

WORKSHOP RESEARCH AND POLICY HANOI, APRIL 11-12, 2006



**Naved Chowdhury,
Cecilia Luttrell
Overseas Development Institute, UK**

**Nguyen Thang,
Nguyen Thu Hang,
Le Kim Sa,
Nguyen Thu Phuong
Center for Analysis and Forecasting,
Vietnamese Academy of Social Sciences**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
INTRODUCTORY SESSION	3
ODI AND THE CIVIL SOCIETY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM	4
VIETNAM'S CASE STUDIES.....	7
GROUP EXERCISES	9
WORKSHOP SUMMARY	14
ANNEX 1: EVALUATION RESULTS.....	15
ANNEX 2. WORKSHOP AGENDA.....	19
ANNEX 3: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	22

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ODI- the Overseas Development Institute, UK is a non-governmental organization which conducts research and provides policy advice to governments, NGOs and private sector. Recently, with funding from DFID, ODI has launched a new program – Research and Policy in Development Program (RAPID), which aims, among other things, to build up capacity for research institutions to help them effectively transfer their evidence-based research into policy process towards fostering economic growth and poverty reduction. One activities of this program is to organize a series of workshops to share information and experiences on how to make an effective link between research and policy process.

Center for Analysis and Forecasting under the Vietnamese Academy of Social Sciences is one of the ODI partners in the above program. ODI and CAF have agreed to hold a two-days workshop 11-12/4/2006 in Vietnam. Its main objective is to provide a forum for sharing experiences, learning from each other skills in dealing with challenges that researchers are facing in bringing their research to policy process as well as the role of civil society organization (CSOs) in this process.

Based on its own experiences, both theoretical and practical, ODI has identified RAPID framework and introduced at the seminar. This is a model reflecting a wide range of inter-related factors, which determines whether research based and other forms of evidence are likely to be adopted by policymakers. Together with this, the ODI researchers have introduced the role of civil society organizations (CSO) in research and policy influence.

A researcher from the Hochiminh City Institute of Economic Research (IER) presented his draft report on how IER's research is used to influence the policy making at a sub-national level. Organizationally, IER is under the People's Committee of Hochiminh City and its main function is to do research and on this basis, provide policy advice to the People's Committee. Numerous studies done by IER are based on request of the People's Committee of Hochiminh City and subsequently used as direct inputs into the City's policy making. However, there are also studies that are initiated by the IER, including "Economic Growth and Its Implications for Policies", one of the three case studies presented in the workshop whose findings received attention from city leaders and made them more determined for reforms to sustain economic growth.

Many participants have found the presentation by ODI researchers very interesting and useful, especially the factors that hinder the uptake of research findings by policy makers. All participants were then involved in a lively discussion about hierarchical organization and role of research institutes (a kind of CSO) in Vietnam.

Participants were divided into three groups for group exercise, which applies RAPID framework to analyze topics that they proposed. Group 1 worked on issues related to migration into Hochiminh City; Group 2 tried to find solutions for the traffic jam in Hochiminh City and the group 3 worked on Land compensation policy in ODA projects. Generally speaking, all three groups successfully applied the RAPID framework in their analysis. All the three proposals also received numerous interesting comments from other groups.

In summary, all participants highly evaluated the usefulness of the seminar. Although in practice, the challenge that policymakers do not pay enough attention and does not use research findings has been in existence for long time, there is no research address this issue in a systematic manner. This seminar was focused on discussing how to improve the buy-in of research findings by those who make policies. Participants made a number of suggestions including organising similar seminars at the sub-national level , to which policymakers will be invited to share their views and assessments.

INTRODUCTORY SESSION

Nguyen Thang, Director of the Center for Analysis and Forecasting opened the workshop and welcomed all participants. He also expressed sincere thanks to ODI – the co-organiser and funder of this workshop. He stressed that this is a forum where ODI shares its experience on how to strengthen the network for better utilization of research findings in development policy. This is very crucial for Vietnamese researchers since up to now there has been no systematic study to find ways to raise the policy usefulness and influence of research.

Then each participant introduced himself/herself. Almost all participants are researchers coming from the Vietnamese Academy of Social Sciences (VASS), which directly

reports to the Prime Minister, and from research institutions falling under ministries or local governments (see Annex 3 for details). There is only one participant from Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs (MOLISA) who comes from the research managing unit of MOLISA, thus representing the “demand” side or policymakers. All participants expressed that they would like to learn new tools and techniques that help improve research-policy linkage and policy influence of research, since they are, based on their own experience, well aware of difficulties in convincing policymakers to uptake their research findings.

ODI AND THE CIVIL SOCIETY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

Two ODI’s researchers, Naved Chowdhury and Cecilia Luttrell, provided brief introduction about the ODI, RAPID program and RAPID framework as well as the role of CSO in policy process. ODI is a leading British NGO with 60 staff members and its main function is to conduct researches and provide policy advice on development issues. ODI’s theoretical, case study and practical work has identified the importance of adopting evidence-based research in policymaking, especially for achieving economic growth and poverty reduction developing countries. Evidence shows that the poor will benefit more when CSOs are involved in policy formulation. Therefore, CSO need to use results of evidence-based research for their effective participation in the policy formulation. This is what the RAPID program aims at. Based on practical experiences, ODI has developed the RAPID framework including four groups of factors influencing utilization of research findings in policy making: political context; evidence; links and external influences. Besides, ODI presenters also pointed out to factors that hinder the applicability of research findings in policy including: speed, superficiality, spin, secrecy and scientific ignorance. Moreover, communication plays a critical role in improving the buy-in of research findings by policymakers.

Participants were involved in a lively discussion after the presentation by the ODI researchers. Below is a summary of the discussion:

- In Vietnam, speed is one of main factors limiting the policy usefulness of research. Policy makers often complain that researchers can rarely provide research-based advice in a timely manner. The main reason is that when an issue

arises, researchers need time to conduct study, which is normally considered to be too long by policy makers.

- Independence of researchers from policy makers is also an issue. At present in Vietnam, the majority of research institutes belong to ministries, which constrains their independence. Their research, therefore, tend to find arguments and evidence to support policies made by policy makers rather than providing independent and objective research-based policy advice. Some research may serve sectoral interest at the expense of national interest. In the near future, as international integration is intensified, bolder reforms will be needed, thus affecting many government agencies and the relationship between research institutes and ministries. Researchers will then need to have more independence and serve the interest of the whole society.
- The two national research centers, the Vietnamese Academy of Social Sciences and the Vietnamese Academy of Science and Technology directly report to the Prime Minister and therefore enjoy greater independence in terms of having more flexibility in selection of research topics and having the national perspective rather than the sectoral one.
- Clearly speed is the biggest challenge for policy-oriented research. However, research quality is also an equally big issue. For example research on garment and textile in Vietnam carried out by VASS' researchers aimed to answer two questions: Are SOEs technically more efficient than private ones and do export oriented firms work better than inward-looking firms? However, the results obtained were very sensitive to assumptions made and methodologies employed. In this case, there is no consensus between researchers, and therefore it is not legitimate to try to convince policy makers, given that research findings do not have adequate credibility.
- Secrecy is another impediment for research to be really useful for policy making. For example, VASS was assigned to initiate assessments of economic and social impacts of Vietnam's WTO accession and on this basis, to suggest counter-measures. However, according to rules, researchers cannot have access to information on the on-going negotiations and therefore the impact assessments have to be made on the basis of assumptions, hypothetical numbers and guesstimates.

- Communication and quality of information are very important. Experience shows that the best way for policy uptake is to summarize research findings in short policy brief, preferably in one-pager form, because policymakers are very busy and therefore do not have time to read long paper. In addition, information must be new and different from what is widely available in the media to really attract their attention.
- A key difference between research and policymaking can be summarised as “3 days is too long for policymaker and 3 months is too short for researcher”. This implies that policymaking normally requires quick answers that researchers can rarely provide.
- There should be a good combination of basic and applied research. Requests from policymakers often come to researchers when issue has already become “burning” and urgent. Without prior knowledge accumulated through basic research, no applied research can respond to the requests in a timely manner.
- Researchers do not have good skills in using the politician’s language, which considerably limit their chance to have their messages getting across.
- It is very difficult to incorporate findings of research on sensitive topics into policy. For example, findings of a study on prostitution shows that prostitution cannot be fully eliminated, and therefore policy should not aim to prohibit, but just restrain it. However, such recommendation contradicts government policy.
- Problems come from both demand and supply sides. From the demand side, leaders of many ministries do not fully trust findings of researches done by their subordinate institutes. From the supply side, researchers cannot provide answers to questions raised by ministries in a timely manner. Moreover, both demand for and capacity of researchers to provide policy advice differ substantially between the central and local levels. Problems faced by poorer and less-developed provinces differ greatly from those faced by big cities such as Hochiminh City. For the latter, issues are normally much more sophisticated concerning, for example, high value services and therefore need more sophisticated approach and methodology to address.

VIETNAM'S CASE STUDIES

Mr. Nguyen Van Phuc, a researcher from Hochiminh City Institute of Economics Research (IER), made a presentation on his work for a joint ODI-CAF research project on the role of research institutions and evidence-based policy making in transition economies. The presentation included an introduction about IER and three case studies, whose results were incorporated, to varying degrees, into policy formulation.

IER is a research institute under the People's Committee of the city. IER has 40 researchers and its main mandate is to advise the local government on development strategy. Research projects at IER are either initiated by city authority or by IER itself. Three case studies of IER are described below:

Case study 1: Establishment of HCMC Fund for Urban Development (HIFU)

This research was initiated by city leaders and was based on literature review and experiences. Results of the research were presented in seminars for comments and once finalized it was applied in practice in HCMC and the report itself was submitted to the central government. This is rather successful research since it contributes significantly to mobilizing financial resources for HCMC. Shortly after HIFU started operation, 12 local development funds were established following the model of HIFU.

Case study 2: Economic Growth and its Implications for Policies.

This research was initiated by IER's leaders based on the fact that economic growth of the city started to decline. Main concerns are to find out whether it was the negative impacts of the Asian financial crisis and to seek solution for sustainable growth. A critical finding of the research is HCMC growth declined well before Asian crisis and thus the slowing-down of growth in HCMC was due mainly to internal reasons rather than external. The finding implies that bold reforms are needed if the city wants to have economic recovery and maintain sustainable growth. Although results of this research were not directly implemented in practice as in case 1, it influenced the city's leaders to accelerate economic reforms such as SOE reforms, banking reforms etc. in Hochiminh City.

Case study 3: Decentralization Decree 93 for HCMC

Based on the facts that HCMC is big city and “one size fits all” regulation would limit the potential of the city, the city leaders requested IER to conduct this research project. After numerous field studies and consultation seminars, IER made a proposal on decentralized management regime for HCMC, which was subsequently submitted to the central government and approved by the Prime Minister through Decree 93 in 2001. This was a very successful study as it contributed to building a transparent and effective administration which is crucial for achieving higher economic growth.

After the presentation, participants entered into a lively discussion, which is summarized as follows:

- It is very difficult to establish policy influence of a particular study at the central level because there are numerous research institutions providing policy advice, not to mention the many factors being in force at the same time. But situation may be different at the local level, where the number of research institutions providing policy advice is limited (only one in the case of Hochiminh City).
- Reply to the question how to establish policy influence of research, IER’s representative said that in many cases, it is difficult to measure precisely to what extent research findings were taken into policy formulation, as nobody systematically monitors how they are used after the research completed.
- Unlike the IER, some Hanoi-based research institutions do not feel that their research receives due attention from the respective ministry. To disseminate their findings, the Institute has to organize seminars and invite representatives from the Ministry or to invite staff of the ministry to involve directly in their researches.
- Case studies 1 and 3 are not representative because they were initiated by the leaders of Hochiminh City. Case study 2, on the other hand, is much more typical because it was done at IER’s own initiative and the results were to some extent incorporated into policy. In general, researches that are ordered by policy making bodies normally have much higher chance of being used by the (commissioning) agencies.
- To make research more objective and independent, budget for research should be directly allocated by the Government to research institutes. If budget is allocated through and decided by ministries as currently practiced, it is very difficult to make sure research results are unbiased.

GROUP EXERCISES

I. Group 1.

- **Topic: Migration in HCMC**

1. *Political context.*

Hochiminh City is the biggest business center of Vietnam and thus received special treatment from the Government. Resolution No. 20 of the Politburo gives significant rights to People's Committee of HCMC. Other documents including Decision 146 of the Prime Minister and Resolutions 13 recognize role of HCMC in regional economic development. In addition, the fast growth of the city's diversified economy results in a huge flow of migrant workers from other localities. This has, however, put pressure on the city's infrastructure. .

2. *Evidence*

Statistics shows that two thirds of HCMC population is migrants. However, there are many different sources of data on migration such as General Statistic Office (GSO), Police, Department of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs, which often contradict. Despite differences, all sources show that the proportion of migrants in the city's population is big and is increasing. There is evidence that most migrants are poor with low level of educational attainment and have unsecured life. This puts huge pressure on the city's infrastructure including housing, infrastructure, education...On the other hand, migrants provide the main human resources for industrial zones.

3. *Links*

External links: Vietnam is further integrated into the world economy. In this context, what policies does HCMC need to adopt to maximise the contribution of migrants to the development of the city? Clearly the city need to answer three questions: 1) Does it need to have some screening criteria for migrants and if yes what are they and in this case, do the poor has an equal chance to live in the city?; 2) Urban fee is applied in numerous big cities in the world, can we do similar thing? and 3) How to solve the housing problem for migrants? Some suggest to build apartments (housing blocks) but in fact this does not help much because living cost in an apartment is considerably higher than sharing a poorly equipped house.

To have good evidence for the research, local authorities at all levels and related agencies need to provide necessary information. The credibility of data needs to be checked and effort should be made to ensure consistency in the data . Building a network is crucial for getting good data for research and during the course of research, researchers should have dialogues with international organizations to get further information and their comments. Once research is done, its findings would be disseminated through seminars.

- *Comments*

1. Data to be collected should be able to answer following questions:
 - + Do migrants contribute to the economic development of HCMC?
 - + Do they cause social disorder?
 - + Do they put pressure on housing?
 - + Do they experience a cultural gap?
 - + Do they threaten the sustainable development of the city?
2. Screening criteria for migrants if applied would violate the Constitution since according to the Constitution people can reside anywhere they like in the territory of Vietnam.
3. Migration is a sensitive issue and cuts across many sectors and levels. A good migration policy should be based on good understanding of the context and opinions of the government, sectors and local departments. Currently, the Ministry of Public Security is drafting new resident registration regulation. When it is done, the research results can be better applied.
4. Some terms are new and need more precise definition and clearer explanation.
5. The media plays very important role when it raises issues such as minimum wage, housing for migrants...Practice shows that when IER brings a problem to media, the City's People Committee must respond.

II. Group 2.

- **Topic: Tackling with traffic jam in Hochiminh City.**

1. *Political context.*

Finding a solution to traffic jam in HCMC is a complex and difficult task because it is concerned with many stakeholders. At the local level, stakeholders include People's

Committee, Department of Transportation and Public Works; Department of Finance, Department of Planning and Investment, Department of Public Security. Among them, the People Committee has a decisive role. In addition, some agencies at the central level also have influence on this issue like the Ministry of Transport, the Government (in case the city wants to build underground or railway etc). It is also indirectly linked to some public utilities sectors: electricity, water, post and telecommunication.

The local authority is highly interested in the results of the research because traffic jam is really a burning issue.

Policy process: department of transport and public works proposes solution to the City's People Committee, which further holds a meeting with other stakeholders for comments before adopt a policy.

Implementation challenges include poor coordination among provincial departments, conflict in allocation of human resources and conflict of interests among them.

2. Evidence.

The causes of traffic jam are poor urban planning, fast urbanization, mass migration from rural areas, poor attitude of people towards traffic regulation, loose law enforcement, shortage of funds for investment in development of infrastructure.

3. Links

Interest groups include primarily inhabitants of HCMC. But other departments also have related interests: department of transportation and public works, whose performance is evaluated on the basis of the smoothness of traffic, department of planning and investment uses this as one of the indicators for allocation of public funds on transportation, the City's People Council plays crucial role since it is mandated to represent the interest of the City's inhabitants.

4. Networks

The network is still weak and therefore needs to be further developed. For example, there is a need to develop a network among researchers, to organize regular meetings where researchers and policymakers can interact and discuss, to involve staff of different departments in the research in order to build up a network among researchers and policymakers.

Directors/leaders of research institutes should play the role of messengers, communicating research findings in the form of written reports or presentations at seminars.

External links: Donors including the World Bank, ADB should have interest in the issue

- *Discussion*
 - Need to address conflict between the Government policy and people affected by ODA project
 - Who, in fact, really make policies in this case – the People Committee or the concerned departments. The latter prepare proposal and the former may just approve it.
 - Evidence: need to estimate the costs to the province in order to convince local policy makers.
 - Network: the police are an important stakeholder, but not mentioned in the analysis.
 - Opening new roads cannot solve the traffic problem.
 - Need to discuss the taxation policy for cars. The association of car manufacturers avoids the word “traffic jam”. Is there any difference between the association of car manufacturers in Vietnam and those in other countries.
 - The inclusion of representatives of the Transportation and Public Works department may jeopardize the independence and objectiveness of the research
 - External links also include the neighboring provinces, as the City provides subsidies of around VND 200 billion per annum for buses connecting these provinces within a distance of 70-80 km.
 - Quantifying the cost is time consuming task, but very important, otherwise policy makers cannot be convinced

III. Group 3

- **Topic: Land compensation in ODA projects**

1. Political context.

External influence is critical factor in this research because the framework for land compensation has existed, but ADB and World Bank may have different compensation

policies, leading to some tension. To find a policy which also meets conditions set by donors is what this research project is looking for. People's Committee will make decision based on advice/proposal from functional departments, specifically department of finance in this case. In most cases, compensation levels set by donors are generous and therefore people who will receive compensation will be supporters for the research, but some agencies e.g. department of finance may oppose it, arguing that it goes against their policy.

2. Evidence

Two criteria 1) household that have to move from area should not be worse off with compensation; and 2) – the beneficiary should pay some amount of money for the affected people. To make findings credible, the research should draw on experience of success/ failure and to do social survey in order to have proper ex-ante assessment of the policy. Questions addressed in the survey might include unit price of compensation, opinions/comments of affected people, increase/not increase the level of support to be provided to the people who suffer from the site clearance...

3. Links

First and the most important stakeholder is people who will have to move out as a result of site clearance. Traditionally, the affected community will elect a representative who will participate in the whole process. Other stakeholders are People's Committee and related departments who have voice in the compensation committee and donors, NGOs. It should be noted that, there might be both supporting and opposing groups depending on how their interests are affected, e.g. one calculation method brings more benefit for one family while makes lost for other.

- *Discussion*

- Evidence from development projects shows that some affected households have impoverished, which is in conflict with the objective of poverty reduction of donor's assistance
- In practice, the challenge associated with ODA is how ensure consistency across non-ODA projects, if compromise to meet donors' conditions has to be made in the ODA project.
- Another important aspect is the cultural dimension of policy. For example if only monetary compensation is given to ethnic people, who usually live in

- mountainous and remote areas, this may not help them resettle in new place successfully because they are unskilled and stick strongly to their traditional livelihood.
- Political context – other external influences are: (i) related to the lenders (if ODA does not include cost for compensation then the Government should bear the cost) and (ii) related to the borrowers.
 - Different donors have different compensation policies. How to harmonize domestic policy with donor's ones is very important task that policy makers to solve. There are two different opinions on how to do this. According to the first opinion, the Government's policy should be followed strictly. The alternative is to implement it in a more flexible way. Researchers should make a position on it.
 - Donors have guiding documents but if we follow their guidance, which is not always appropriate for Vietnam's conditions, we have to suggest complementary policies to avoid potential risks.

WORKSHOP SUMMARY

With lively discussions, and the diversity of constructive opinions expressed, strong interest shown and many new things learnt by participants, the joint VASS-ODI workshop on research and policy can be considered as a success.

The workshop has equipped the participants with a well-founded and integrated approach to the important issue of improving research-policy linkage. Participants have had an opportunity to discuss in detail specific issues about various models and tools for conducting policy research for use in the policy process, as well as the role of GSOs in this process.

However, participants also felt that more case studies would be needed to better illustrate the application of tools in practice. It is also suggested that more similar workshops should be conducted in the future, with a wider pool of participants and better representation of stakeholders at the sub-national level.

Wider dissemination and better application of the RAPID framework in practice would clearly improve the policy usefulness and influence of research in the future in Vietnam.

ANNEX 1: EVALUATION RESULTS

Question 1: What two things you have heard about in this workshop will most help your organization?

- Policy-research link, its problems and how to solve them.
- Systematize knowledge of policy advice.
- RAPID framework and other tools used for better communication of research findings to policy makers.
- Experiences, both domestic and international, on research-policy links.
- Proper statement of problem for the formulation of research idea. Understanding the analytical framework for use in research and policy formulation
- Role of CSO in policy process.
- Application of RAPID framework in providing policy advice to the Government at the national and sub-national levels. Two most important factors are evidence and external context.
- Skills for communication of research findings to policy making.
- Case studies on policy advice.
- Factors hindering policy uptake including list of factors and priority order.
- Skills for convincing policy-makers to harmonize interests of different stakeholders.
- Interpretation of research findings using political language.
- Role of speed in the research-policy link.
- Challenges facing researchers and their policy advisory activities.
- International experience and Vietnam's case studies on the communication of research findings to the policy making.
- Preparing policy brief.
- Learning from group exercises and having an opportunity to share experience with other colleagues.

Question 2: Please rate the following aspects of the workshop/seminar

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	Total
Objectives defined and achieved	18	4	0	0	0	22
Concepts explained clearly	15	7	0	0	0	22
Time allocation for the seminar	13	9	0	0	0	22
Relevance to my work	19	3	0	0	0	22
Well-organized	17	5	0	0	0	22
Overall quality of the workshop	18	4	0	0	0	22

Question 3: Please comment on the overall workshop/seminar quality and value:

- With a diversity of opinions, the seminar is very useful.
- PPTs and other seminar materials are well prepared.
- Discussion is highly interactive and comments made by participants are very constructive.
- Excellent presentations.
- The seminar is very relevant. More similar seminars need to be organized in Vietnam in the future, but with a wider pool of participants.
- The seminar provides good model and tools for policy research.
- Some terms in Vietnamese are not very clear.
- Speakers should illustrate applications of tools in more case studies.
- The seminar introduces a comprehensive approach to research-policy link (RAPID framework), which assures policy uptake and effective and timely policy advice
- Skills learnt are very essential for researchers.
- Main information delivered through the seminar including tools for policy research, transmission mechanism and role of CSO in the policy process are very important

Question 4: Do you have any additional comments or suggestions for future workshops like this?

- Wider participation is encouraged; need to organize similar seminars in other provinces.
- More time needs to be allotted to the seminar. It would be better if some key policy-makers can be invited to talk about their needs and expectation from research.
- Need to elaborate indicators to assess policy influence of research and socio-economic impacts of research-based policy making.
- Some good research findings were not taken into policy process. Was there any debate about this between researchers and policy-makers? It would be very interesting to hear about this in the next workshop, if any.
- Need to invite more Vietnamese speakers/policy-makers and have more case studies.
- More focus should be given to evidence.
- More case studies (both success and failure) in policy advice.
- To build a network after the seminar for further exchange of information and research findings.
- To elaborate the procedure for communication of research findings into the policy process and institutionalize it for application in the whole country.
- To clarify priority order among factors listed in the RAPID framework, which is most crucial.
- More time should be allotted to group exercise sections.
- Keep participants informed about new developments in this topic through ODI website or participants network.

Question 5: In your country, to what extent do:

(Score between 0=none and 5=always)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
a) Policymakers use research-based evidence to be important in policy making?	3	2	3	2	3	1	3	1	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	4	3	2	4	2
b) CSOs contribute to policy making?	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	1	2	3	1	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	4	3	3
c) CSO's use research-based evidence to inform their work?	3	3	3	4	3	0	2	2	3	3	3	1	1	4	2	2	3	4	3	3	3	4

Question 6: What other areas would you be interested in?

	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low	Total
Learning More about CSO-Policy Links	7	12	3			22
Tools for Mapping Policy Contexts	7	12	3			22
Research Techniques	17	4	1			22
Support with Communications	12	8	2			22
Collaborative Efforts to Change Policy	9	10	3			22

ANNEX 2. WORKSHOP AGENDA



WORKSHOP ON RESEARCH AND POLICY Hanoi, 11th -12th April 2006

DAY 1

08.30 – 09.00	Registration
09.00 – 09.30	Opening and Introduction <i>Dr. Nguyen Thang, Director of CAF</i>
09.30 – 10.00	Research organizations and policy making ODI's Civil Society Partnerships Programme <i>Naveed Chowdhury, ODI & Cecilia Luttrell, ODI</i>
10.00 – 10.15	Tea break
10.15 – 10.45	Presentation of 3 case studies from CSPP <i>Naveed Chowdhury</i>
10.45 – 11.15	Discussion and Feedback <i>Plenary</i>
11.15 – 11.45	The RAPID Practical Framework <i>ODI</i>
11.45 – 12.15	Discussion <i>Plenary</i>
12.15 – 13.30	Lunch
13.30 – 14.00	Introduction to the research <i>Nguyen Thang</i>
14.00 – 14.30	Case Studies Presentation <i>Nguyen Van Phuc, Institute of Economic Research of HCMC</i>
14.30 – 15.00	Discussion and Feedback on the case study work <i>Plenary</i>

15.00 – 15.15	Tea break
15.15 – 15.45	More discussion on the case study work <i>Plenary</i>
	Some experiences from ODI in research-policy work <i>Cecilia Luttrell</i>
15.45 – 17.00	Group work: Applying the RAPID framework <i>Small groups</i>
17.00	Brief overview of the next day <i>ODI</i>

DAY 2

09.00 – 10.00	Recap of Day 1 <i>ODI</i>
	Presentation of the Group work on the RAPID framework <i>Plenary</i>
10.00 – 10.15	Tea break
10.15 – 10.45	Finish presentations & discussion <i>Plenary</i>
10.45 – 11.15	Tools for Policy Impact and Advocacy & discussion <i>ODI</i>
11.15 – 12.00	Group work: Using the Force Field Analysis <i>Small groups</i>
12.00 – 13.30	Lunch
13.30 – 15.00	Presentation of the Group Work & Discussion <i>Plenary</i>
15.00 – 15.15	Tea break
15.15 – 15.45	Communication Tools & discussion <i>ODI</i>
15.45 – 16.00	Workshop Evaluation <i>Participants</i>

16.00 – 16.30

Closing
Nguyen Thang & ODI

ANNEX 3: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

WORKSHOP ON RESEARCH AND POLICY

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Ha noi, 11- 12/04/2006.

	Name	Address/Organization	Contacts
I.	Institute of Economics, HCMC		
1.	Nguyen Van Phuc	28 Le Quy Don Street, W3, D3, HCMC.	Email: nvphuc@yahoo.com
2.	Vu Pham Tin	28 Le Quy Don Street, W3, D3, HCMC.	Email: tinvp@yahoo.com vuphamtin@gmail.com
3.	Le Nguyen Hai Dang	28 Le Quy Don Street, W3, D3, HCMC.	Email: lenguyenhaidang@yahoo.com
4.	Pham Binh An	28 Le Quy Don Street, W3, D3, HCMC.	Email: phambinhan@yahoo.com
5.	Du Phuoc Tan	28 Le Quy Don Street, W3, D3, HCMC.	Email: tandp@tphcm.gov.vn
6.	Tran Van Bich	28 Le Quy Don Street, W3, D3, HCMC.	Email: tranvanbich@yahoo.com
II.	Hue University of Economics		
7.	Mai Van Xuan	Dean of Faculty of Economics and development studies.	Email: xtq2003@dng.vnn.vn
III.	University of An Giang		
8.	Mai Ngoc Diep	Center of Social Science and Humanity	Email: mndiep@agu.edu.vn

IV	Viet Nam Institute of Economics		
9.	Nguyen Van Huan	477 Nguyen Trai Road, Thanh Xuan, Ha Noi.	Email: ngvhuan@yahoo.com
10.	Vu Hung Cuong	Dept of Economics of Development. 477 Nguyen Trai Road, Thanh Xuan, Ha Noi.	Email: vuhungcuong@hotmail.com
V.	Institute of World Economics and Politics.		
11.	Bui Truong Giang	Center for Int'l Security and Strategic Studies (CISS) 176 Thai Ha Street, Dong Da, Ha Noi.	Email: gianghang@fpt.vn
12.	Nguyen Hong Son	176 Thai Ha Street, Dong Da, Ha Noi.	Email: hongsonIWEP@yahoo.com
VI.	Institute of Gender and Family		
	Ngo Thi Tuan Dung		
13.	Le Ngoc Lan	6 Dinh Cong Trang Street, Ha Noi.	Email: lan6212@yahoo.com
VII.	Institute of Agricultural Policies and Strategy.		
14.	Truong Thu Trang	6 Nguyen Cong Tru	Email: trangmymy@gmail.com
15	Tran Cong Thang	6 Nguyen Cong Tru	
VIII.	Central Institute of Economic Management		
16	Dang Thi Thu Hoai	CIEM, 68 Phan Dinh Phung, Ba Dinh, Ha Noi	Email: thuhoai@ciem.org.vn

17.	Pham Lan Huong	CIEM, 68 Phan Dinh Phung, Ba Dinh, Ha Noi	plh@ciem.org.vn
IX.	Institute of Labour Science and Social Affairs.		
18.	Nguyen Thi Bich Thuy	2 Dinh Le Street, Hoan Kiem, Ha Noi	Email: thuytienanh2004@yahoo.com
19.	Dao Ngoc Nga	2 Dinh Le Street, Hoan Kiem, Ha Noi	
21.	Le Viet Hoa	Project VIE 02/001 (MOLISA)	Email: le.viet.hoa@undp.org hoahepr@gmail.com
22.	Nguyen Thu Huong		Email: huonglyvn60@yahoo.com
X.	Institute of Environmental and Sustainable Development Research		
23	Tran Ngoc Ngoan	7 Floor, #1 Lieu Giai St.	
24.	Dang Duc Phuong	7 Floor, #1 Lieu Giai St.	Email: ducphuong02@hotmail.com
XI	Institute of Development Strategy (MPI)		
25	Tran Thi Hoang Ngan	General Department, DSI.	Email: hoangngan0811@yahoo.com
XII	Centre for Analysis and Forecasting (CAF) 14 Fl, # 1 Lieu Giai, Ba Dinh, Ha Noi.		
26.	Nguyen Thang	14 Fl, # 1 Lieu Giai, Ba Dinh, Ha Noi	Email: nguyenthang98@yahoo.com
27.	Le Thuc Duc	14 Fl, # 1 Lieu Giai, Ba Dinh, Ha Noi	Email: dl5183@yahoo.com

28	Nguyen Thi Thu Hang	14 Fl, # 1 Lieu Giai, Ba Dinh, Ha Noi	Email: thuhang28@yahoo.com
29.	Le Kim Sa	14 Fl, # 1 Lieu Giai, Ba Dinh, Ha Noi	Email: Kimsa.le@gmail.com
30.	Nguyen Cao Duc	14 Fl, # 1 Lieu Giai, Ba Dinh, Ha Noi	Email: ngcaoduc@yahoo.com
31	Nguyen Thu Phuong	14 Floor, #1 Lieu Giai St. Hanoi	Phuong.nguyenthu@gmail.com
32	Dang Xuan Thanh	14 Floor, #1 Lieu Giai St. Hanoi	Thanh_dangxuan@yahoo.com
Overseas Development Institute, UK			
33	Naved Chowdhury	Overseas Development Institute, 111 Westminster Bridge Road, London, SE1 7JD, the UK	N.chowdhury@odi.org.uk
34	Cecilia Luttrell	Overseas Development Institute, 111 Westminster Bridge Road, London, SE1 7JD, the UK	c.luttrell@odi.org.uk