institutes, the universities, and to a lesser extent and in a less obvious way, via consultancy and even non-governmental organisations. Some of these work in partnership or twinning arrangements with institutions in the developing countries. The overall picture is quite complex and patchy. There is no overarching framework for the conduct of this research. The agenda for research seems to be driven more by the interests and professional histories of the research institutes and researchers, rather than by direct reference to the Danish policy framework. There is no national, inclusive forum to bring researchers and research institutions together, including other stakeholders such as Danish civil society organisations, NGOs and private consultancy firms.

A broader look into the overall Danish research milieu, the major channels for such Danida-financed development research work are thirty-five international research institutes, research networks and programmes such as Enhancement of Research Capacity in Developing Countries (ENRECA), the Danish Council for Development Research (RUF), nine Danish research institutes (only four of them are under Danida appropriation Bill), and research within bilateral and multilateral programmes. Some, but not all of these, are involved in development-related social science research. In this context, the most significant in terms of funding (2000 budget allocation in DKK in brackets) are:

1. Enhancement of Research Capacity in Developing Countries (ENRECA) (59 million), which involves Danish researchers
2. The Danish Council for Development Research (49.5 million)
3. The Centre for Development Research (24 million in 2000)
4. The Peace Research Institute (11.6 million)
5. Danish Centre for Human Rights (27.7 million)
6. Rehabilitation Centre for Torture Victims (24 million)
7. Bilateral sector programmes and multilateral assistance – unspecified amounts.

In addition, various other institutes have a social science research presence, albeit it sometimes very small. (Danish Bilharziasis Laboratory (DBL), Danish Government Institute of Seed Pathology for Developing Countries (DGISP) and Danida Forest Seed Centre (DFSC).

The Danish Council for Development Research (RUF)¹ RUF fulfils two important functions: it acts as an advisory body on matters of research in general; and equally importantly, it allocates research funds. RUF therefore exercises influence in the direction of Danish social science research. In 2000, RUF received 49.5 million DKK, which it channels on to projects and programmes that it deems suitable.

¹) *The material in this section is quoted in Evaluation of Danida's Bilateral Programme (ENRECA), August 2000. Vol 2. ITAD in association with ODI), pp. 156-160. However, we supplemented our conclusions with interviews with a number of RUF council members. The reviewers do not necessarily agree with all ITAD/ODI/Evaluation's commentary on RUF.*

Approximately 130 research projects are carried out by researchers attached to Danish research milieu, with financial support from RUF. Yearly approximately 60 projects are approved by RUF of which about 14 are Ph.D. projects. To date RUF has financed the education of 202 researchers in the field of development. In all, since 1978, 635 research projects have been carried out with funding from RUF. RUF sponsors research within all fields, but with emphasis on research in natural resource management, social conditions and health. In years past there have been relatively few eligible applications relating to topics within commercially oriented development research, i.e. dealing primarily with commercial conditions and questions concerning technological adaptation. In the light of Danida's greater involvement in the private sector a need can be discerned for supporting such research. Accordingly, a special effort is to be made to inform the relevant Danish research milieu of the opportunities from Danida, and RUF will be asked to encourage researchers to submit applications relating to this field.

Besides funding individual projects, since 1996 RUF has awarded grants for the implementation of more comprehensive programmes (e.g. on such subjects as development economics and forest fires). Since then the aim being that, 20-25 per cent of all funds will be channelled into this. Grants are also provided, through RUF, for research professorships within the fields of both health and the environment (co-funded by respective national research councils).

Finally there is the scheme which – initially on a trial basis, from 1998 to 2000 – will make it possible for RUF to sponsor fieldwork within agriculture and health carried out in developing countries by a limited number of MA students in connection with the writing of their theses. This work looks likely to encourage the recruitment of qualified young people to be initiated into development research, although it is not part of RUF regular grants.

RUF grants are not confined to projects directly relating to conditions in Denmark's programme countries. However, by far the majority of them do focus on these countries, and the rest tend to be of relevance to them. RUF is also becoming more insistent in its demands that the sponsored research will be carried out in collaboration with local researchers, with RUF, thus, also making its contribution to building of local research capacity. Although the main criteria stipulated by RUF in order to qualify for a grant are scientific merit and general bearing on development, increasingly emphasis is being placed on relevance to Danish assistance.

RUF prides itself of its encouragement of interdisciplinary research by encouraging social and natural scientists to work together. This is evident in the composition of its board and grants structure.

The synergy between RUF research priorities and Danida's research policy is poorly conceptualised. To that extent, RUF's practice has contributed to broadening of the research base, but with inadequate focus on areas critical to Danida's mission and mandate.

Centre for Development Research (CDR): The single largest direct institutional recipient of Danida funding assumed to be devoted entirely to development-related social science research is the CDR.

As a government-funded research institute, the CDR is positioned between Danida and the university sector, and is distinct from the consultancy sector. Around sixty two per

cent of annual funding comes from Danida. In 2000, the core grant to CDR of 24 million (7 per cent of the 363.9 million allocated for development related research). The rest of the CDR annual budget comes from the research councils (most significantly RUF) and evaluation research.

At the institutional level there is a shared normative concern with contributing to poverty alleviation globally. The approach of the institution, as articulated by the Director, Poul-Engberg Pedersen, is informed by the belief that the quality of Danish development co-operation will be enhanced if interventions are based on deep knowledge of the site of interventions abroad. The CDR is committed to 'doing the homework' necessary for effective Danish development interventions. Hence the distinguishing features of the CDR include the emphasis placed on extensive fieldwork, and on collaborative, medium term research programmes involving partners within Denmark and abroad.

A distinctive feature of the development-related research undertaken here is that it adopts a long-term perspective, and aims to make a contribution at a paradigmatic level. Researchers aspire to offer a critical view of the development process, to shatter development myths and hence importantly to influence the agenda of the development process and development research. They regard themselves as being ahead of the current development agenda on account of the basic research and reflection in which they are engaged. They contrast this role with that of consultants who by their very nature must be following rather than leading academic debate.

The method of knowledge generation by CDR has evolved over the last five years towards creating thematic research groups under senior researchers. The emphasis remains on evidence-based field research, but achieving this through larger programmes and teams. The focus is always interdisciplinary, and this is another hallmark of the institution. The inability to attract economists to the institute is regarded as an impediment to a more balanced staff profile. Graduates prefer better-paid jobs as development economists in consultancy firms.

Knowledge is disseminated through a number of channels, including CDR policy papers such as *Agricultural Policy in Africa after Adjustment*; the house journal, targeted at a wider, interested Danish audience; working papers; and articles in peer review journals; seminars and conferences.

The dissemination of knowledge, especially to the key funder, Danida, is not satisfactory. Danida staff is under great pressure, and do not have the time to engage in normal academic reflection and discussion. There is a need to enhance the delivery of knowledge to targeted Danida staff, a matter to which we shall return later. There is also a need to enhance the delivery of research to the wider international academic audience. Greater emphasis is needed on planned output targeted at key international journals and publishers.

The CDR contributes to capacity building both inside Denmark and abroad. It plays a role in training the future development researchers of Denmark. The training of graduate students is important, as is the opportunity for some masters students to be affiliated to thematic research groups. The CDR provides the opportunity for potential doctoral candidates to work on their proposals, paid for one month, prior to submission. In the case of refusal of sponsorship, help is given if appropriate on resubmissions.

While the CDR cannot award degrees, its permanent researchers play an important role in co-supervision of doctoral candidates, for example with colleagues at Roskilde University's International Development Institute. It is important that a close fit is achieved between the research area of the doctoral candidates and the interests of the thematic group in which they are respectively located within CDR. This does not always seem to be the case. It is also important that researchers who are publishing at an international standard train doctoral candidates. Such researchers can pass on the skills of their trade in all aspects to younger scholars, so as to enable the latter to function at an international level competently and confidently.

The bulk of CDR research is in-house. The research quality in terms of international publishing is limited to a relatively small number of (senior) scholars. CDR 1999 Annual Report (pp. 98-103) shows that between 1995 and 1999, its staff has published 10 books, 4 of them are in-house. However, reports submitted to the reviewers by CDR show that between 1996-1999 it published 220 papers and articles, about 50 of them are in internationally recognised peer reviewed journals or chapters in books published by internationally recognised publishers. During the same period, CDR staff published 41 monographs (including Ph.D. theses), 18 consultancy reports, 45 conference papers and working papers published outside CDR and 90 conference contributions and working papers. Considering the number of researchers involved and the variety and quantity of in-house publications, it is safe to argue that publishing in internationally peer reviewed journals, chapters and books published by internationally recognised publishers represent about 15 per cent of the total in-house, including publishing in Denmark. International publishing is now increasing, but is not yet at a level commensurate with the number of senior researchers involved; particularly given that CDR is primarily a research centre.

We acknowledge that since the last two years (1999-2000) there has been a steady increase in international publishing. We also observed that the 1996-1999 cumulative publications statistics do not distinguish between CDR researchers output and output by Ph.D. students (monographs) and guest researchers conference publications, including working paper contributions. However, the reviewers do not question the quality of internationally published work or the criterion developed to review in-house published monographs.

Although the majority of CDR research falls within the soft development research domain, it has recently begun to give some attention to hard development research. For instance: CDR has carried out more consultancy reports, a research theme on development aid, the publication of one policy paper, and some demand-driven evaluation research for multilateral development institutions such as FAO and UNDP.

At face value, CDR is engaged in very wide research themes, but lacking in focus and hardly meeting the minimum requirement for satisfying a mandate with regard to supporting Danida's development policy more directly. At the moment Danida does not even have any drawing rights on CDR's resources; like any other institutions, it commissions reports for which it must pay.

International Development Studies (IDS, Roskilde University): IDS is a typical university development studies centre with a clearly defined mission and objectives. The mission and objectives are translated into carrying out IDS mandate through teaching, and integrating teaching and development research through a large number of students. Although it is first and foremost an educational institute, IDS has developed a unique

pedagogical methodology, which combines 'strategic research' and education (capacity-building) in the field of development studies.

Research programmes are well-developed and up-to-date, investigating the state of the art issues relevant both to development policy process, evaluation, basic and innovative research. The major research themes are also major graduate training themes. IDS is involved in Denmark's major research initiatives for capacity development (ENRECA, SLUSE and North-South initiative of Copenhagen University), and collaboration in research and Ph.D. supervision with CDR, a natural extension of IDS outreach objectives. Researchers at the IDS have been successful in gaining competitive RUF funding for their research. The Livelihood, Identity and Organisation in Situations of Instability programme attracted DKK 5.3 m over the period 1996-2000. It involved collaboration between the IDS, the CDR and the Institute of Anthropology at Copenhagen University. Also, the research project 'Institutional Frameworks for Industrial Development: Asian Experiences' attracted DDK 734.000 over the period February 1996-December 1998. It involved two IDS researchers. The Sudan-Sahel Environmental Research Initiative (SEREIN) obtained DKK 15 million over 1994-99, DKK 3.5 of which was specific for the IDS. SEREN also received funding from the Danish Strategic Research Programme for the Environment, which had co-funding from RUF. This involved collaboration between the University of Copenhagen's Institute of Geography, the IDS, and the Dept of Biological Sciences in the University of Aarhus. The second phase of the project, 2000-2004, has a budget of DKK 5 million. It involves IDS researchers.

The significance of all of this research work would be magnified by targeted peer-reviewed publication. As with CDR, there are a small number of prolific writers with excellent track records of publications, including books with international publishers and internationally reviewed journals. But the current general emphasis on occasional papers and other in-house products limits the impact of the research work. These publications are relevant to IDS main objectives, i.e. teaching and capacity building in the field of development studies (ref. List of publications provided to the reviewers by IDS staff). Yet while publication within Denmark and within developing countries is important, in order to raise the profile of Roskilde this must be complemented by more publication of research findings in international refereed journals and via monographs. There is a failure to maximise the potential impact of the important work being done. This is regrettable, and it does not do justice to the quality of the research which has been generated through such large-scale funding. With the exception of evaluation research, the rest of the research produced by IDS staff can be classified as soft research, particularly in the field of basic/fundamental or theoretical research. What IDS calls 'strategic research' largely falls within this domain.

Department of Political Science, University of Aarhus: The Department of Political Science is part of the Faculty of Social Science, the largest in Denmark and amongst the largest department of Political Science in Europe (1,600 BA and MA students and about 35 staff). Like most university departments, the main responsibility of the staff is teaching and research and both are organized into 6 political science sub-disciplines (political theory, and comparative politics, international relations, public administration, policy studies, political sociology and research methods). Interdisciplinary research is practiced through the association created with the Center for Social Science and the Environment and the Center for Gender Studies. The Faculty of Social Science has employed a development studies co-coordinator to facilitate interdisciplinary research and inter-departmental and faculty.

The best way to describe development research in Aarhus is that it grew spontaneously out of the staff and graduate students (both at the MA and Ph.D. level) interest in the study of developing countries. The study of developing countries is well entrenched into the curriculum, with staff and Ph.D. students conducting research on democratization, human rights, governance, politics of transition. Some staff members are working closely with Danida's democratization programme.

Currently the Department of Political Science has two RUF-funded and 3 Departmental-funded Ph.D. students carrying out research in Africa. This is in addition to staff research in Asia, the Middle East, Latin America, African and countries in transition, although a sizeable number of the staff combines development research with research on Denmark, Nordic, EU and international organizations.

The staff research output compares favorably with similar European departments. For instance, 50 per cent of the research produced is in English and published by international, reputable publishing houses. The senior staff produce a steady flow of publications in international peer reviewed journals. The rest of the research output is not insignificant, published mainly by Aarhus University Press and a number of Nordic-based journals. Professor Georg Sorensen is among the internationally well-known Danish scholars in the social sciences, particularly well known for his work on democratization, democracy, dictatorship and development.

Development studies at the Social Sciences Faculty, University of Aarhus are very responsive to developing countries problems, although it does not have a specialized center dealing particularly with developing countries. This is a system very similar to many European situations where faculties combine development studies and the national curriculum, thus allowing the students both to broaden their choice of subjects and to chose thesis topics lying outside of the European milieu.

Development Economics Research Group (DERG), Copenhagen University: The reviewers view the Development Economics Research Group (DERG) as a demand-driven research group which emerged as a response to a serious shortfall in the number of development economists. Because of this need-driven orientation, this network has proved its relevance and capacity to respond to this challenge through a sustained engagement in research and training activities.

DERG is a pragmatic network of development economists based at (i) the Institute of Economics at the University of Copenhagen, (ii) the Department of Economics and natural Resources, the Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University and (iii) the Danish Institute of Agriculture and Fisheries Economics. DERG research focuses on applied economic research with special reference to development economics. DERG stipulates a measure of openness and awareness of the importance of interdisciplinary research combining quantitative and analytical research methods. DERG's theoretical and policy research is based on fieldwork, and empirically supported by strong material evidence, thus making a direct input into an evaluation of policy outcomes and consequences.

DERG research and training covers three major activities:

1. **Training** (capacity enhancement/building) at the basic (100 students per annum) and advanced (20-30 students per annum) levels.

2. **Research** in three central areas of enquiry: a) developing countries in the global economy, including globalization, international trade and capital movements; b) national economic development policies, including structural adjustment, growth and transitional economics and c) agriculture, environment and resource utilization, including the links between poverty, agriculture, natural resources and local institutions. These three central areas are embedded in three cross cutting themes dealing with theory of development economics, poverty and food security, and aid policy.
3. **Advisory/policy** research for Danida, regional and international development research and education institutions.

Relative to its range of activities and publication records, the reviewers are of the view that DERG is a lean and very efficient research group, consisting of two permanent researchers, 3 Ph.D. students and possibly one Masters student. This small group of researchers is responsible for training about 100 students at the basic level and 20-30 students at the advanced level. With such a small number of researchers, time-management, co-ordination and synergy are essential for keeping track of teaching, research and advisory/policy research, seminars and symposia.

DERG is a demand-driven network of development economists who developed a niche specialised on training and research in applied development economics. Their capacity-building programme is well targeted and serves a specialised role in an area of expertise where Denmark is confronting a serious shortfall.

Like IDS, DERG is a typical university research study group combining teaching and research. It is therefore more focused and with clear objectives and a mission within which it operates. However, unlike IDS, DERG displays a strong disciplinary orientation, focusing on development economics, with no major effort to expand beyond its disciplinary boundaries.

The significance and relevance of DERG can be attested to through the high demand for its graduates, some of whom find their way to positions within Danida and various development and development-related institutions. However, the shortfall is still persistent due probably to insufficient funds for Ph.D. training in this important area. DERG has received programme funding of DKK 6 million from RUF over a 5-year period (1996-2001).

Despite their small number, DERG researchers are able to produce high quality and quantity research in internationally recognised journals and with international publishing houses. Although it is relatively new, DERG's impact in the Danish development research scene is remarkable given the demand driven nature of its objectives. It is also not clear why such relevant and highly demanded development education and research capacity-building is not accorded funding priority, particularly when seen together with funding provided for other projects more remotely related to development research.

DERG research and publications are both relevant and significant, given that it is a university based research network. This relevance can be attributed to the fact that: 1) it deals with issues at the forefront of development economics closely associated with the current global context of development, 2) it responds to policy priorities within Danida,

and 3) its research is pertinent to developing countries current development priorities. The DERG has left a considerable impact which can be judged by the quantity and quality of its international publications as well as its working papers for national development economics audience.

Institute of Anthropology is part of the University of Copenhagen. With circa 17 members of staff, it ranks as one of the largest concentrations of academic anthropologists in Europe. It has benefited from the additional resources received by the Faculty 1995-7 in order to upgrade research, in response to a perception that this area had been neglected. Thus the Institute has enjoyed a period of expansion, with new staff positions, including a new Professorship in Applied Anthropology in 1998 whose remit is very contemporary and geared towards changing practice.

The Institute portrays itself as a bringing together a diverse group of people and interests, embracing for example development, medical anthropology, an interest in theoretical issues, history of ideas, theories of knowledge and historical anthropology. It prides itself of a running dialogue that incorporates many people with different interests and views.

The approach to research strategy design has been largely pragmatic: responding to the interests of existing staff. However, the Institute now sees the need to be more proactive. It identifies the need to adjust its research priorities, partly due to the international development of anthropology in which new fields and paradigms are arising, and partly due to developments within the Institute itself, particularly with respect to human resources.

There are seventeen members of staff involved in research, undergraduate teaching, Masters and Ph.D. student supervision. Of the current 19 Ph.D. students, one quarter are sponsored by RUF; two are ENRECA sponsored; and one is sponsored by his own Government (of Malaysia through the SLUSE programme).

Three formal research priority areas are continuing in the Institute's Development Plan for 1999-2003: local and global development; medical anthropology; and complex societies. These reflect the general orientation of the Institute in research terms. In addition, the Institute identifies a number of areas of importance. Four such areas will be tried out in a concrete initiative for a five-year period: environment and society; children, youth and society; post-socialist world; and political culture (Fourth World politics). Some of these areas have Ph.D. students attached. Each of these four new areas are of strategic and analytical importance, and grounded in the empirical conditions of specific regions.

The Institute is in a unique position to bring to development research insights based on living with communities, experiencing the opportunities and constraints imposed on them by development interventions. It is also well placed to deal with issues considered by some researchers (economists and political scientists) as soft research, simply because of their in-depth and detailed understanding of processes of change with special emphasis on structure and agency.

Like other Danish research institutions, and in this case as an institute operating within the confines of the University of Copenhagen's mandate, the Institute's research and training programmes are, to a large extent, supply-driven. Understandably, and with a few noteworthy exceptions, policy relevance and capacity building contributions are

indirectly policy focused, although their incremental value to development cannot be overlooked.

The research carried by the staff and the graduate students falls broadly within the soft development category which we described earlier, i.e. basic/fundamental, innovative, theoretical and incremental rather than instrumental research. The institute's staff has diverse background, covering almost all fields of anthropology. It has a wide regional coverage, with particular concentration in Africa. The Institute is very responsive to Danida strategic research policy in at least three of its four research priority areas: medical anthropology (HIV/AIDs), environment and society (local actors in sustainable development and natural resource management), children and youth. The Institute's Development Plan for 1999-2003 reflects a plausible synergy with research carried out by other research institutions where the possibility of networking and partnership exists.

The North-South Initiative: The University of Copenhagen initiated the North-South research project as part of the University's Research priority areas and long-term planning for the period from 1996 to 2001. These research priority areas are a) Biotechnology, b) Environment and c) North/South research. The North/South research area covers social and natural science disciplines in cross cutting fields where the University of Copenhagen already has significant contribution at the national and international levels.

The North-South budget for the period 1997-2001 (both years included) is 12 million DKK plus 9 Ph.D. scholarships at 1 million DKK Per student. The total budget for 1997-2001 is 21 million DKK.

The North-South research initiative covers four major priority themes: 1) Environment and Natural Resource Management in the South, 2) Health Research in Africa, 3) Development Economics and 4) Islam. In addition to University funding, the North/South initiative receives financial support from Danida through its participation in various inter-university and inter-research institution facilities. For instance, the theme on Environment and Natural Resource Management in the South receives financial support from RUF and the Danish Environmental Research Programme.

North/South is a research and education (capacity-building) network concerned with 1) enhancing research co-operation, 2) strengthening the research on biotechnology and environment and 3) promoting an enabling environment, and 4) facilitating co-ordination and co-operation among the research activities of the departments and faculties in the University of Copenhagen. It is a main facility for supporting visiting researchers, students, research travel grants for masters students, Ph.D. scholarships, and co-operation with universities in the developing countries.

The North/South Initiative has developed a broad network of partners and individuals concerned with the study of issues affecting the countries of the South. Internationally its networks include several social and natural science faculties at Copenhagen University (Health Sciences, Biotechnology, economics, Geography, Social Anthropology and Centre of African Studies and Carsten Niebuhr Institute of Near Eastern Studies. The Initiative also has active participation in SLUSE, ENRECA, with discernible linkages with Roskilde University Centre, Centre of Development Studies and the Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University. Externally, the North/South initiative is part of two types of networks: 1) individual researchers in the social and natural sciences both

from the South and the North, and 2) institutional linkages with the World Bank, FAO and universities and research institutions in the South.

The North/South Initiative is designed as a short-term facility to strengthen research in priority areas linked to the University of Copenhagen's interest to develop an international standing vis-à-vis the debate in global issues. It aims at enhancing co-operation with universities and individuals from the south, as well as facilitating inter-faculty and interdisciplinary research.

Although the North/South is a Copenhagen University initiative, it is infused in pre-existing networks and development initiatives. Whether the Initiative has become a replica of already existing research institutions and structures, or whether it will retain its distinctiveness as a research and development facility depends on the University's capacity to maintain such a network beyond the six year period originally envisaged. The Initiative's contribution in terms of strengthening research varies from theme to theme, depending on theme priorities (Ph.D. training, workshops and seminars, long-term applied research, facilitation of field visits for upcoming graduate students in the field of development studies etc.).

The structure of North-South research is more flexible in responding to demands from institutions and individual researchers from the South, who have no direct access to Danida-funded projects. For instance, the visiting scholars scheme avails to Denmark a wide range of research talent both in the South and the North, open up potentials for networking and an exchange of ideas and views. The North-South initiative has enjoyed some success in achieving some of its objectives, particularly the creation of a varied and capable network in the field of development studies and interdisciplinary research.

As a university-based initiative, the North-South research programme is not expected to respond directly to Danida development research priorities. However, as its activities have gradually been infused and supplemented by Danida-funded projects, it found itself directly or indirectly operating in areas not radically different from those developed through its networks and partners.

Copenhagen Peace Research Institute (COPRI) receives indirect Danida funding. COPRI was established as an independent institute by the Danish Parliament in 1985 aimed at supporting and strengthening multidisciplinary research on Peace and Security. In 1996 COPRI came under the Ministry of Research and Information Technology. Some of the Institute's research areas are of direct relevance to Danida. These include a project on Military Restructuring dealing with Non-Offensive Defence (NOD) and Conversion (CONV), as well a project on Peace (support) Operations (i.e. the use of military forces by international bodies for peacekeeping, preventive deployment, humanitarian assistance)and an interest in new forms of conflict and the implications of the (alleged) "Revolution in Military Affairs". Three more areas include internal conflicts, global governance and European security.

Danida invited COPRI to contribute to its activities due to its interest in geographical areas in the developing countries. COPRI's current research in the developing countries, include:

- Middle East/Persian Gulf, especially Iran, Iraq, Israel and Syria
- All North Africa and Africa South of the Sahara (South Africa, Zimbabwe, Angola, Mozambique, DR Congo, Rwanda, Burundi, Uganda and Horn of Africa)
- South Asia (India, Pakistan), all ASEAN countries and China.

COPRI stands out as a highly professional research institute, with a track record of publications in internationally recognized journals and publishing houses. COPRI definitely has a comparative advantage over CDR and RUC, particularly in terms of academic specialism and practical experiences in the highly specialised domain of peace and security research. This comparative advantage stems from the fact that peace research is more narrowly defined than development studies.

COPRI's research and capacity-building activities are relevant to Danida's research objectives in regard to the prevention of armed conflicts, with its wider implications for development intervention in countries plagued by protracted armed conflicts and complex emergencies.

Rehabilitation and Research Centre for Torture Victims (RCT): RCT is a private, non-profit organisation for whom Danida is the main single funder, providing about two thirds of the annual turnover. During the 1980s the Centre was funded as a treatment Centre for the torture survivors. Its mandate extended during the 1990s to include prevention as well as treatment. The Centre fights torture, provides professional help to torture survivors in Denmark and in countries in which torture and organised violence occurs or has occurred. Currently it focuses on four areas: treatment, research, international projects and prevention. In common with many other Danish research institutes, it carries out advocacy functions within Denmark. Also it provides information for hospitals, and its staff are involved in teaching and applying their research findings.

The Centre is expanding the scope of its research activities and developing its role as a leading international centre carrying out research into torture and organised violence. The Scientific Committee meets four times a year to discuss the research agenda and to make recommendations to the RCT board. This involves an interdisciplinary mix of active researchers including for example representatives from the CDR and the Center for Human Rights.

Currently the Centre investigates the mental and physical consequences of torture and is involved in developing new ways of treating torture survivors. As part of its fight to abolish torture worldwide, it is investigating the reasons why torture takes place and the implications for the affected areas.

The research department cooperates with other organisations internationally both on projects and for dissemination of research findings. The Centre is committed to working with local partners. Currently it is cooperating on rehabilitation and prevention projects with partners in eight countries. It is involved in capacity building in countries that are the site of torture, so that those countries have some capacity to continue the work after direct co-operation with the RCT has ended. Its outreach extends beyond health professionals to include police and actors within the legal system. As with other Danish research institutes, the RCT is involved in the training of Masters and Ph.D. students within Denmark, for example helping them with contacts abroad and helping with Ph.D. applications.

Danish Centre for Human Rights was established by a parliamentary decision on 5 May 1987. The objective of the Centre is to gather and develop knowledge about human rights nationally, regionally, and internationally.

The work of the Danish Centre for Human Rights includes research, information, education, and documentation relating to Danish, European, and international human rights conditions. The Centre considers human rights work to be interdisciplinary, and therefore the staff has a broad range of professional backgrounds such as law, anthropology, sociology, economics, humanities, journalism, and pedagogy.

The Human Rights Centre co-operates with organisations and public authorities in Denmark, with human rights centres and humanitarian organisations in other countries, as well as with the Nordic Council, the Council of Europe, the EU, and the UN. The Centre provides Danida-funded support to NGOs in developing countries and capacity development of university institutions in Niger, Benin, Rwanda, Malawi and Vietnam.

The Centre is a national human rights institution with several programmes in the field of conflict prevention and resolution. Its main objective is to contribute to the building of a society based on the rule of law and respect for human rights, and thus to prevent conflict. In Rwanda it is helping with the rehabilitation of legal education at the National University of Rwanda, and the incorporation of human rights education in this schooling. In Estonia the Centre is helping to strengthen the Legal Information Centre for Human Rights, while in Bosnia-Herzegovina it has helped create an NGO network with the task of promoting human rights awareness among the general public and authorities.

The research sector of the Danish Centre for Human Rights enjoys strong leadership, and is becoming increasingly dynamic and professional. It is growing in academic stature and is characterised also by an activist outlook. The reviewers recognise the importance of the activities of the Human Rights Centre. A long list of publications was presented to the reviewers after the publication of the draft report. Hence our comment is that the publications profile is impressive and contains books published by internationally recognised publishers as well as several publications in internationally peer-reviewed journals.

Private Consultancy Firms: COWI: Evaluation Research. COWI is a private engineering and planning consultancy established in 1930. COWI strives to maintain its position within Denmark and beyond as the consultancy firm closest to development research. It has grown to become the largest milieu for development outside of the public sector in the Nordic countries. Eighty to ninety per cent of its work typically is aid related, and conducted outside of Denmark. Its clients include Danida and Daned within Denmark, other Nordic governments, the World Bank, the regional development banks, the EU, arms of the UN system, and NGOs. As a private business, it has no core funding and must compete for work. Sometimes it is in direct competition with Danish research institutes, which enjoy core funding.

Most COWI professionals exhibit a strong combination of academic strength and practical experience. COWI has between 100 and 200 professional consultants working in social science and human resource development. About 100 of these are concentrated in the Development Planning Department (DO2); others are scattered elsewhere throughout the company. The Development Planning Department has three subsections: water resources, water supply and sanitation; institutional, urban and human

development; and agriculture, natural resources and rural infrastructure. Institutional, urban and human development houses the greatest concentration of social scientists. Of the 100 consultants in the DO2, about 40 are in long-term positions abroad (at least six months, often two years), while the other 60 are in the Copenhagen head office. Of the latter, over half are travelling at any time. There is a wide range of expertise, including for example a strong presence in sociology and anthropology (circa 10), political science and public administration (circa 15-20), and development economics.

COWI has robust personal networks with colleagues at Roskilde University's International Development Studies (IDS) and Centre of Development Research (CDR). The director of COWI's DO2 Development Planning Division, sits on the board of Roskilde's IDS. COWI calls upon the Danish research community to support some of its projects. For example, about half a dozen colleagues from the University of Roskilde's IDS make short-term contributions to COWI teams. In addition, COWI recognizes the role of the IDS in training the Danish development research resource base, and sees the centre at Roskilde as a source of potential future employees. On occasions COWI has cooperated with researchers at the CDR. This also shows that while some COWI consultants are researchers, some researchers are likewise consultants cooperating with COWI in research and development issues.

Broadly speaking, COWI undertakes assignments that others define for it; thus it does not set its own research agenda. The market-led nature of its funding means that it is necessarily responsive rather than proactive. This factor affects the orientation of its work. It engages in a variety of applied research work, ranging from long-term capacity building development projects in developing countries, to short-term feasibility studies, evaluations and monitoring, as well as impact studies.

All work by COWI is organized according to projects, and project work is organized in interdisciplinary teams. An example is the Rural Roads Prioritization project, which brought together sociologists, transport economists and road engineers over a six-month period. The model that was developed has attracted the interest of the World Bank and the Inter American Development Bank.

The organizational framework of COWI contributes to the quality and broader relevance of applied research output, as seen in the example of Rural Roads Prioritization described above. While the impact is often highly contextualised, it can also be transferable.

Clearly the impact and relevance of COWI's work both in the localities in which it is undertaken and in Danida is in general clear. Of course the output cannot be measured in terms of published articles or books, as in the case of academic researchers. However, this should not lead us to underestimate its research relevance.

COWI's Significance. The reviewers are of the opinion that the COWI case illustrates that Danish international consultancy firms apply the range of what we have defined earlier as hard development research, directly linked to "consumer" demands in all fields that require prudent and practical synergy between development and research. COWI avails to its employees opportunities for further education, as well as a pool of financial resources for research work and publications. The development planning department gives COWI a strong research presence.

Apparently a major difference with academic research is the practical nature of consultancy/evaluation work and its direct relevance to development policy parameters, implementation and evaluation of consequences. The main concern of evaluation research is obtaining objective empirical evidence regarding the actual effectiveness or impacts of action programmes, sectoral strategies and development projects. Like other types of research, the reliability of evaluation depends on the quality of data collected, research design and techniques for collecting data as well as the care taken by researchers in employing a variety of research methods.²

It seems that some Danish researchers are dismissive of evaluation (conducted by private consulting companies) as development research. Yet others are themselves involved in it. The view that evaluation is not research reveals a narrow conception of one of the most advanced subjects of development research. Although consultancy companies do not refer to evaluation as research, in our view, evaluation research is the most developed area of development research in Denmark. Professional researchers and academics, including those currently working in research institutions and universities, in addition to the consultancy firm staff, contribute significantly to evaluation research.

Evaluation research is one of the few areas where policy makers and officials assign development research an instrumental value, and this stems directly from the fact that evaluation is demand-driven. Also like other types of development research, evaluation is used to generate knowledge on policy, programme, and project or strategy effectiveness that can be used as feedback information to assist in the making of decisions regarding social and other programmes.

The conventional separation between evaluation/consultancy and research no longer holds ground. The reviewers found that one of the major internationally recognised works on development work and research is published by a COWI employee (Britha Mikkelsen (1995) entitled *Methods of Development Work and Research: A Guide for Practitioners*. New Delhi: Sage).

However, a major difference between consultancy and development research is that the former is demanded and the researcher has to follow specifically designed terms of reference, often limited by time as well as a host of special skills, procedures, format, presentation and report communication style. There is less room for consultancy or evaluation research to be guided by theoretical paradigms or to be intended for generating theoretical insights, although it is not difficult for these qualities to be teased out of it.

International consultancy firms are profit-oriented and therefore give special considerations to time, quality of reports, while seeking to make some profit. Although they are competitive in terms of professionalism, they lack the subsidy enjoyed by

2) *Evaluation research, "the determination (whether based on opinions, records, subjective or objective data) of the results (whether desirable or undesirable; transient or permanent, immediate or delayed) attained by an activity or part of an activity (whether a programme, a project or a strategy) designed to accomplish some value goal or objective (whether ultimate, intermediate, or immediate, effort or performance, long or short range)". See Hoole 1978, Saha 1994 and Arthuer 1995 among others for more on the relationship between consultancy and development research.*

development research institutions which are either highly subsidised or to a large extent dependent on funds from the state for the majority of their operations.

Sample of Danish NGOs as Stakeholders: Investigative Research for Empowerment

IBIS is a Danish NGO of thirty five years standing (circa 1965). IBIS has a clear political agenda that has been invigorated and legitimated in the Vision 2012. Its external mission is to be engaged directly in the reduction and alleviation of poverty through its work alongside social and popular organizations of civil society. Within Denmark (and increasingly, beyond) it is engaged in advocacy work aimed at influencing Northern development policies. In terms of IBIS's own self-assessment, research plays a small part in its work, which is very much action-oriented. However, our findings suggest that this NGO, together with others, such as MS, is engaged indirectly in much investigative research on the ground in the developing countries. Moreover, IBIS has a limited but effective research base at its head office in Copenhagen. Two individuals conduct research on global trade and global debt issues, as well as carrying out non-research tasks. This research base, we suggest, is very important relative to its size. It is engaged directly with macro-level issues of global agenda setting of development policy.

It is important to note that IBIS in an informal way tries to think about what issues are going to be important in the development field in a few years time, and where possible with partners in the South to extend knowledge of them. Four years ago in asking this question they realized the upcoming importance of TRIPS to the developing world, and were able to set up a project in Ecuador which gave a platform to indigenous groups who would be hurt by the TRIPS.

The IBIS approach is to maximise the significance of its input by operating effectively with other actors in Denmark, in Europe and of course in the developing world. For example, at the national level it has been involved with many other Danish actors – both governmental and non-governmental- to negotiate a common position prior to the Seattle Trade summit. IBIS also plays a role in the international debt network.

At the European level, IBIS is involved with EUROSTEP, a network of non-Church NGOs. Biannual meetings help keep IBIS abreast of the developing agendas of larger NGOs which invest far more heavily in research on global debt, trade and aid issues. It is also involved with the Liaison Committee of EU NGOs working on trade and aid.

At the level of developing countries, projects within countries can feed investigative research findings directly back to the head office to inform the research work on trade or debt. An example would be how the HIPC works in Nicaragua or Mozambique. There is great potential here, but of course resources are limited to tap this to its full extent.

We find the relevance of research undertaken by IBIS to be very clear. IBIS in its research for advocacy is at the cutting edge of the global development debate, and attempting to influence the governance and direction of the global development project. IBIS researchers engage with very contemporary issues. However, this work does not seem to feed into Danida, which provides 90 per cent of IBIS funding. This is a great

pity, and potentially a lost opportunity for Denmark, for it would help Danida to contribute to the development debate in the multilateral institutions.

In addition, impact could be enhanced if there were greater interaction with researchers at the universities and in the research institutes. These researchers have more time to devote to these urgent research issues, and can expand the knowledge base over a longer period. The synergy created and the enhanced knowledge base would facilitate potentially greater uptake by Danida, provided that the latter was open to and capable of absorbing such knowledge.

MS (Danish Association for International Co-operation): MS is a Danish NGO founded in 1944 and working in the South since 1963. Its key operating principle continues to be the open meeting of cultures, based on respect and equality. MS is a dynamic institution adapting its focus in response to the challenge of globalization. Working with partners and networks in the North, and over 200 partners in the South, MS is playing an important agenda-setting role in the development debate and in development practice.

Over the last 40 years, MS's programme has changed significantly in response to global level changes and experiences gained from working in the field. Importantly there has been a shift from a donor-driven approach to a needs-based partnership approach. The focus has shifted from technical co-operation through Danish volunteers in the 1960s and 70s; to increased localization in the 1980s; to partnership in the 1990s. The change in emphasis from volunteers to partners reflects increasing acknowledgement that the development of strong civil societies is crucial to the development of independent, sustainable societies in the South.

MS is involved in training and international level advocacy work to meet the challenge of globalisation. The benefits of globalization are unevenly distributed, and there is a need for advocacy work on global trade, finance and investment, as well as for local training in the South regarding these and other development problems. The MS Training Centre for Development Co-operation, located in northern Tanzania, has hosted regional workshops on subjects such as globalisation, the WTO and Land Rights in East Africa. Regarding international advocacy, MS's goal is the development of globally binding rules and regulations that can be monitored and enforced. Alongside this MS advocates the localization of as many decisions as possible. MS recognizes that the challenges of globalization require civil society to develop networks at the national, regional and global level. MS calls this general approach Globalization by People, whereby people are placed at the centre rather than at the margins of the development process.

MS realizes that in order to play a full advocacy role on these issues, it must work with other groups and it must have the support of research behind it. MS is not in a position to undertake this work itself, and does not see itself as a research organization. However, it has a very clear sense of the challenges which globalization poses to development, and what research is necessary and practically useful. MS sees a clear link between the work of research centres around the world and the professionalisation of advocacy work by NGOs. It is also well aware of the need for research-based information to inform policy choices by Southern states. Therefore MS is involved in the European Union/Denmark (ERO/DK) NGO Research Initiative geared toward helping ACP countries make informed choices about whether or not to renegotiate Regional Economic Partnership

Agreements with the EU. A detailed study of the South African experience with EU trade distortions may provide useful lessons for other countries. It may also contribute to spelling out policy measures that would promote greater coherence between EU development and trade policy, and the deployment of CAP instruments.

MS, along with other NGOs for example through EUROSTEP, plays a role in transforming research findings into a political agenda aimed at impacting on regional and global development policy. For example, NOVIB (a Dutch NGO, literally translated Netherlands International Development Organisation) has commissioned research work in Dakar into the fisheries issue in West Africa and Chile. MS has transformed the research findings into a political agenda geared toward impacting on EU legislation in favour of poor fishermen from the South. MS uses the knowledge accumulated to equip itself properly to participate in international policy-making fora such as the EU.

4. Magnitude and Diversity

The magnitude and diversity of Denmark's international co-operation assistance is both highly impressive and challenging for a country of its size. Hence the potential significance of the Danish research resource base cannot be overemphasised. As presented above, the synoptic overview of Danish research illustrates that the magnitude of funding and diversity of institutes reflect a rather muted congruence with the Danida's policy framework or strategic policy orientation. The social science research that can be classified as development or development related embraces many areas/themes, for example:

- Political economy of globalisation
- Managing development: people, states and international organisations
- Local organisations and rural poverty alleviation
- Taxation, aid and democracy
- Technological capacity, linkages and diffusion
- Development impact analysis
- Conflict, movement and state formation
- Military restructuring
- Human rights and politics
- Human rights and religion
- Human rights and the role of law
- Information technology and human rights
- Democratisation and governance
- Development co-operation as a human rights instrument
- Interstate conflicts
- Development aid and poverty alleviation
- Social security
- Developing countries in the global economy
- International trade and capital movements;
- National economic development policies
- Agriculture, environment and resource utilisation
- Environment and natural resource management
- Human Health
- Development economics
- Religion and Politics (Islam)
- Livelihood, identity and organisation in situations of instability
- Institutional frameworks for industrial development Asia: experiences
- Sudano-Sahel environmental research initiative
- Financial markets and commodity markets
- Global commodity chain theory
- Food security
- Development, institutions, and foreign trade
- Private sector development.

Each of the above themes includes several other sub-themes and should not be treated as mere project titles, even though they may be so in some instances. We also prefer to use these rather than aggregating them further and thus keep the reader guessing whether his or her research project is not included.

Although the research themes are diverse and encompass a variety of pertinent sub-themes, the majority falls within what we described earlier as soft rather than hard development research. Typically, the research is supply driven, superficial in some instances and can hardly influence development agenda, engage policy makers in the current debate or lead the way in development policy re-orientation.

Understandably, policy makers question the relevance of the research industry and its capacity to contribute to improving development policy conception, processes or implementation. However, even if policy makers are receptive to the research results and findings, the absence of a platform for debating their policy implications is problematic. These questions and others are addressed below. The answers to them will help inform options for a dynamic strategy for the integration of the Danish development research resource base into Danish development strategy, with the overall aim of increasing the impact of Danish development polices and assistance.

Grey Areas: The reviewers notice either the near-absence or inadequately focused research in some areas that have become prominent in development studies and development policy.

First, *population studies, particularly those aspects of population which directly concern global development agendas* such as poverty alleviation, environment, sustainable development, social development and human security. Most of the current population research concentrates on conventional subjects such as natural resource management, migration and livelihood conditions.

Second, *research pertaining to gender and development, gender and politics, particularly gender and democracy* is either not present or dispersed and does not make a strong showing in the research agenda or publications of most research institutions. This is surprising, given its emphasis in Danida's strategic research policy and programmes. The reviewers could not come up with an explicit reason as to why this is so. While gender is a cross-cutting issue and while it is desirable that all development research is gender sensitive, neither the material we read, nor the listed publications of the institutions we reviewed, demonstrate any prominence of gender issues as research themes on their own right, or as cross-cutting subjects. This is not to suggest that there is no research on women and development issues; but even this does not lend itself to a well-developed area of research.

Third, *research on NGOs, civil society and social movement* activism is confined to a number of reports often commissioned by NGOs. The research on governance and democracy which largely belongs to this domain is subsumed under a number of sub-themes and has not been taken as a recent and urgent issue that requires some attention given the changing context of development. In these circumstances, social science development research in Denmark lays itself open to the charge of elitism, being out of touch with grassroots organisations. It contributes little to 'liberation science' in the broader sense of the interface between development research and development activism.

Fourth, *research on information technology and culture* is also absent, although there is still a preoccupation with cultural anthropology, mostly in its more conventional sense. The only research project we encountered with clear reference to this subject is currently being developed by the Danish Human Rights Centre, but mainly on the use of information technology to enhance the flow of information in the human rights field. The consequences of the communication revolution (not only culturally, but also in the field

of economics and finance, the emergence of a global civil society and such current issues) have in recent years become one of the major global research themes on the so-called emergent issues.

Fifth, *research on multilateral (international) and regional organisations* and the global development agenda (WTO, World Bank, IMF, OECD, DAC, EU), and their influence of Danish development policy, has been conducted but more from a political economy rather than development policy and development economics perspectives. This research area is ultimately linked to the debate on the pros and cons of global governance and the expanding ethos of multilateralism. The current research on the political economy of globalisation (CDR) may shed theoretical insights into commodity chain, but with meagre development policy implications unless an effort is exerted already now to make the research agenda more policy-oriented. Evidently, the absence of policy research in this field would certainly have a direct negative impact on the ability of Danish funded research to influence the global development agenda or to be fully engaged in agenda setting or even global agenda resistance.

Sixth, neither the material (5 works each submitted by most research centres) nor the list of publications submitted by all research centres show any strength of *research on sustainable development economics, policies and institutions, sustainability of development projects*. This however, does not mean that there is absence of research on natural resource management, an area for which Danish researchers are renown.

Seventh, although there are *research projects on conflicts (CDR, RUC and COPRI among others), research directly dealing with developing countries' conflict studies, complex emergencies and conflict management is at its infancy*. The research been currently carried out is more on the analysis of the root causes and consequences of conflict than the area of conflict management and post-conflict reconstruction/rehabilitation. The particular research on humanitarian intervention is Danida led or commissioned deals with diverse and important aspects.

The reviewers do not contest the fact there is some research done in these areas, but are of the opinion that what has been done is too little, not systematic, and inadequately co-ordinated to have any significant bearing on Danida's capacity to influence these important development issues. There is nothing new in these development research themes, but it seems that some research institutions have changed the labels under which they practice development research without infusing new and more contemporary insights highlighting the paradigmatic shifts even from a critical stand-point.

Danish Research: Making a Difference by Making it Different

The development research currently pursued in Denmark, by major Danida-funded institutions is patchy and concentrates on historical themes that need to be developed, reshaped and made more relevant, not only to Danida's development activities, but also to the current debate. Until recently development institutions were still operating research projects that responded only sparsely to the changing global context of development. Moreover even where new themes have been adopted, sometimes the impression is that this amounts to old wine in new bottles. The labels may have changed under which development research is conducted, but this has not always resulted in a significant infusion of new, more contemporary insights or paradigmatic shifts.

The reviewers are of the view that with more prudent organisation of research, priority setting and concerted effort to workout a Danish perspective on development research, Danida-funded research can make a difference. This, we argue, should not be done at the expense of long-term incremental research.

5. Relevance and Utility

Ideally, a national process of research prioritisation should result in a greater direct contribution both to poverty reduction in developing countries and to the enhancement in the effectiveness of Danish assistance. It will ensure that the research agenda is driven in an inclusive manner by proper discussion, and importantly that the need to provide relevant support to Danida is met. This greater focus will also contribute to raising the international standing of the research output. Currently there exist pockets of individual excellence within the university system and the research institutes. Greater focus and contact would result in a positive catalytic effect which would benefit not only current researchers for whom the goal posts are moving, but also the students coming through the system on whom the quality of the future Danish resource base depends.

The relationship between soft and hard development research on the one hand, and development processes and development policy on the other, leaves much to be desired. At least three factors contribute to this. Firstly, researchers engaged in theoretical, basic or fundamental research often fail to value policy research perhaps because the latter bestows little international academic acclaim. International publishing institutions and journals, as well as the academic world in general, are still organised according to narrow disciplinary boundaries. Development research is interdisciplinary; although more demanding than disciplinary research, it is still to find its place within a largely conservative academic establishment. Secondly, social scientists for whom the main objective of research is knowledge generation define their role as the production of reflective/innovative and critical research that could somehow feed into development processes and development policies. Advancing the frontiers of knowledge is seen as a process that indirectly contributes to a knowledge pool that can be used to promote a better conception of development. Third, researchers are dependent on Danida funding and therefore have little room for manoeuvre. However, the lack of clarity as to the precise role that development research can play in support of a better conception of development processes and development policy adds to the confusion. Although Danida has certain expectations of the research community, by and large, the research community has failed to rethink its mission to undertake such responsibilities. Generally, Danida-funded development and development-related research is by and large supply driven. As a grant distribution authority, RUF maintains more independence and has therefore been more flexible in funding research projects outside Danida priority areas. RUF interest in quality research proposals, with sound scientific bases, runs the risk of intensifying the classical tension between policy and science. In other words, while science attempts to understand and explain the reality of the world by generating more knowledge, the domain of policy, particularly development policy, is to change that reality. Relevant knowledge is that which transcends explaining how the real world operates, to engaging the world and contributing to policies that can change the world – for the better. Such knowledge contributes directly or indirectly to the variety of domains of development research interventions.

The reviewers caution against relying only on instrumental research. This is mainly because the excessive use of instrumental research can direct attention away from central policy issues in which little research has been done. Further, the Impact of research can lead to the creation of a centralised power informed only by the area where research is available and used. Danida's disappointment could be explained against the fact that

rather little research is actually directly used in policy-making. Even where research is specifically designed to influence the course of policy, and where researchers are careful to cultivate contacts with the powerful, it is difficult to find evidence of the utilization of findings and recommendations on a scale that comes anywhere near to matching the amount of such work produced.

The reviewers accretion that while it is necessary to engineer a shift in emphasis from the intrinsic worth of research for its own sake, including the autonomy and independence of researchers (to choose their research topics and orientation), there is also a compelling need for advancing the utilitarian value of research. However, this option may not necessarily satisfy Danida, which seeks to define research in instrumental terms regarding usefulness for development policy and development processes. Even within the latter dimension of development and development-related research, instrumental research could also be used to legitimise decisions that policy makers have already decided to take. Instrumental research is often subordinated to political and policy-makers' special considerations, derived from the policy environment within which research findings and recommendations may or may not be implemented. However, the reviewers have not found sufficient evidence to suggest that research has been used to legitimise policy; on the contrary, the reviewers found that there are only meagre instrumental research results of direct development policy relevance. This, by and far, does not necessarily convince the reviewers that the research being done is of absolutely no relationship to Danida's development policy. The crux of the matter is the research being done has not shown any discernible instrumental value, as is expected of institutions mandated to conduct development research.

6. Networks and Partnership

Individual Danish researchers and institutions are involved in collaborative research with a wide range of institutions in Denmark and abroad. Collaboration is an imperative necessitated by the existence of a relatively small pool of researchers, and the overlap of institutional objectives and functions. Danish research networks often involve large number of institutions and individuals and are, to a large extent, of an ad hoc nature, often project or programme-based. The reviewers could not see whether networks such as ENRECA, DERG and North-South Initiative could evolve into long-term strategic and sustainable networks.

The current research networks are fluid, informal and based on links between institutions and individuals that operate jointly in a specific time bound activity or activities. Since all networks depend heavily on government funding (Danida and other national ministries), it is difficult for the Danish research networks to qualify under the optimal requirements of sustainable functioning networks. That is, the capacity to depict interrelationships and synergies between activities in order to consolidate gains and reveal anomalies and constraints, including the facilitation of inter-project continuity and long-term alliances. Typically, the institutions and individuals engaged in these informal networks operate independently, more concerned with the end result than the sustainability of the research project or programme.

Due to the similarity and overlap of the range of research projects, programmes and activities in which collaborating institutions and individual researchers are involved, division of activities between networks is difficult to ensure. Various institutions attempt to maximise input at the expense of shared-results. As in the case of ENRECA, the network partners have different experiences with capacity building in the field of development research, but to what extent these experiences have contributed to the development of an ENRECA-wide long-term strategy is in the view of the reviewers not evident. To that extent the networks consist of an aggregation of institutional and individual interests, thus fall short of mutual dependency of activity and events that are often considered catalytic to researchers' efforts to forge long term alliances. The idea that networks are basic research planning and co-ordination units can hardly be achieved under the current structure, which in a broad sense impacts negatively on the sustainability of partnership, not only between the Danish collaborating institutions, but also between these institutions and their 'partners' in the developing countries. Danida-funded research in the social sciences is supply-driven. Projects and programmes represent the individual interests of researchers, and their institutions' perceptions as to what needs to be done in order to develop capacity in the developing countries. Danida-funded development research does not meet the minimum requirement of what is understood by partnership i.e. partnership being a strategic alliance in which individuals, groups or research organizations work together, develop common programmes, objectives, and share resources with the commitment to undertake specific tasks and meet pre-set targets. Concomitant to partnership is the ability of partners to work in a flexible manner where they can revise, regularly and periodically what they set to achieve in order to maintain success and secure programme or project sustainability. The absence of such a notion of partnership means that there are very few avenues available for funding large-scale research projects that originate in the developing countries. This gives Danish research institutions the monopoly over setting their own

development agenda, and then they seek the co-operation of developing country partners. As a result some of the questions we raised vis-à-vis research capacity building may persist, unless a plausible strategy (or guidelines) for true partnership in development research is implemented, in congruence with Danida's *Partnership 2000*. If such a strategy (or guidelines) is developed, Danida-funded institutions would have little problem in activating such a policy since they have already developed an impressive network of individuals and institutions with which they can develop partnership arrangements.

7. Research Capacity Building

Capacity building for development, and development research-related capacity building by Danish education and research institutions, is largely supply-driven. Individual or groups of institutions put together research capacity projects and seek collaborating institutions in the developing countries. Capacity building is an activity that, “seeks to strengthen human resources (managerial, professional and technical) in particular institutions and to provide those institutions with the means whereby these resources can be marshalled and sustained effectively to perform planning formulation, and implementation tasks throughout government on any priority area” (Cohen, J. M. (1993) *Building Sustainable Public Sector Managerial, Professional and Technical Capacity: A Framework for Analysis and Intervention*. Development Discussion paper 473. Cambridge, MA. Harvard Institute for International Development, p. 26). Therefore before embarking on this activity a survey of the capacities needed, and of the priority areas of the collaborating institutions, should be conducted, and grey areas identified. Capacity building would thus be relevant and demand-driven, rather than supply-driven.

Although the involvement of developing country institutions is necessary, we found no compelling evidence to suggest that surveys (formal or informal) were conducted to identify what type of capacity is needed: a) capacity development, b) capacity up-grading, c) improvement of capacity utilisation or d) capacity retention. In a situation where such basic questions persist, capacity building without prior knowledge of the range and types of capacities needed at the national or sector-specific levels, the reviewers are concerned whether the capacities developed are those actually needed by the collaborating institutions.

Although it is obvious that post-graduate training might in the long run create some research capacity, the reviewers are somehow doubtful whether capacity development is most desirable at that level.

Furthermore, the development research and development-related research in Denmark is quite specific. It does not qualify under the minimum requirements stipulated by the specific meaning assigned to capacity building in the OECD context i.e. an umbrella term to include institution building and human resource development in a developing country's management of development policies and programmes. By and the large, the training in the field of development studies is of an overly academic nature and less on policy research, policy analysis or development management. This could be attributed to the fact that capacity building is sought through regular academic training rather than special (short or long-term) tailor-made programmes. (There are of course some noteworthy exceptions, such as courses run by the Danish Centre for Human Rights). Re-training is then required in policy research, policy analysis and development management, with a specific focus on applied research, development policy research, development co-operation research, strategic research and innovative research. What the participants in Danida-funded capacity building in development and development-related research have received is actually in the field of basic or fundamental research. This itself requires translation into development policy and development policy-related research.

The reviewers are of the opinion that a formula which combines long-term capacity building through development studies, and short-term tailor-made capacity building courses, would be more beneficial to the developing countries than the current monolithic trend. The absence of training in areas such as policy research, policy analysis, development management, evaluation and analysis of development programmes, projects and sectors, their viability, consequences and sustainability and so forth, is a pity. Turning the situation around depends on the development of a) clear partnership objectives as stated earlier and b) a better surveillance system for developing countries' capacity needs assessment.

8. Opportunities

The opportunities that may accrue from restructuring the Danish development research milieu are far-reaching and compelling. There are opportunities for Danida, for the research community, and for the Danish educational system. Moreover, these individual benefits accruing to specific actors will, when taken together, result in a whole much greater than the sum of the parts. The benefits will be felt outside as well as within Denmark.

- *First, there will be the opportunity for Danida's development policy to be directly underpinned by relevant development research.* Currently there is concern within Danida that much of the development research which it funds either is not relevant to Danish development co-operation, or is presented in a format which makes it largely inaccessible to policy makers. There is a belief that development co-operation would be more effective if properly supported by development research. Clearly if Danida is to follow up some of the new areas of interest outlined in *Partnership 2000*, it will need very focussed help from the research community very soon.
- *Second, there will be the opportunity for greater dialogue and shared learning between all actors on the development research scene in Denmark: researchers, NGOs, consultancies, government ministries, and educational institutions. Policy dialogue between all stakeholders will be institutionalised at the national level.* Currently, there are few focal points for a coming together of all research stakeholders. This is a missed opportunity to forge a development research community that is far greater than the sum of its parts. The experience of the Sudano-Sahel research community meetings is a fine example of what can be achieved through an inclusive policy. The CDR could be playing a much bigger role in forging such a community.
- *Third, the creation of a more tangible, coherent critical mass within Denmark will enhance the opportunity for Denmark to directly influence the setting of the global development agenda.* Currently Denmark is one of the world leaders in terms of contributions of GNP to development co-operation, and Danish NGOs are admired world-wide. However, the level of influence that Denmark exerts within the major multilateral agencies, is not commensurate with its high standing within the international development co-operation community. A more coherent development community at home would help Denmark to counter the Anglo-Saxon dominance of global development policy-making in the major multilaterals – a factor that bothers many Danish development researchers.
- *Fourth, co-ordination of the research agenda at the national level will make it easier to control quality, ensure relevance, identify grey areas, explore new areas of development and research intervention, avoid duplication and unproductive overlap, consolidate gains.* The lack of a strategic plan for national development research is leading to patchy coverage. The lack of effective monitoring means that research does not always attain the desired international standard, and where it is of international quality, opportunities to capture an international audience are often missed. Some areas of interest to Danida are not covered. Projects are often funded on account of their intrinsic research merit rather than their relevance to Danida or the global development agenda.
- *Fifth, there will be more effective resource rationalisation.* To diminish the impact of cuts in allocated resources, and to decrease unnecessary waste and duplication, there needs to be a more efficient use of resources. There must be greater direction from

Danida about its needs and expectations, and the research community must engage in a conversation about how these might best be met.

- Sixth, there will be a Denmark-wide documentation of development research activities. This transparency will make it far easier for those within the system and outside it to access relevant researchers and materials and build networks.
- *Seventh, there will be the opportunity for better absorption of research findings by Danida, and hence the opportunity for improved policy.* Currently there are significant blocks to the transmission of research findings to Danida. Both Danida and researchers find this situation frustrating.
- *Eighth, Danida will feel that it is enjoying better value for money in terms of its investment in the Danish research community.* Researchers will feel valued and their standing will be enhanced. There will be a greater sense of security for them within the relationship with Danida.
- *Ninth, international development studies will be further entrenched within the Danish higher education system.* Currently Roskilde is shouldering the main burden of development studies teaching. There is potential to bring existing disciplinary researchers into development studies teaching a more formal way, along with researchers from research institutes.
- *Tenth, Danish international development studies will achieve greater impact within the international academic community.* Too little effort has been made to date to offer the findings of Danish development research in the social sciences to the international community of scholars. There is an opportunity now to direct Danish scholars in a much more focused way towards exposure and participation in the international arena. This will bring mutual benefits.
- *Eleventh, there will also be the opportunity for the development of workable networks for genuine partnership.* Within this relatively small, comparatively well-resourced community of interested stakeholders in Denmark, there is great scope for the building of sustainable partnership. This requires widespread commitment, but with a central driver that provides the space and focal point around which to build. With stronger partnerships within Denmark, there will be the chance to forge stronger partnerships outside.

In conclusion, in the view of the reviewers, the existence of the Commission means that there is an opportunity to change the structure and the process of Danida-funded development-related research in Denmark. If the research community and Danida can work together to revise the structure and process of funded research, if they can share a clearer sense of appropriate expectations within their relationship, then all parties will flourish, and the whole will be far greater than the sum of its parts.

9. Recommendations

1. In order for the research community and Danida to arrive at a satisfactory and flourishing relationship based on mutual benefits and synergy, the structure and process of development research in Denmark must be reformed, or even radically transformed. The significance of the outcome will in our view be related to the boldness of the path taken.
2. The reviewers do not regard the maintenance of the current organisational structure as a serious recommendation to achieve the desired result i.e. the development of a balancing act between incremental and instrumental research. However, the reviewers consider some of the problems facing the research institutions as a symptom of a bigger problem, rather than the problem itself. The bigger problem is the fragmented nature of the supply-driven research scene, largely funded by Danida but without direct mapping onto Danida's priorities and without direct and continuous open channels of communication with Danida.
3. The quality and amount of peer review published international level research and dissemination is not commensurate with the level of expenditure across the research institutions. However, understandably, the value of such research to Danida is limited, although it can be described as dominantly incremental. There is the need to augment international level research, including development of a prudent system of peer performance reviews.
4. There is the need to develop a spectrum ranging from limited to much more far-reaching restructuring, with the latter in our view the most desirable path. In all cases, new channels of dialogue with Danida would need to be activated, and greater communication between all stakeholders in the Danish research milieu would be necessary. Below we outline four possibilities along that spectrum; these should be taken as indicative, not exhaustive.
5. While the reviewers acknowledge the significance of NGOs and grassroots and civil society organizations quest for informed debate on new development issues, their access to the research milieu is limited. Therefore there is the need for a concerted effort to be exerted in order to support and enhance the channels of communication between the Danish research milieu, NGOs, grassroots and civil society organization.
6. Danish consultancy firms play an important role in providing demand-driven instrumental (evaluation and impact assessment among others) development research. Their contribution to evaluation research signals them as readily available to undertake policy research that feeds directly into Danida's needs. Some of the social scientists working in these consultancy firms produce high reports. It is recommended that the Commission look carefully into the consequences of the current relationship between these consultancy firms and the mainstream Danish development institutions.
7. The reviewers acknowledge the proliferation and use of IT for virtual networking and partnership publicity. However, the reviewers are of the view that most such virtual networks have not been used effectively for the dissemination of international research. The impression given is that these are on an informal nature. Networks and

partnership with developing countries requires special effort and Danida and the Danish research milieu should make an effort to make true partnership happen and networks combine both real and virtual relations in joint activities.

8. Special attention should be given to a co-ordinated effort for the Danish research milieu to leave an impact on the grey areas described in this report. This is particularly important due to the direct bearing of these research topics on the changing patterns as well as priority and current development agenda setting – both for Danida and globally.
9. While there is an apparent need for creating a national institution to set a development research agenda in co-operation with the Danish research milieu and Danida, caution must be taken against a heavily centralised research structure which may stifle initiatives and strangles the existing potential for diversity and innovation.
10. Finally, the relevance and utility of development research to Danida can be assured only if Danida has been able to create clear demands on the research community, including drawing rights and performance contracts. Essentially Danida must develop its own capacity to absorb the research findings and utilise them in order to enhance hence improve its development policy activities.

Annex 1

Documents Consulted for Danida Review

1. CDR Website.
2. CDR Ministry of Foreign Affairs 'Evaluation Report: CDR Volumes 1 and 11', 1996.
3. CDR 2000' pamphlet.
4. CDR Annual report 1999.
5. CDR 'Continuity and Change at CDR', paper for the Commission on Development-related research funded by Danida, 11 September 2000.
6. CDR 1999: Objectives and Achievements- Outputs and resources' 1st draft, 4 October 2000.
7. CDR Tables showing composition of CDR staff 1997-99, and the number and origin of Ph.D. students attached to CDR.
8. CDR external "Evaluation of the Research Area 'Local Institutions and rural Development' at the CDR", April 2000.
9. CDR list of publications of CDR staff over the period 1996-2000, broken down by monograph, articles, papers published outside CDR; other papers; consultancy reports.
10. CDR Policy Paper 'Agricultural Policy in Africa after Adjustment' edited by E. Friis-Hansen.
11. CDR sample of five publications by each research group.
12. CDR Memo on its potential restructuring.
13. (COPRI) (2000) Copenhagen Peace Research Institute: Presentation of Research Programmes and Staff.
14. (COPRI) (2000) Copenhagen Peace Research Institute. Sample of 5 publications submitted by the staff.
15. Copenhagen Peace Research Institute.
16. Danish Council for Development Research: 'Data base: Projects on Social Science', displaying grant holder, title, RUF file number, project period and type (e.g. doctoral, postdoctoral other) institutional host, partners keywords, statement on relevance to development aid, English abstract, Danish abstract, and where relevant, resulting publications.
17. Danish Centre for Human Rights (2000) Presentation of Staff and Research Projects.
18. Danish Centre for Human Rights Web-site.
<http://www.humanrights.dk/uk/reportsindex.htm>.
19. Danish Centre for Human Rights (2000) Denmark's fourth periodic report concerning the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.
20. Danish Council for Development Research: RUF 'Summaries of Research Projects, 1996-97', published 1998.
21. Danish Council for Development Research: RUF 'Summaries of Research Projects, 1998', published 1999.
22. Danish Council for Development Research, RUF: 'Priorities for Danida- financed Development Research', Paper for the Commission on Development-related Research Funded by Danida, 10 October 2000.
23. Danida: 'Evaluation Report: CDR' Main report and annexes, Volumes 1 and 11, 1996/4.
24. Danida: 'Guidelines for Sector Programme Support' (1998, revised)

25. Danida: 'Evaluation of Danida's Bilateral Programme for Enhancement of Research Capacity in Developing Countries' Draft Phase 3 Report, Volumes 1 and 11, August 22nd 2000.
26. Danida: 'Denmark's Development Policy' draft analysis document, May 2000.
27. Danida, Sts 4: 'Analysis of Danish Assistance to the CGIAR Centres' Final Report, August 1999.
28. Danida: 'Gender Equality in Danish Development Co-operation' Working paper 10, *Partnership 2000*, May 2000.
29. Danida: 'Danish Development Assistance in the Field of Research', October 1999.
30. Danida: 'The Role of Research in Danish Development Assistance' *Partnership 2000*, Paper 22, May 2000.
31. Danida: 'A Developing World: Strategy for Danish Development Policy towards the Year 2000' Summary of a Strategy Paper presented by the Danish Government, March 1994.
32. IBIS (2000) Reporting 2000/Applications, Overall Strategy, pp. 2-21.
33. MS Annual Report 1999: Danish Association for International Co-operation.
34. MS in the South (2000) Position Paper No. 2 NGO Strategy 2000. Danish Association for International Co-operation.
35. MS in the South: Partners and Activities.(2000). Danish Association for International Co-operation.
36. MS: Civil Society and the NGOs: Defining the Nature of the Challenge (2000). Discussion Paper No. 1. Danish Association for International Co-operation.
37. RCT Arsberetning (Annual Report)1998: Rehabilitation and Research Centre for Torture Victims.
38. RCT-Compilation of Publications (1999) Rehabilitation and Research Centre for Torture Victims.
39. RCT-Briefly (2000) RCT's Work with Torture Survivors in Denmark and Abroad. Rehabilitation and Research Centre for Torture Victims.
40. RCT-Globally (2000): RCT's International Work. Rehabilitation and Research Centre for Torture Victims.
41. RCT-Strategy for the Rehabilitation and Research Centre for Torture Victims (2000-2003). Rehabilitation and Research Centre for Torture Victims.
42. RCT-Strategy for the Rehabilitation and Research Centre for Torture Victims (2000). Sample of five publications submitted to the reviewers.
43. Roskilde University (2000) Research Areas, Graduate School Master's Programme. International Development Studies
44. Roskilde University (2000) List of Publications submitted by IDS programme Leaders.
45. Roskilde University (2000) Five sample Publications submitted by IDS staff to the reviewers.
46. Roskilde University (2000) University Catalogue and Description of Programmes.
47. University of Aarhus (1999-2000) Annual Report.
48. University of Aarhus (1997) Department of Political Science: Presentation of Scientific Staff.
49. University of Aarhus (1999) Department of Political Science: Presentation of Scientific Staff.
50. University of Aarhus (1999) Department of Political Science: Presentation of Scientific Staff.
51. University of Aarhus (2000) Political Science. Information Package.
52. University of Copenhagen (2000) North-South Priority Area: Strategy Paper (2000-2003).
53. University of Copenhagen (2000) Progress Report for the North-South Priority Area.

Annex 2

Terms of Reference, Specialist Review Team (Social Sciences)

Terms of Reference

The social sciences specialist team is requested to:

- Prepare an overview of Danida-funded development research in the field of social sciences. In addition to a mapping exercise, the team is expected to point out particular features which characterise the field, such as diversity of interests, continuity and stability, national and international linkages to other research environments linkages to development agencies, the importance of interdisciplinary approaches etc.
- To the extent possible, the volume and quality of the research output should be described and assessed, e.g. with reference to internationally acknowledged publications and procedures for quality assurance
- Assess the relationship between Danish development research and the ‘mainstream’ national research agenda within the field of social sciences. A main issue to be examined is the extent to which development-related research is seen as an integral component of the national research agenda (and, by extension, how this is reflected in organisational and financial terms)
- Assess the contribution of Danish development research to the international social sciences research effort with specific reference to the comparative advantages that Danish institutes may bring to the overall effort
- Assess the ability of the overall Danish development research effort in social science subjects to adapt to new and emerging issues, and to modify the research agenda appropriately both in terms of international and developing country priorities
- Assess the upstream administrative and institutional arrangements and structures and their influence on the quality and focus of the research into social science issues
- Assess the impact of Danish development research in social sciences in terms of building of long term capacity in Denmark, its impact on Danida’s work and priorities and its contribution to increase the capacity of partner countries to respond to social science research challenges generated by the development process.

Mode of Work

The team will review available documentation and available research output from the Danish institutions engaged in development research. Members of the team will undertake these reviews on the basis of their expertise and experience. In Denmark, administrative support will be provided by Development Associated to facilitate visits to the most relevant Danish research institutes, consultations with Danish colleagues, as well as with any developing country collaborators who may be in Denmark during this period.

Reporting

The team will prepare a report that will contain:

- The review and assessment of the team with respect to the quality and relevance of Danish development research in the field of social sciences
- A discussion of issues arising from the review with regard to options, opportunities and priorities for future Danida support to development research in Denmark.

Schedule

The team will start the preliminary review of written material as soon as it becomes available. The team will visit Denmark for a period of 7-10 days.

Annex 3

A. Interviews in Copenhagen 2-5 October 2000

Monday 2 October

- 9.00 Poul Engberg Pedersen, Center for Development Reseach.
- 13.30 Roskilde University, contactperson Laurids S. Lauridsen, IDS.

Tuesday 3 October

CDR

- 9.00-10.30 Globalisation research theme. Peter Gibbon, Phil Raikes and Claes Brundenius.
- 10.45-12.30 Management research theme. Gorm Rye Olsen, Neil Webster, Kirsten Westergaard, Ole Therkildsen and Kirsten Bach.
- 12.30-13.00 Lunch. Anni Hammerlund (Administration) and Jesper Linell (Publications and Information).
- 13.00-14.45 Nature research theme. Jannik Boesen, Esbern Friis-Hansen, Steen Folke, Helle Ravnborg and Rie Odgaard.
- 15.00-16.30 Conflict research theme. Finn Stepputat, Nick van Hear and Ninna Nyberg Sørensen.

Wednesday 4 October

- 9.00-10.00 Jørgen Bæk Simonsen, Director of Carsten Nieburh Institute (North-South coordination group).
- 12.30 Klaus Winkel, head of research office, Danida.
- 16.00 Niels Fold, Institute of Geography, (North-South coordination group).

Thursday 5 October

- 9.00 Bjørn Møller, Center for peace and conflict.
- 11.30 Rasmus Heltberg, Institute of Economics.

B. Interviews in Copenhagen 23-27 October 2000**Monday, 23 October**

- 10.00 IBIS:
Lars Koch
Morten Emil Hansen
Vagn Berthelsen
- 13.00-15.00 Center for Torture and Rehabilitation:
Edith Montgomery

Tuesday 24 October

- 9.00 COWI. Consulting Engineers and Planners AS
Consult Lars Peter Christensen (LPC)
- 11.30 Ivan Nielsen, director of RUF (Council of development Research)

Wednesday 25 October

- 9.00 Institute of Anthropology, Michael Whyte,
16.00 Poul Buck-Hansen, director, Development Associates
Evening: Holger Bern Hansen, director of Centre for Africa Studies

Thursday 26 October

- 14.00-15.00 Centre for Human Rights:
Hans Otto Sahne
Morten Kærums,
Kirsten Hastrup

Friday 27 October

Bjørn Førde, Secretary General, Danish Association for
International Development, (MS)

C. Interviews in Aarhus 5 December 2000**Wednesday 5 December**

Clement S. Østergaard and Jørgen Dige Pedersen,
Department of Political Science, Aarhus University,
