

CSPP Advisory Group Meeting

ODI 15th November 2006

In Attendance

- Nicolás Ducoté, CIPPEC, Argentina
- Priyanthi Fernando, CEPA, Sri Lanka
- Professor Amani, ESRF, Tanzania
- Volkhart Finn Heinrich, CIVICUS, South Africa
- Diane Stone, University of Warwick, UK
- Megan Lloyd Laney, CommsConsult, UK
- Simon Maxwell, ODI, UK
- Andrew Shepherd, ODI, UK
- John Young, ODI, UK
- Naved Chowdhury, ODI, UK
- Kirsty Cockburn, ODI, UK
- Cecilia Norlander, ODI, UK

Apologies:

- Mike Battcock, DFID, UK
- Merilee Grindle, Harvard, USA
- David Kalete, Commonwealth Secretariat, UK
- David Lewis, LSE, UK
- Alison Evans, ODI, UK
- Chris Stevens, ODI, UK
- James Darcy, ODI, UK

Summary of the discussions

This was the second CSPP Advisory Group Meeting, and as with the first meeting ([in November 2005](#)), overlapped with the [Annual Partners' Meeting](#). During the first part of the meeting CSPP staff presented a progress report to the Advisers. Partners then joined in and made a series of presentations on the results of the partners meeting. The partners left the meeting after lunch (to travel to Oxford for the [ODI/INASP Research-Policy Seminar](#)) leaving the CSPP staff and Advisers to continue the discussions.

The key objectives of the second meeting were to review progress over the last year, to provide advice for the remaining second year of the Phase 2 plan developed at the last meeting, and to discuss longer term issues for Phase 3 of the programme, which will start in April 2008.

A [presentation](#) of progress by CSPP staff, based on the [Annual Report](#), sketched the wide range of activities during the year and highlighted the growing enthusiasm, industry and ownership of the programme by the core partners as demonstrated during the partners' meeting over the previous two days. Special mention was made of the rapid growth of the Latin America network (led by CIPPEC), which already has more members than in the rest of the world, the two relatively successful Global Projects (Food Security in Sub Saharan Africa and Aid Architecture), and the dramatic improvement of ODI's own communication work. The acceptance by DFID of the Phase 2 plan, new log frame and M&E framework, wide range of publications and toolkits, and growing interest in the programme by other programmes and donors was also noted.

In the subsequent discussion the advisors welcomed this evidence of progress, but raised a number of challenges: the relative lack of south-south collaboration; the degree of involvement of southern partners in overall programme management; the tension between effort to build a network focusing on the 'art and science of bridging research and policy' and on collaborative work on policy issues; the current range of partners – more policy-activist NGOs than research-focused think tanks; and how to balance effort between work on national, sectoral policy issues and on global aid management and delivery issues.

Some of these came up again in a series of presentations by participants of the conclusions of the Partners' Meeting, which focused on five issues. *How to increase interaction and*

participation? Capacity development: how, and by whom? How to run the network? Opportunities for global and regional collaborations. How to bring in additional resources.

While many of the suggestions reinforced activities that are already planned in phase 2, the presentations and subsequent discussions helped to clarify the balance of effort over the next year: more on collaborative projects with existing members; more lesson learning and sharing; more south-south collaboration; and more emphasis on the content of the programme – the use of research-based evidence to inform policy. While there were useful suggestions about how to formalise the network and attract more resources, it was felt that it would be a mistake to over-formalise the network at this stage, or to become distracted from programme work by fundraising efforts.

Further discussion over lunch identified a number of specific steps that could be taken over the next year to improve lesson learning within the network. These included: resources for partners to write up case studies; better mechanisms for partners to share their own work with each other; more reflection and sharing of experience throughout eg the action Research projects; developing a common framework or template for case studies and earlier and more southern involvement in planning for next year's partners meeting.

The partners left the meeting after lunch, leaving the advisers to continue their discussions on the programme, focusing on the medium and longer term. Key points included the following:

- *Focus of the programme* – The purpose of the programme is to strengthen the capacity of southern CSOs to use research-based evidence to engage with development policy. Network members should be organisations keen to learn how to do this, and to pass on this knowledge to others. But they are all working on specific policy issues, and the Action Research and Global Policy projects provide opportunities to 'learn by doing'. These (and other projects funded by other donors) will be the core of the 'research' undertaken by the programme. The main research challenge for the programme is how to learn effectively from these diverse 'action-research' projects.
- *Spectrum of activities* – There is also a need for some more theoretical research in the programme, and it is important that the programme develops a broad spectrum of work from research to action, and works with a wide range of actors from researchers to activist NGOs, rather than simply develops a programme 'in the middle of the spectrum'.
- *Membership of the network* – While the current core partners may be more NGO/CSO-like than the sort of Think Tanks envisaged by the programme, they are all interested in the art and science of bridging research and policy, are all keen to collaborate with the programme, and are developing the sort of relationship necessary for a successful network. While new more research-orientated TT-like organisations should be gradually brought into the network through participation in specific projects this must be done in a way which does not undermine this evolving network.
- *The degree of involvement of Advisors and Partners in the internal objectives of the programme.* This needs to be clarified by ODI. While some Advisors and Partners may be interested in how ODI reorganises itself to be more effective, most are more interested in external elements of the programme – the network, and collaborative projects. There might be interest though in a small stream of work within the programme on 'how to be an effective think tank'.
- *Relationship of this network with other ODI networks* – The CSPP network should seek to include members of other ODI networks both to learn from their work in specific policy areas, and to facilitate the exchange of lessons from the CSPP network about bridging research and policy.
- *Management / Control* – There should be more involvement of southern partners in the management of the external elements of the programme in Phase 3.

- *Communicating the lessons* – While the programme has produced an impressive range of publications and toolkits, they tend to be a) rather traditional web/print based and b) dominated by material generated by ODI itself. As the programme develops it should do more to incorporate other (especially southern) knowledge in the publications and other communication outputs, and should embrace a wider range of communication channels including eg exchange visits, and video.
- *Structure and role of the Advisors* – It is too soon to develop more formalised structure for the network. Until (and if) it is possible to establish a central fund for project activities, there is no need for an additional management mechanism. The Advisors would however welcome a more substantial involvement in the programme than just through the annual meeting.

Recommendations:

A number of recommendations were made:

- *More engagement of Advisors between annual meetings* - Eg through opportunistic meetings at other points in the year, through involvement in project activities, through requests to comment on research reports and publications etc, and by linking the programme to their other networks
- *The next meeting* - Should be a two-day meeting alongside Partners meeting, with a greater emphasis on the content of the programme.
- *How to be a TT* – A small amount of work should be done before the next meeting to review the literature, and existing knowledge on ‘How to be an effective Think Tank’, and a paper should be prepared outlining what further work the programme could do on this issue.
- *Involving other organisations* – Effort should be made to draw in other organisations though their involvement in the Global Projects and other projects (eg LATrade, IDRC Globalisation project, C4C etc – if these bids are successful)
- *Engagement of other ODI Partners and Networks* – Effort should also be made to interact more with other ODI networks and programmes.
- Specific effort should be made to:
 - Encourage more S-S collaboration between network members
 - Publish more work with /for Southern Partners
 - Develop a wider spectrum of work: research to action, and CSOs to TTs etc

Full Meeting Notes

1. Introduction of Advisors

2. Programme Update for Advisors

John, Naved and Kirsty provided an update of progress over the last year (see power point presentation).

Progress so far

- Description of the programme in the CSPP AR (circulated)
- Huge amount of activities:
 - Learn from Latin American network to spread network regionally
 - Global projects: Aid Architecture and Food Security in Southern Africa
 - ToT inappropriate name, a workshop to bring together tools

The Impact Log

- Too early to see an impact but grateful for the CIPPEC – ODI cooperation

The Network: Progress (Naved)

- Still setting up the network, deciding on the structure and have just chosen a name ('Bridging Research Policy Network');
- Activities that have taken place include:
 - the ToT which is a challenging term since it's more of customising tools according to context;
 - Setting up the website: chosen one of three skins and hopefully part of it will be up by December;
 - Newsletter every three months;
 - ARP: research and action to feed into the ongoing policy process, not first do the research and then engage in the policy process. Very interesting proposals, and chosen 5
 - Participated in external events (CIVCUS) with invited member from Zambia and John participated in a workshop in Delhi together with one partner from Kenya
- External demand for support, especially from CEF with a project attempting to be pro-active rather than reactive

Issues

- Takes time to show impact
- Discussions on memberships (e.g. core partners)

ODI's own Communications (Kirsty)

- Clustering material, linkages for output across the institute
- Targeting audiences
- Lots of internal: recruited new COS within the research groups, revamped information products and improved meeting series with material being written up and being accessible after meetings

Communication: what next?

- Collecting case studies;
- Next year: AR and tools on CD-ROM;

- Video conferencing;
- Listen more to partners, working harder with media partners in the south

Phase II – Revised Log Frame (John)

- Useful meeting last year
- Realised that network partners didn't exist: Revised our log frame
- After networks study needed to develop M&E to see how helpful the log frame is and worked together with Rick Davies and then changed our log frame again
- Structure has changed but not the content
- Now two purposed: internal and external
- Goals and Purpose have not changed
- 7 outputs; activities are the same as old log frame

Fundraising/Collaboration

- Working to bring in more funding but challenging
- Institutional funds to build the programme and the network but not so much money for the partners so we can actually work
- How else?
- Other programmes to collaborate with or get funding from

Partners' meeting

- Great enthusiasm
- Healthy questions and debate
- Common pools of knowledge
- Should it be called a Community of Practice?
- Divided opinions: why work about the network, just work on the projects
- What does ODI get out of it: work better, more equitable, less north-driven
- Chose a name
- We are learning how to this better and to focus

Discussion

Priyanthi:

- Keeness for south-south work (not been achieved yet)
- Global project to agree on, process to identify
- Related to nervousness: network to deliver CSPP programme or own life/agenda – decide what matters and what don't
- Participation in management of programme:
 - Project selection
 - ODI led – can some one else lead?
 - Is the programme accountable to the network?

John: Room for changes in Phase II. What to do until 2011 (as long as we have secured funding)?

Simon:

- What's the role of the TT in the modern era?
- Annual awards ceremony TT of the year.
 - Average age 25

- Special to be a TT in a capital city
- IPPR role model for driving the UK policy process
- Every country needs an ODI, only better
- Key is research
- Social movements, advocacy (ODI doesn't campaign), academic environment (debate in academia on informing policy)
- How as ODI we want to work with TTs, research institutes, social movements, advocacy organisations
- Most other TTs are domestic but we are tackling international issues
- Network partners not as good as they need to be at addressing global issues
- Work together to build partnerships with other developed countries
- Trying to achieve: important national domestic issues, next stage is to work on international issues
- For the advisory committee: conceptualise the role of the TT – what kind of TT will make a difference in the future?

Nicolas:

- Pleased to hear that partners and advisors are useful for the programme, pleased also that partners are being listened to and can change the programme two years in

Diane:

- Look at similar networks that have failed, e.g. RAND which brought together similar but smaller networks but failed due to a combination of reasons, useful lesson
- Not keen on the name BRPN:
 - Think three years down the line, Bridging Research and Policy has been used a lot so it's time for something new
 - Knowledge power: RAPID does not do research – policy

Megan:

- Name example: FAIRCOP(?)

Amani:

- Focus on domestic issues and link with partners on national arena
- International – Global/regional: Capacity to link
- Double edged role
- Lacking: link with external TTs on global issues. Capacity must be built. Governance to do so: carefully thought. Complex
- Capacity to understand overlapping issues must be built

Simon:

- How do we get China to get more involved in Africa?

3. Key conclusions from the Partners' meeting

In this session, there were 5 presentations from partners outlining the key conclusions from the partners meeting focusing on 5 challenges facing the CSPP:

1. *How should we increase interaction and participation?* (Prepared by Rashed, Rosemary and Manish)
2. *Capacity development: how, and by whom?* (Prepared by Vanesa, Hang, Nuning and Sue)
3. *How should we run the network?* (Prepared by Carlos Toranzo, Bola, Julie and Vivian)

4. *What are the opportunities for global and regional collaborations?*(Prepared by Carlos Aramburu, Sin and Besinati)
5. *How can we bring in additional resources?* (Prepared by Tony, Charles and Mavuto)

1. Increasing interaction and participation

- Internalisation: institutional capacity building; staffing; strategic programming
- Increasing motivation and driving force: look for external opportunities and funding; look to energise and mobilise
- Shared learning (internal audience): successes and failures; comparative analysis; tap expertise of members; country visits; mechanisms for continuous interaction
- Dissemination (external audience): conferences, website, dialogues; linkages with other groups (media)
- South-South, North-South: macro level; closer collaboration on regional and sub-regional levels

It was felt that it would be pertinent if Carlos A then gave his group's presentation:

4. Possible regional/global collaborations

- Experience sharing workshop in decentralised way
- Regional networking on common issues – research/policy links
- Regional skills database – institutional and personal
- One annual workshop in each region leading into international annual meeting
- Comparative research on influencing policy
- Training needs
- Joint action projects

Discussion:

- *Diane*: It is useful to look at the networks that don't work. What we see is that social capital is essential but intangible. Also, training is instrumental. However, possibly the most important thing which has not been mentioned yet is the moment is the *energy* and the *passion*. From my experience the 3 most important factors in starting up a network are 1) I only do it with people and institutions I know, and have a history of engagement with. 2) All the members must have something in common. 3) You need funding.
- *Carlos A*: We need to think through what kind of members we want. To attract the right types of organisations we should offer incentives. Also, to enhance the climate of evidence-based policy it would be good to publish and celebrate examples of good practice by governments in this area.
- *Andrew S*: One key activity at the moment is to identify external opportunities. Comparative research is very challenging, and would give the network something very substantial to work on together
- *John*: Yes. We can't work together on nothing, so if we want to start fostering this energy and help the group form, we need stuff to work on together.
- *Carlos T*: It is very difficult to find the time or money to spend on CSPP work at the moment.
- *Charles*: This is the major issue. It is not enough to have the research, and not enough to say that the policy makers should be doing certain things. Resources are the ever-present problem.

2. Capacity development

For partners:

- South-South exchange visits, to develop concrete learning
- Creation of peer assistance group; partners to allocate time to help other partners
- Involvement in CSPP research; to learn research techniques
- Participate or develop materials for training in other regions
- Conduct the global project
- Create space in the annual meeting to share knowledge, lessons and practices

For all:

- Capacity workshops; engage policy makers and other organisations
- Website to share information, debate, etc
- Research on good practices on specific issues; e.g. media influence, engaging with parliamentarians, dealing with corruption. This would need to feed into website, workshops, etc.

Discussion:

- *Julie:* We are always constrained by individual and institutional capacity!
- *Megan:* We want to build the institutional capacity of core members, but this is very difficult. Perhaps we should strengthen partners to bring others in?
- *Naved:* We should consider whether we want to build the capacity of the institution or the *individual*. We would like to strengthen institutions, but at the moment we are strengthening individuals. Also, in the long run maybe BRPN needs to be open for all institutions to access, but we currently need to focus on a small selection of institutions to engage with deeply and for a long period of time.
- *Tony:* This sort of question is quite normal for us to be having at this formative stage. If we want to deepen participation we should have more activities at regional and national level and build a community of practice there.
- *Rosemary:* The quantity is not important here. Capacity building should be about helping institutions internalise our values.
- *Prof. Amani:* About the question of individuals or institutions- the sooner the institutions the better. However, looking to take on more institutions right now would be dangerous.
- *Simon M:* the concern is, how did we give *these* institutions the privilege.
- *John:* Don't forget Diane's first point for starting a network- work with people you know. Also, on separate policy projects we can work to bring in broader groups of people.
- *Finn:* We are focusing a lot on functions and roles, but not a lot on content here. The generic issues, the art and science of bringing research and policy is our key concern. We should be looking at unpacking the various cross-cutting themes within this work.
- *Carlos T:* When we talk about whether we are looking to strengthen the individuals or the member organisations, we should be realistic. In Latin America, for example, things depend heavily on strong individuals; we need to play to this fact since it is the ground-level reality.

3. How to run the network:

Governance structure:

The proposed structure has a steering committee and the advisors, with the CSPP and the secretariat underneath them, the full members beneath them (with working groups of full members at this level) and observer members at the bottom.

Membership:

- Full members: Want active participation, evidence of impact, subject to approval by steering committee. Need to decide upon application criteria.
- Observer members: Individuals or organisations- anyone interested in promoting pro-poor policies through research-based evidence (like ALNAP)
- Steering committee: Volunteers/nominees, with 2 full members from each region and 2 from the ODI.

Administration:

Secretariat to perform the following functions:

- Co-ordinate the efficient running of the network
- Prepare the annual meeting
- Financial record keeping
- Facilitate contacts and meetings
- Support working groups and regional networks
- Communication and information sharing
- Run website, in charge of publications

Agenda:

- Annual meeting in different locations, to be co-hosted by full members and regions
- Working groups, contacts and meetings
- Exchange visits, placements

Discussion:

- *Carlos A:* The full members would be the prime candidates for the financial resources of the network
- *Julie:* but we don't want to be elitist
- *Tony:* lets not worry about formalising a structure right now, but focus on improving our *networking*.
- *Priyanthi:* To get a good balance, it is very important who is working in the secretariat, which should be decentralised.
- *?:* We are assuming that we can transcend things too fast here. The governance is working fine the way it is right now, and we should stick to our strengths and this informality.
- *Vanesa:* We should just make sure that there is some mechanism to include Southern voices in the organisation as soon as possible. This would help us explore the logic of joint engagement and the co-ordination of the network.
- *Simon M:* We need to make sure the organisation has 'porous edges', to allow organisations in and out. Also, to be able to make a decision on issues like this we need concrete proposals
- *Julie:* How did you select us?
- *John:* We wanted to map all CSOs involved in both advocacy and research. This was impossible, so we looked for suitable organisations in our workshops. Work with people you know!

5. Bringing in additional resources

Initial considerations:

- Need to develop strategy
- Consider a variety of resources: financial, material (e.g. publications), technical/human, goodwill and support
- Asses: what do we have? What gaps?
- Define objectives vs. resources

Possible sources of resources:

- Multi-laterals: UNDP, WB, other UN agencies
- Bilaterals: DFID, USAID, Millennium Challenge Fund, Irish Aid, JICA, SIDA + CIDA
- Foundations: Africa Capacity Building Fund, ADB, Ford foundation, Rockefeller foundation
- Regional Bodies: Regional blocks (e.g. ECOWAS, E.A. Comm), African Union
- Individual partner organisations

Technical resources:

- Other capacity building organisations
- Universities and tertiary institutions
- Secondment, internship opportunities

Goodwill and Support:

- Keep goodwill with influential persons
- Regular communications with funders, beneficiaries and supporters
- Good documentation

Levels of fundraising:

- Global level: ODI to lead in consultation with network members
- Strategic level: Advisors to lead
- Regional and sub-regional: coalitions
- Individual partner level: partner organisations

Discussion:

- *John:* As far as fundraising goes, we have lots of irons in the fire, there is no need to feel anxious.
- *Vanesa:* we should discuss funding alongside discussion *accountability*.
- *Simon M:* We should have a combination of central and local funding, and the network members should formulate a 'business plan'.

4. Lunchtime meeting

During Wednesday's partners' meeting, it was decided that it would be useful to have a meeting to discuss: 1) what is the focus of the network? 2) What are we doing differently/going to do differently as a result of this workshop?

- *Sin:* Is the network focused on global achievement, or for national level policy improvements?
- *John:* The focus is that Southern CSOs show improved use of research for policy engagement for poverty reduction

- *Carlos A:* (for next year) we need to have more learning, and more significant space for Southern voices to share specific experiences. Perhaps incentives (a budget) to write up ARPs?
- *Naved:* Yes, we need to focus on the 'art and craft' of bridging research and policy. We will have the ARP people coming back, it should be noted that the ARP budgets do include a part for documentation.
- *Manish:* It would be useful if we could share documents and lessons *during* our projects.
- *Julie:* We should have a template to make sharing and comparison more easy
- *John:* the RAPID framework already does this, but we could look for another way to collectively frame these projects.
- *Priyanthi:* lets assess frameworks' usefulness as we do projects, and suggest other tools
- *John:* Good; this adds to existing knowledge, and it is good to have learning and communication built into these projects. We could possibly find additional resources for case studies too.
- *Enrique:* How do we decide which ones?
- *Nicola:* We should look at the cross-cutting themes of BRP- this would allow more comparison
- *Diane:* we should look into major issues and difficulties, for example ideological conflicts and impasse, methodological disputes.
- *Priyanthi:* We could see what issues come up when looking at suggestions for global projects, and commission 1-year projects based on that?
- *Julie:* It would be really useful if we had some kind of table or format with which we share all our experiences throughout the year
- *Megan:* Good idea- using these templates we can then ascertain where we already have stories and where there are gaps in our knowledge or lesson sharing. It would allow us to have an overview of what we already have, which could help direct us in choosing new case studies, new members, compare regional coverage, etc
- *Manish:* we need to make sure that people share lessons on failures.
- *Megan:* one way to help this happen is to reframe the issue (don't call it failure)
- *Enrique:* We have found that often the most interesting case studies are told by people who were not directly involved in the process they are describing
- *Priyanthi:* For next year: we should decide on the location of the meeting, and we should have an event on *networking*.
- *John:* Let's start the discussion over the internet on who can host next year's event, and what to include.

5. Advisors' Meeting (without the Partners)

Simon invited each of the Advisors to comment on what they had heard so far

Andrew:

- 7 outputs in the logframe, what stage is the programme at?, no talk of outputs 2-4
- Part of the programme to generate knowledge, right grouping?
- Issue of membership:
 - Strategic membership, logic behind it
 - Enough organisations can call themselves TTs
 - Community of TTs, not aspiring TTS to generate knowledge
- Resource allocation: read between the lines but not said in the open
 - Spend energy on fundraising or using the resources you already have

- Issues about partnership: part of programme resources to Latin American network → power issue
- Agenda setting
- How to generate knowledge: is case studies and synthesis enough?
 - Is comparative research the right way to go?
 - The contexts are so difference; categorise like the log frame
 - Compare situations: what's appropriate?
 - Demand for knowledge but the knowledge isn't there
 - The right kind of network to generate knowledge?

Megan:

- Greater courage to ask questions, enabling environment for fruitful discussions
- Network is to serve the overall purpose and to mobilise other organisations
- Close community, afraid to open up to the world?
- Confident people are not afraid of being inclusive
- The 'definitive network: you will never get all the right people at one time

Nicolas:

- Too early to change governance and structure
- Test our own commitment; key partners that can commit for five years
- Organisation is very functional, ready to fly by itself in two to three years time
- Too much work needs to be done
- Key core of responsible people instead of loose affiliation
- Preserver in our regional efforts: not quantity, also the commitment they bring
- Develop relationships with organisations I know will be part for next three to four years
- The lonely person: who comes to this meeting? If we can influence the executive director rather than an intern (e.g. easier for Vanesa to go because Nicolas is going)
- How to bring senior practitioners, on senior level?

Finn:

- Purpose of network not very clear
- Partner or CSPP driven?
- We discussed outcome1 (the network), how much is the network to influence the other outcomes?
- Doing policy and working on the policy process or reflecting on policy processes?
- Good with practitioners but need the other network for own sake or for broader community?
- Content of policy, most talk of structure

Simon:

- Dilemma in the programme
- Surprisingly large number of people are not TTs
- Problem: ODI's key partners are not in the room, in South but also Northern partners
- Move from key partners to network of bridging research and policy e.g. water
- Network of relatively limited use because it's a network for bridging research and policy
- How do we get relatively serious researchers?
- Are we interesting enough and getting the right outputs?

Priyanthi:

- Clarify CSO and TT; this is CSPP not TTPP
- Around the table are CSOs, not TTs
- CSO is a broader concept than TT
- Here because they are CSOs and by generating knowledge trying to influence policy, whether this is evidence or not?

John:

- Young programme, two years
 - Degree of energy that other more established networks at ODI lack
 - Compare with RING which took eight to ten years and almost died in its tenth year
- We can't expect the CSPP to deliver everything we want ODI to do
- Engage with well established TTs within ODI:
 - Lots of people don't want to tell us who their partners are
 - Increasingly we are being asked to work with to bring money
 - We didn't talk enough of the work we want to do

Discussion

- *Nicolas:* Before we move on (endless discussion with ODI and among organisations): make a decision.
- *Naved:* It's rare that we speak about the other outcomes. Outcome 2 only gets 10% of the funding, but the success of the programme seems to rely on this outcome. Want to build a coherent outcome: all partners should have a say in resource allocation etc
- *Simon:* Maybe not with these people, maybe with other partners that work on the other outcomes
- *Priyanthi:* Integrate the network in programme, the network has no meaning by itself – why build a network? For what?
- *Nicolas:* Outcome 6: is not up to us. Outcome 5 and 7: limited and marginal impact. Outcome 1 to 4: what we can do.
- *Simon:* Outcome 5, 6 and 7 together: should be covered by advisors
- *John:* Outcome 5: more resources. Invest in ODI's communication. Outcome 6 and 7: interesting for both us and other members of the network
- *Nicolas:* Limited time and shall we look at all kind of CSOs?
- *John:* TT like functions (like us) rather than TT like organisations
- *Andrew:* Too wide? Output 5: monitor a lot? What is it going to deliver for us?
- *Simon:* Market for TT Directors to meet
- *Priyanthi:* CEPA is not seeing itself as a TT. We struggle with 5, 6 and 7 ourselves
- *Simon:* Not very well prepared to deal with this: work stream for TT directors
- *Nicolas:* Let's deal with outcomes 1 to 4 now and deal with 5 to 7 later
- *Simon:* How do we deal with M&E? Feedback to Kirsty
- *Nicolas:* Like to see the three year Communication strategy
- *Priyanthi:* Very similar to what we are struggling with
- *Simon:* Work stream for people: get a paper on TTs
- *Nicolas:* Work with the people we have for now. Continue to build trust and relationships. Advisory board hasn't been interacting with each other. Bring a few new people but try to keep committed people (Advisors and Partners)
- *Priyanthi:* Self selection: not everyone wants to be part of all projects
- *Amani:* Let's be flexible

- *Priyanthi*: Institutionalised interest: Institution to demonstrate interest that we want to do it
- *Naved*: Need for being clear on boundaries
- *Megan*: User group to be linked with other networks
- *Finn*: Useful to distinguish different network. The definition is too broad; need to narrow down. Those who are reflecting on policy process. e.g. many organisation do water policies but few want to learn how to influence policy
- *Simon*: Different people will be involved in different things. E.g. some may not be very 'researchy' but will be running workshops. What do we mean with learning? OK not to be academic but intent to be. Testing hypothesis. Getting enough of joint projects?
- *Naved*: ARP are intended to be like this, not so much of testing hypothesis
- *John*: Vast unlearned material that are not being processed. Failed in learning from the knowledge you have generated.
- *Naved*: Just in the beginning; first couple of years to build
- *Simon*: Let's be more strategic about bridging research and policy from the beginning
- *Priyanthi*: Learning is not research learning but 'how to'. Learning comes from that reflection. Practical sense: you want to do something (i.e. influence policy) not just reflecting. 'Learning by doing'
- *Simon*: End of research: you reflect not only what you have done but also what you learned from the process
- *Andrew*: Right kind of people to theorise. Complicated because linking up with alliances etc.
- *John*: Balance: doing a lot less well or doing less better. Elitist: north driven, arrogance. Accept criticism: trying rather too much. Trick to make the transition, mistake not to make transition.
- *Finn*: Most interesting case studies when you are involved in it
- *Diane*: What kind of learning: institutional or individual? 'Policy making: Art, Craft or Science?' Tap into this: Craft: workshops, Science: research, cause and effect, Art: experimental, doing it, → different kinds of learning
- *Simon*: Research in this field: case studies. How do we theorise, how do we engage in debate and theory? (e.g. political science, history, sociology, economy)
- *Diane*: Different disciplines have different history and don't talk to each other. e.g. Decision making: Economy and psychology.
- *Simon*: We are not academic enough.
- *Diane*: Advisors are not being used enough in this field. Advisors can be used to link into universities: Events in scholarly settings, Ask from an academic position; Scope to look at what academic institutes are doing: research ethics? David Moss article (Anthropology)
- *Andrew*: No accident that the network ended up as it is. Elitist (ODI) ↔ social movement with focus on communication. Missing link to poverty - You need research but need to be communicated. Instead of counting, appreciate what we have
- *Simon*: Take away three lessons: We need to support people. Need to make stronger links to the academic communities. Need to build research capacity within the network but not everyone need to be involved
- *Priyanthi*: What is the knowledge for? Why do we need it and who needs to do it?
- *Simon*: To bridge research and policy (to reduce poverty)
- *Priyanthi*: Trying to change policy: whose policy? National/regional to be of use for us. Address both?

- *Diane*: How decide something on a scientific level that something is useful? How it's used (localised); Internalise how to use it
- *Priyanthi*: The CSPP need to do all the outcome
- *John*: Don't over theorise what we do. You can learn without reflecting just by doing it (compare with medicine). How to capture it?
- *Diane*: Not academic at all. Problem: to say it can be captured. Organisations have to re invent the wheel and make own mistakes. How to operationalise
- *Megan*: They do their learning by doing ARP. Learning is done on all sorts of levels. They will learn and influence others
- *Diane*: Exchange visits to capture.
- *Simon*: Individual learning ≠ research learning
- *Megan*: Learning comes from doing the research. Refrain the way people look at things.
- *John*: Maybe do more of the other stuff. Get balance right: Academic – experimental, Peer reviews, capture on videos, Not all the same way
- *Andrew*: Everything in the middle but should be part of a spectrum. Is it a partnership or a network or a network within a partnership? Use the toolkit and talk in other ways but not on the impact log, can't be measured
- *Simon*: Not many people in the network who are interested in engaging in academic debate or get people who have a PhD in bridging research and policy
- *Priyanthi*: Capacity building? Need to create that environment
- *Naved*: Good to do this now, not in the 5th year. Strategic direction for CSPP and the network: are we comfortable with the way we are progressing? Collectively agree how to take it forward
- *Simon*: We have agreed on learning and reflection and engaging with the academia. Different roles within the network. Different things what the network will do: list from this morning: Research, Capacity building. People we need are outside this circle
- *Naved*: Not aim to get additional funds this year. Don't focus on governance yet, more focus on capacity building.
- *Amani*: Let's leave it open
- *Priyanthi*: Network keen on Southern dialogue: Was in last minutes notes, Didn't do enough on this and why, Depends on trade-off
- *Naved*: No obstacles to do this; lack of interest from partners. CSPP is an encouraging environment, but people have other things to do
- *Priyanthi*: Go back and actively create opportunities. Create a programme where Southern dialogue will happen.
- *Nicolas*: We should commit ourselves
- *Priyanthi*: Research not being done: create space for Southern partners to do. Build into the selection process.
- *John*: The ARPs are an opportunity to do so, to be more pro-active.
- *Megan*: External timeline with what the rest of the world is doing. Calendar dates
- *Nicolas*: e.g. MDGs . Look a the outside world: global timeline? Business plan for level of detail
- *Simon*: Role of this group and work with GDN. Website before GDN meeting in Beijing?
- *Nicolas*: Continue after Beijing? Roll out phase?
- *John*: Like to collaborate with rather than compete (GDN)
- *Diane*: Not got any tools, training programs yet?
- *Nicolas*: GDN projects are not run very well. Don't worry about competition. Their capacity is much less than the network

- *Naved:* Will the name confuse? Bridgingresearchandpolicy.network and bridgingreaserachandpolicy.org?
- *Diane:* Why turn into an acronym and why network (e.g. coalition, alliance etc)?
- *Priyanthi:* Name is not for the advisors if we change: explain to partners and why
- *John:* High level advice. Develop into collaborative venture. Not want to be seen as a donor but as a partner. You want to be informal advisors and not more structured than this.
- *Naved:* Time/energy: should not be more structured
- *John:* Stay the same. Should not over formalise it now. Roll it over
- *Simon:* Valuable to us and part of the accountability to DfID. Use these meeting better; have more space.
- *Nicolas:* Advisors to persevere with group of people. Accountable to British tax payers.
- *Priyanthi:* Accountable to partners as well.
- *Nicolas:* Re: how much time to devote: No point in duplicating partners' work. Therefore joining now to talk about the role of the TT etc
- *Andrew:* Artificial to meet once a year. Meet before phase III
- *John:* Two day meeting and electronic discussions

AOB

Megan:

- Network useful
- DfID framework between 2008 and 2011
- Not enough tapping in to the south last time

Simon:

- ECTON network(?)

Simon then thanked everyone for contributing to a very constructive and useful meeting.