Leading the British Government's fight against world poverty

Improving the impact of development research through better research communications and uptake

Report of the AusAID, DFID and UKCDS funded workshop: London, November 29th and 30th 2010

Louise Shaxson
Delta Partnership

Louise Shaxson of Delta Partnership has been contracted as the lead facilitator for this workshop.
The views expressed do not necessarily reflect those of DFID, AusAID or UKCDS

Table of contents

Photo credits: David Sayer, Wellcome Trust

Glossary

AFIDEP	African Institute for Development Policy
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
BAPPENAS	Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional (Indonesian Development Planning Agency)
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CSO	Civil Society Organisations
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
DFID	Department for International Development (of the UK Government)
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
GMO	Genetically Modified Organism
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MP	Member of Parliament
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
OMAFRA	Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs
SIDA	Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency
SMS	Short Message Service (i.e. text message on a mobile phone)
UKCDS	UK Collaborative on Development Sciences
WFSJ	World Federation of Science Journalists

1. Executive summary: emerging themes

This is the report of the workshop on *Improving the impact of development research through better communication and uptake,* which was co-hosted by AusAID, DFID and UKCDS on November 29th and 30th in London and involved 80 participants from across the globe. Several of the presentations and related materials can be found at www.researchtoaction.org. This report summarises the written outputs from the workshop and should be read in conjunction with the background paper.

The workshop was a mixture of keynote presentations, panel and plenary sessions, networking events, a world café and group work. A'marketplace' showcased some current best practices in research communication and gave all participants the opportunity to learn of new approaches and techniques. The sequence of events was:

Day 1: Improving research communication and uptake

- Keynote speeches by Geoff Barnard and M R Madhavan
- Panel sessions with contributions from ten panellists from around the world
- World cafe – focusing on the eight questions outlined in the background paper
- Evening reception – with an address from Chris Whitty, Director of Research and Chief Scientific Adviser at DFID

Day 2: Showcasing good practice, and the role of knowledge intermediaries

- Marketplace of tools and techniques – fifteen organisations showcased their work on research communication and uptake
- The roles and impact of knowledge intermediaries - group work
- (A separate meeting of funding agencies was held at DFID)

While there has been some editing of the workshop's outputs, the emphasis has been on capturing the detail of what was discussed. The extensive nature of discussions – set off by the wide variety of questions in the background paper – means that it is difficult to accurately *summarise* what was said. Instead, this introductory section picks out the themes that emerged from the presentations, group work and plenary sessions.

1.1 Research is one voice in the knowledge 'ecology'

It was clear from presentations and discussions throughout the two days that research is but one voice in the knowledge 'ecology' relating to policy and practice – as Geoff Barnard set out in his opening keynote. This is not to dismiss its importance and the strength of messages which emerge from research, but to recognise the wealth of other types of knowledge with which research must collaborate (and, at times, compete). Thus the field of research communication is moving away from a reliance on the linear model to one which appreciates the contribution made by a wide variety of actors – some of whom may be indeed conducting their own research. As one group in the world cafe observed, *research is not something 'we' do and communicate with 'them'*: local groups can be assisted to conduct their own research, and where there are shared interests it may be possible to collaborate with the private sector to build common understanding around mutual or overlapping agendas.

The need to remain neutral in the face of interest groups, power relations and maverick or other strongly competing voices was another theme through the workshop. In his keynote speech, M R Madhavan noted that when his organisation produced policy briefs they were careful not to include recommendations or judgements, instead letting the evidence speak for itself. Remaining studiously neutral helped them retain the trust of the parliamentarians they are there to serve. But this is not necessarily desirable in the face of poor quality research or other evidence – participants noted the ease with which social media helps spread ideas that may be based on false assumptions or shoddy work, and that researchers, intermediary organisations and research communicators should use all types of media to strongly communicate the highest quality evidence from a piece of research.

So the ecology of research communication is a complex one: discussions reinforced the notion that good practice means involving the variety of actors around an issue from the outset, but care needs to be taken not to assume that each actor plays the same role every time. Civil society organisations (CSOs) are no longer simply recipients of research, for example – they may conduct their own research or be 'conduits' for the research of others (see Question 4 from the World Café). Eliya Zulu observed that given their role in holding governments to account, CSOs may play an increasingly important role in research communication in future. And where the private sector delivers public services (the example was given of health and education services in some African countries), it too must be involved in discussions about bridging research, policy and practice.

1.2 Balancing supply and demand for research

There is still much to do to improve the supply of robust research and other types of knowledge to policy and practice. Improving developing country capacity to conduct, communicate and utilise research is important – but this should not be limited to only national-level research institutes. Rudy Prawiradinata noted that, in a large country like Indonesia, national-level research may be of little use to local policymakers: local capacity to supply research and other types of knowledge also needs strengthening to fulfil their specific needs. Ann Waters-Bayer observed that local participatory innovation could fill some of this gap, but it means getting policymakers and others to recognise its validity as an alternative approach to agricultural extension services and committing funding to supporting it.

It is also important to improve the demand for research evidence, but it appears from workshop discussions that we know more about how to improve supply than we do about *how to improve demand* for evidence, particularly in the policy sphere. M R Madhavan noted that the work of his organisation was 'seasonal': when Parliament was in session the work involved responding to requests at short notice, but when Parliament was in recess they try to anticipate the issues that are likely to emerge and prepare for the day when those requests will come in. It takes time to build up an understanding of what is needed, and demand is not uniform: answers to Question 1 of the World Café show that simply asking once is not enough – we need to ask at various different levels in an organisation, and to understand the different triggers that stimulate demand.

In terms of balancing supply and demand, there were two key messages from the workshop. The first was to share good practice on stimulating the demand for research evidence; and this is mentioned in the funders' statement as a potential area for cross-donor collaboration. The other message was (to use Geoff Barnard's metaphor) the need for researchers to 'get their feet wet' in the ecology of the 'knowledge pond'. This means improving their ability to: work with the media, build relationships with research users, take advantage of the particular skills of knowledge intermediaries, and collaborate with other knowledge producers.

1.3 Improving our ability to assess the impact of research

There is increasing pressure to demonstrate that research is having an impact; creating value, affecting decision-making, and having a positive effect on people's livelihoods. While this is certainly not a new concern, we are in an age where evidence-based decisions and value for money are uppermost in the minds of funding agencies – but how will this influence the field of research communication? As an example, DFID previously stipulated that many of the research programmes which it funds should spend at least 10% of their budget on communication activities. This appears to have had a positive impact on the uptake of research by both policy and practice, and it is unclear how its current move away from input-based to outcome-based targets will affect the extent to which research programmes will continue to fund work on research communication and uptake.

The particular challenge faced by people involved in research communication is to collect evidence of impact that is generalisable, particularly where local context is felt to play a large part in achieving impact and where research can only contribute to a wider debate. What emerged from discussions was the need to strengthen work in two areas: a greater use of case studies, and a sharper focus on theories of change. On their own, neither will be enough to provide evidence that is robust enough to make general points or from which to scale up. But using both together will, as Gerd Schonwalder said, allow us to 'broaden our lens', looking across sectors and countries to be better able to develop specific recommendations for using research results in different settings.

Another aspect to the impact of research is the contribution it makes to debate. It may not be possible to attribute changes in policy or practice to a particular piece of research, but participants recognised the importance of being 'in the room', using organisational resources to best advantages to build networks and participate in live debates (see Nik Soni's panel presentation). Discussions recognised the contribution that knowledge intermediary organisations might make to this, both in terms of understanding the demand for knowledge from policy and practice, as well as being able to synthesise and interpret research results and communicate them – using appropriate media – to the potential users.

Having taken this on board, participants still felt that there was a need for a conceptual framework for assessing the impact of research communication and uptake work: one that was shared by all donors. The background paper referenced work by Adolph *et al* which set out seven categories that could form the basis for this, and participants discussed where it could be strengthened (see Question 8 in the World Café). The need for this shared framework is recognised in the funders' statement which appears at the end of this report as one area for possible future collaboration.

1.4 Knowledge intermediaries

The rise of knowledge intermediaries as a particular group of actors has been an organic one. While there are many organisations who identify themselves as knowledge intermediaries and have been working in this way for many years, it is only in the past decade or so that the intermediary function has begun to be recognised as something separate. Faye Reagon and Elin Gwyn spoke about their work as intermediaries: Faye about the challenges facing intermediaries and the need to develop standards of good practice and share understanding of impact and effectiveness, Elin about how having a formalised, systematised approach would help provide rigour and structure to the work that she does to accelerate research into use in a Canadian ministry.

The different functions that knowledge intermediaries perform have different impacts, both immediate and in the longer-term - pages 26-32 of this report identify some of the measures that could be used. The workshop outputs are only a first attempt at this – more needs to be done to consider, analyse and refine the indicators for each of the different functions. However it is noticeable that in moving from 'informing' to 'building sustainable institutions' the measures of impact shift from content analysis and Google Analytics-type information on issues such as hit rates, downloads and citations (informing) to measures of inclusivity and stakeholder involvement in project and programme plans and institutional strategies.

There is still a considerable way to go before we can develop a robust framework for assessing the impact of knowledge intermediaries, but the outputs from the workshop provide a good first attempt.

2. Keynote presentations

The two keynote presentations were given by Geoff Barnard, Director of Knowledge Management at the multi-continent Climate and Development Knowledge Network, and M R Madhavan from PRS Legislative Research in New Delhi.

Geoff Barnard spoke about the history of research communication and uptake work, from the time when communication was seen as a distraction or an afterthought, to the current situation where there is a rich ecology of actors in the 'knowledge pond'. The factors influencing this change are:

- A recognition that development research is of limited value if it stays on the shelves
- A greater pressure on funding bodies to demonstrate the poverty impact of research
- A global quest for more 'evidence based' policy & practice
- More competition among research players and greater southern capacity to conduct research
- The internet, which has caused an explosion in communication tools and techniques
- The rise of intermediary organisations specialising in linking research to policy and practice

Because research is only one ingredient in good decision-making, both researchers and communicators need to engage with the policymaking process to ensure that the research voice is heard, to help transform the way research knowledge is used and to improve the impact it has. Strong support from the funders of research is a key driver: communication is an integral part of the whole research process rather than something to be bolted on at the end. But the main challenge is to demonstrate impact and to bring others such as researchers, funders and the media on board to help us do so.

Geoff's slides can be found [here]

M R Madhavan talked about the work of PRS Legislative Research in trying to address legislators' needs. He noted that they play several roles (legislative, oversight, financial and representative) and to fulfil those roles they take part in many different activities: law making, policy oversight, committee work, budget approval, financial oversight and representing their constituent interests. Legislators are time poor, have to listen to competing interests and voices and often have to take decisions in the face of unclear or missing evidence.

In order to serve their needs for evidence, several things must be in place. First, research must be credible: it must be of high quality and perceived to be non-partisan. In his view, this means not making any recommendations or judgement calls; instead simply presenting the evidence and letting it speak for itself. Second, it must be readable: parliamentarians are often generalists looking at specialist issues and need good, fast technical support: PRS Legislative Services use a a group of 'friends' as a sounding board to ensure that policy briefs are accessible and readable. Third, the response time may be incredibly short: the example was cited of a phone call received while parliament was actively discussing an issue – demanding an immediate response. But it is possible to anticipate what the issues under discussion are likely to be: looking at legislative schedules and keeping an ear to the ground on what is likely to be 'hot' in future means that it is possible to prepare for the day when that oral briefing is suddenly needed, or there is a jump in demand for policy briefs.

M R Madhavan's slides can be found here

3. Panel 1: Improving the uptake of research in policy and practice by matching 'supply push' to 'demand pull'

3.1 Nik Soni, Pacific Institute for Public Policy, Vanuatu

How do you best get research onto the policy agenda? What sort of research attracts policymakers' interests? What hints and tips could you give to any infomediaries to help them get issues onto policy's agenda?

The first is to try to understand policy's needs – it's important to spend a lot of time networking with policymakers, getting to know them and their needs. But it's also important to spend a lot of time talking to researchers: you can't focus on policy alone. The Pacific Institute for Public Policy sees itself as the bridge between the two, and is working to find ways to connect them.

What sort of research attracts policymakers? The answer is: whatever helps further their aims and ambitions. But there are a few hints and tips for bridging research and policy:

- Keep the message simple but have the details close at hand.
- Never present more than 4 or 5 points at one – especially to a politician.

- Always take time to think about how best to interact with policymakers, and be creative: work out the most suitable media.
- Also be creative with the mode of interaction – think about meeting over lunch, dinner, drinks... use the tools which work best for that group of people.
- Is the internet a challenge to all of this? Not really: the message is that we must embrace the new to strengthen the old.

In terms of getting issues onto policy's agenda, bear in mind that we (knowledge intermediaries) are seeking to serve the public rather than to influence them. The need to remain neutral is a strong one, so that we can continue to build strong bridges between research and policy.

3.2 Celia Reyes, Philippines Institute for Development Studies, Manila

From your point of view as a researcher, how have you found that your research best gets taken up into policy and practice? What influences this and how can you develop a strategy which ensures research uptake from the outset?

As a bit of background, the Community-Based Monitoring System program of the Poverty and Economic Policy Research Network, supported by the International Development Research Centre, the Canadian CIDA and AusAID, focuses on local poverty monitoring systems, and assessing social protection systems and the effects of economic policy and external shocks. In our experience it is very important to engage policy makers at different stages – particularly at the start and the end of the research. There is a tendency to only consider the end of the research process, but we have found that engaging decision makers at the start is actually equally important as it helps to improve the policy relevance of the questions that researchers are asking. However, this doesn't mean that we should only do research on what policymakers think they need, as sometimes they fail to realise what might be important.

A few suggestions that have worked for us include:

- It is important to engage policymakers at different stages of the research, particularly at the start and the end. Have policy advisory committees for research projects to guide in the identification and formulation of policy research questions.
- Be aware of the issues being faced by policymakers. Being aware of the policy questions, we can identify the entry points for our researches that will facilitate uptake by policymakers.
- Disseminate in the language and format that is most suitable to policy makers – many of them may still prefer hard copies of policy briefs rather than emails or meetings. For instance, we find that policymakers appreciate better spatial disparities in poverty when data is presented in maps than in tables.
- Researchers need to be prepared to spend time engaging with policymakers, which requires both patience and money! It takes time to influence policymakers and to effect change in decision-making processes.

3.3 Rudy Prawiradinata, BAPPENAS, Jakarta, Indonesia

In your experience, what works best to stimulate policy-maker demand for research?

BAPPENAS is the national development planning agency, so it is an important player in terms of linking research to policy in Indonesia. The question of how we stimulate demand does rest on the assumption that the supply side is ready: that there are already research and research institutions out there which could be useful in policymaking. If this is the case, then one of the best ways to stimulate demand is to show success stories: policymakers need to see successful policies that are based on research evidence, so they are already looking to fill this need. Good success stories really help raise the interest levels of policymakers.

However, it's important not to think that there is only one group of policymakers: in Indonesia there are national and local level forums, and there are actually more problems at the local level than at the national. When the national government wants to develop a policy it can use information from national universities and research institutes, or their own think tank teams; but these sorts of service are not readily available at the local level. Within local level policymaking processes the demand for research is increasing, but there is limited supply because of this lack of local research organisations: BAPPENAS is currently working with AusAID to try to develop the knowledge sector at local level.

So it is worth considering exactly who it is that we are dealing with. But it is not just a question of how well educated they are and whether or not they have a clear idea of what they want to do (though if they don't really know what they want to do, it can be quite challenging to work with them). It is also important to consider whether the policymakers you're engaging with are national or local, because this will have quite an effect on their demand for research evidence.

3.4 Wendy Graham, University of Aberdeen

How do you select which particular mechanism to use to promote the uptake of research? What seems to work best, when and where? Does this seem to differ across sectors?

Unfortunately Wendy was snowed in and unable to attend the workshop.

3.5 Kerry Albright, UK Department for International Development, London

What can donors do to incentivise research uptake? What works and what doesn't? Can donors influence this process in a meaningful way, or do they just get in the way? What are the forthcoming challenges and opportunities around this?

DFID's interest in research communication began in the late 1990's, but in 2003 all the work was brought together under a central research division – which then started funding knowledge intermediaries as a specific type of actor. DFID also developed the '10% rule' for research programme consortia, specifying that at least 10% of the budget should be spent on research communication activities, and that each project and programme should develop a specific research communications plan.

A review in 2008 by ODI showed that those projects subjected to the '10% rule' actually managed to convert some of the sceptics, and that the rule itself was quite effective in getting researchers to use a range of communication mechanisms (though the effect was not always felt wider than the specific project or programme, and did not always have a broader influence on the host institution). However, in recent years we have also seen the development of an informal '30% research uptake rule' – where communication, capacity-building and monitoring & evaluation activities together should account for up to 30% of the total project budget. A recent review of two DFID-funded research portfolios (Agriculture and Human Development) showed that both broadly spent more than 30% of the total budget on research uptake activities, though for specific programmes this ranged from 5% to 75% depending upon where they were on the basic to applied spectrum of research funding.

Now, however, the new UK government is moving away from input commitments to outcome commitments and an increasing focus on results, impacts and sustainability. Given that there is no obvious end point for research communication (as there might be for primary research programmes), it is not always clear what the effect of this change in emphasis might be for research communication and uptake. It is an expensive business both in terms of human as well as financial resources, and it is challenging for all of us to work out how to mesh short-term funding cycles with the need to demonstrate longer-term and sustainable impacts of communication and uptake work.

3.6 Discussion – first panel session

The plenary discussion centred around two areas:

First, how do you cope with the fact that most policymakers and parliamentarians have their own interests and power relations? How can we build sustainable networks and channels when these interests are often very short-term? How can we fit these short-term interests with research's long-term agenda? And what role can/should the media play when they are often driving or setting the agenda? The answers from the panel included a variety of suggestions:

- The PIPP network has taken over ten years to get it to its current state: we can't get away from the fact that it is an incredibly time consuming process to build a robust network.
- However, it is vital to always "be in the live debate" – in order to maintain engagement you must be in the room (in person) and you must be diplomatic, regardless of what that debate is. It's important to constantly engage with both sides; and for this to work you need to retain your neutral, independent status: you can't be seen to be taking one side or the other.
- It's not easy to deal with maverick voices – whose arguments are not based on evidence. We can't stop them from saying what they have to say, but we can try to ensure that the debate is aligned with trusted sources of robust evidence.

- It is useful to consider the different networks you need to build and to use your staff appropriately: use your researchers to build networks with researchers; other people to build different networks with journalists, and your most senior staff could focus on building diplomatic links with politicians.
- Within each organisation there will be different people to engage with: it's important to analyse each organisation to see who is best placed to make any changes. But it is also important not to try to change their voice – instead the point must be to make them better informed.
- Building relationships between the executive and Parliament can be difficult: local government terms are often only 3 years, but there may be other organisations with longer-term horizons that we could work with to institutionalise change.
- Much of the work that has been done with the Ugandan Parliament (for example) shows that MPs' requests for briefs are mainly related to their speaking at or attending international conferences, rather than for their day-to-day work of parliamentary business. It's difficult to incentivise this, but again demonstrating success may be one way of encouraging them to demand evidence for their 'normal' work.

Second, how do we demonstrate impact? What suggestions did the panel members have for demonstrating impact? The answers focused on whether or not it is possible to assess the final impact on policy, or whether it is more realistic to assess contribution to the debate:

- It is important to monitor a variety of media – including church groups – to give an idea over whether the debate has become more evidence-based and nuanced, or whether it is still polarised.
- There is less of a need to worry about the impact on policy outcomes – it is the contribution to the debate that matters.
- Many big policy decisions have so many influences that it is simply impossible to demonstrate the success of a particular piece of research: one organisation did some work on telecommunications which has since been deregulated – while it cannot claim that this was entirely due to its inputs, it is confident that it made a good contribution to the debate.
- Impact is measured in different ways in DFID. As a sector it's possible to measure outreach levels, looking at how research communication has contributed to enhancing voices and debate. But the real difficulty is measuring impact on policy and practice, so that we can prove that investing in this sector makes a difference on the ground.

4. Panel 2: Different ways of making the link between research, policy and practice

4.1 Eliya Zulu, AFIDEP, Nairobi

As a researcher who founded AFIDEP to bridge development research, policy and practice, how are you positioning yourself in relation to a) policy, b) civil society organisations and c) the private sector? What relationships do you hope to build with all three?

AFIDEP (African Institute for Development Policy) was set up to promote the use of research evidence in decision making process – national, regional and international. Its key to notethat evidence is not only critical in policymaking processes, but also in informing effective implementation. MMany countries are rich in policy but poor in implementation: policies on population (for example) are often well grounded on evidence across many African countries as a result of much technical advice from the UN and other bodies, but there is a real problem with their implementation.

AFIDEP is also seeking build local capacity in knowledge translation in Africa. There is a big gap in Africa on translation of knowledge despite the fact that a lot of research is done, mostly by northern researchers, but it is fragmented is scientific journals and academic reports. AFIDEP seeks to synthesize this evidence from an African perspective and re-package it for African policy-makers. We also recognise that African governments may listen to the World Bank or UN agencies more than they do to local researchers – so we also target international development partners. An example of weak local capacity is shown by the WHO's recent systematic reviews (e.g. on teenage pregnancy), but none of the studies have been led by African authors. Local capacity building is an important part of our work at AFIDEP, because it is the local professionals who will interact closely with policy makers to maximize impact of research in development.

CSOs and the private sector are equally important: CSOs play a big role in holding African governments to account and ensure they implement the policies they have developed. In some African countries 40-60% of health services and some education is provided by the private sector - so the private sector must be included in discussions about how to develop and implement evidence-based policies.

Like others have said, we need to be careful when talking about short term impact of research because it sometimes takes decades of good research to impact on policy; and building the relationships and trust that is required to stimulate application of evidence in decision-making takes patience and time. Furthermore, too much pressure on showing impact of research on policy may also have a negative outcome in that researchers bombard policymakers with evidence that may not be robust enough just because they have to fulfil grant obligations on policy engagement. But building local capacity to produce and interpret good evidence must be a part of that longer-term impact we're seeking.

4.2 Faye Reagon, Human Sciences Research Council, South Africa

Drawing on your own role as an intermediary, and on the recent posts on www.knowledgebrokersforum.org, could you bring us up to date with discussions about the role of knowledge intermediaries? Can this role be defined uniquely or do experiences differ from around the world? Are there any general lessons to be learned?

The discipline of information/knowledge intermediaries is an emerging one, with a real richness of discussion between northern and southern partners. But while there are some agreements on what these people and organisations do; there are also areas where there is little consensus.

Areas where there is agreement include:

- Knowledge intermediaries are all champions of evidence-based policy-making, but take a broad definition of evidence
- There is a need to facilitate the flow of information into hands of policy-makers, and knowledge intermediaries play a role in translating and mediating that process
- They are also involved in developing capacity to produce and use evidence
- Finally, they are strong network builders

However, where there is little consensus is around the terms such as 'knowledge intermediaries', 'knowledge brokers', 'communication', 'translation': which are all dependent on the context, sector, and issue under discussion. While there is a growing body of conceptual and theoretical knowledge about their roles, we recognise that in fact the roles are fluid and context dependent.

4.3 Nalaka Gunawardene – TVE Asia Pacific, Sri Lanka

What needs to be done to improve connections between researchers and the media? What is your experience of working on this? How can we improve the mutual responsibility to report science accurately and in an interesting way to enhance uptake?

The media is one among several players in the wider process of communicating for change. There's no single recipe for working with the media that works for every organisation and every issue. There are three elements – we might call them the ABCs – for improving the connections between researchers and the media:

- Access – given the 24-hour news cycle, journalists need quick and easy access to research and researchers. Ideally, this means access to the researchers themselves, not administrators or other intermediaries within research institutes.
- Bridges – we need physical as well as virtual bridges to enable the media, research and policy communities to come together, enabling trust and cooperation between them.
- Credibility – an extremely important element for both sides. Building trust goes a long way towards strengthening credibility, which is hard to earn but easy to lose.

More time and effort need to be invested in all of these, and there are no short-cuts. We also need to remember that the media is both a contested and contentious space. As a market place of ideas and arguments, it offers more of a cacophony, not a symphony! Media-based communication is necessary, *but not sufficient*, to influence policy or inspire behaviour change.

For improving links between researchers and the media, three suggestions. First, be more open and honest with each other, recognising the limits of each profession. Second, be more like Janus, the two-faced Roman God, so we both look back at where we have been and look forward to what is new and next. Third, it is useful to occasionally get 'embedded' with each other to draw better insights into how media and research communities operate.

4.4 Ann Waters-Bayer, Prolinnova

Whose knowledge counts? How do you effectively incorporate different types of knowledge, including local and community knowledge, as well as research and innovation, policy and practice? Are you able to get your voice heard, or is research seen as an elitist area?

Whose knowledge counts? Everyone's knowledge counts. We need to begin by recognising that local knowledge is often overlooked, but also by recognising that like all knowledge it has its limitations. Local and community knowledge is not static, it adapts - research and innovation can and should be a part of this adaptation process. If we can do this by supporting local research, it will help them better engage with others on researchable issues.

A successful initiative led by Prolinnova targeted key people in the Cambodian Government who were known to be open to the use of local knowledge: they were taken out on field visits, attended workshops and came to local meetings. This persuaded them to see participatory innovation as an approach to agricultural extension services, encouraging it in practice even though it was not explicitly written into policy.

One way of supporting this could be to set up local innovation support funds, where community control over the fund means that farmers have a stronger say in co-generating knowledge. It is a continuous process of proving success that reflects local conditions.

4.5 Gerd Schonwalder, IDRC

We are in a new area of results and impact – what are the lessons and challenges for us in terms of what to do next, particularly given the acknowledged difficulties of measuring the impact of research communication and uptake activities? Do you have any lessons you can share on how to measure the value of investing in this area from an IDRC perspective?

One of the main challenges in terms of measuring the impact of work on research communication and uptake may be that of terminology: if we talk about 'measuring' impact, are we setting the standard so high that we may not be able to meet it? As others have said, impact is not only about having a direct impact on policy/ policy-making: it's also about having an impact on the policy debate – which we can sometimes forget.

Research is always just one ingredient in a big mix, which makes the attribution problem a difficult one to solve. But there is a second problem, which is that much development research takes place in changing/complex environments, making it difficult (or impossible) to replicate results in other contexts. The current debate around Randomised Controlled Trials brings out many of these issues. But there are three possible suggestions for confronting this problem:

- We need to look for results and impact in very clearly defined situations rather than seeking generalised solutions. We need to get better at understanding how research projects have made concrete contributions in concrete settings – at project level, at programme level and in policy processes (such as tobacco control)
- We need to be more specific in identifying the chains of causality (the theories of change) so that we can better identify the times when it would be most effective to try to have an impact. If we can do this judiciously, we can identify the junctions where research is more likely to be able to contribute strongly to project, programme and policy. But theories of change can become rigid: we need to be intelligent about how we use them

- If both of these are achieved we may then be able to broaden the lens, looking across sectors and countries to develop specific recommendations by using research results in different settings. Competition policy is one area where this seems to have worked well – others include health systems strengthening and work in fragile states.

So it is not that we cannot measure impact, it is that we need to be careful how we specify what we mean by ‘impact’, what we mean by ‘measuring’, and that we need to be more rigorous about the theories of change so that we can understand the potential for research to have wide effects. The questions now are about what resources we need, and how should we think about targeting them so that we can ensure this happens.

4.6 Discussion – second panel session

One of the big challenges of working at a local level is documenting changes and successes to get the messages out to more people. FAO, for example, has been working with farmer field schools for twenty years, but is still struggling to get the messages out as widely as it would like. There’s no magic answer, but producing posters and booklets in local language, using farmer-led methods of documenting change, and using intermediaries, have all been useful in the past. Another option is to work with multi-stakeholder groups – including the media, researchers, policymakers and farmers – but a very local level, so that researchers can support local people to co-create innovation.

From a northern perspective, John Holmes at Oxford University did a study looking at intermediaries across North America and Europe and found that no one has good metrics for understanding their impact. However Land & Water Australia is a good example of an intermediary organisation: they explicitly treated knowledge as an asset, revisited old reports (up to 20 years old) to check that the knowledge they contained was still being mobilised. A key aspect is to institutionalise that you are trying to measure – while it may take time to do this, it needs to be done and does not have to cost a great deal.

Several other points were made in discussion:

- Changing international focus and thinking can be as important as specifically affecting national policies.
- There is a great deal said about making knowledge accessible, but is enough done on how knowledge is preserved? Not only documented knowledge, but also the knowledge that is lost when people move from one organisation to another.
- More needs to be done to understand the demand side of this equation: it relates to issues of citizenship and accountability of policymakers as much as it relates to improving policymaking processes to better use knowledge.

5. World café

The background paper outlined eight broad questions relating to research communication and uptake; within each of these, three sub-questions were identified. Participants were invited to move around the room to answer four of the questions, choosing the ones which most resonated with them. Each 'rotation' by participants lasted twenty minutes, and the process of answering the questions was mediated by a facilitator at each table.

The questions were addressed in immense detail by participants. The next ten pages summarise the raw outputs, which are available in Annex A.

Report of the World Cafe

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Question 1: How do we strengthen user demand for evidence from research? Different users, different pathways?
There is an increasing awareness in the literature that models of research communication and uptake have focused on improving the supply; and a corresponding emphasis on the need to improve the demand from end users (from 'push' to 'pull' models).</td></tr>
<tr><td>1a. How do we find out what the demand for research evidence is from users? Do different groups (policymakers, practitioners, civil society & the private sector) express their demand in different ways and what are the barriers to determining their demand?</td><td>How to find out: we need to ask them! But ask at different levels (senior and junior)...What is the issue? What information do they have and need? When do they need it? Who do they currently get it from? How best can <u>you</u> get it to them?

Other suggestions: researchers need to be more familiar with policymakers' products, and can work with the media to build coalitions for action; or build strategic alliances with technical policymakers so as to better convince political policymakers. There's a big difference between responding to short-term demands for today's policy questions (the rapid response intermediary role) and generating demand for new research (a longer-term process); particularly because legislators have short time horizons which don't match with the longer-term research cycle. Participatory reviews between researchers and legislators would help catch emerging issues.</td></tr>
<tr><td>1b. Are there any novel ways to create demand for research evidence? What role might incentives, structures, penalties and funding play in creating demand (such as earmarked funding to purchase research to directly inform decision-making)?</td><td>Does the phrase 'create' demand give rise to a false premise? Should we be talking instead about empowering demand or providing an avenue for demand? We can stimulate demand through novel communication modes (such as comic strips) or by simply finding out what policymakers' priority questions are. However the evidence does need to be fit for purpose which means research needs to be 'close to the ground', being a part of the relevant networks and structures and actively managing networks and relationships.

Various incentives were outlined as being useful in the UK: the Research Excellence Framework will have 'impact' measures in its new form and is one example of a different incentive. <u>Dis</u>incentives for policymakers can include government procurement regulations which prohibit them from commissioning research. The main messages were that different actors have different triggers for articulating demand: we need to find novel, appropriate ways to support these. Also, different sectors are at different stages of development (e.g. health, agriculture) – there is a need to encourage learning across sectors.</td></tr>
<tr><td>1c How do we know when we have strengthened user demand for evidence? What metrics
could we use to demonstrate this?</td><td>First, you have to know who your user is. Then you have to know what they care about. Then you have to show them how your research gives them what they care about. The metrics flow from that. Measurable and quantitative metrics might include: the number of hits on the website, number of downloads, contact / questions / phone-ins, audience size/attendance, and the results of questionnaires or other feedback. Ensuring that application processes for research projects and programmes take into account the demand side means you will know you've strengthened demand (the UK Research Council's impact plans give us a qualitative sense of demand). Another way of strengthening demand is to strengthen the challenge function in an organisation to drive up evidence use and research quality.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Question 1: next steps
Identify users: understand their needs, what they're most interested in (different users will have different needs, even in the same organisation) – survey their demand
Invest in tertiary education – in the longer term this will build capacity to understand research evidence and the capacity to demand / articulate research needs. It will also produce quality teachers for schools
Rebrand 'research' to make it more accessible to users
Encourage policymakers to acknowledge / cite research use, offer incentives for greater user of research, and make it possible to track users
The importance of <u>authoritative repositories</u> and access to experts: assist users to demand easily accessible knowledge and evidence</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Question 2: How do we effectively incorporate different types of knowledge into research communication and uptake activities?
While research is perceived as occupying a particular space in evidence for policy and practice, it is clearly not the only voice and in some instances may be the ‘junior partner’. As we seek to demonstrate the impact of research on policy and practice, we need to be able to clarify what other forms of knowledge may modify its impact and in what ways this may happen.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2a. What are the different types of local knowledge and how should research communication and uptake activities take them into account? Knowledge of the local context, folk knowledge, indigenous technical knowledge... are there others?</td><td>Knowledge transfer is always people to people, not institution to institution. Different types of knowledge include: oral tradition, livelihood strategies, emotional knowledge, political knowledge, environmental knowledge. “Research” should not just be something that “we” do and communicate with “them”: this may be appropriate in some cases but we should always begin by exploring ways of engaging collaboratively from the start, e.g. via participatory research. From the very beginning the research process should consider various kinds of knowledge, and then research communication becomes more effective.

Don’t put research on a pedestal: researchers coming into a new environment to do work on a particular issue need to survey the local body of knowledge, opinions and in understanding on that issue and that local factors and conditions that affect that issue.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2b. How should research communications and uptake activities mesh local knowledge (as above) with other types of knowledge such as tacit knowledge, political views, values and different world views?</td><td>Different levels of communication are required at various points in the “research” chain. At the start certain elements, such as local context, may be more important. Later, when communicating the findings, it may be the case that we need to broaden the range of stakeholders involved. Facilitation is needed to change power relations “in the head” by getting researchers to value the knowledge of others. In addition, there are different lenses through which people view research: political, cultural etc. There is a need to understand how all these groups, and also researchers, view their work.

Researchers and end users (farmers, policy-makers) should consult each other at the start of the research activity. The chances are that the end users will feel part of the process and likely to take up the results, leading to more effective collaboration at the start of research which will help integrate a variety of viewpoints.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2c. What is the role of research communicators in transmitting or brokering these different types of knowledge – are there any situations where they might do more harm than good?</td><td>The first step is to build long-term relationships with users to understand what effective communication will be. Communicators must distinguish between different types of audiences and different types of evidence. Communicators should “do no harm” and so have some process of validating the knowledge to be communicated. Harm may arise for several reasons: if the “knowledge” is not accurate or valid, if it cannot be used (which creates anxiety), if it relates only to problems and not solutions, if it breaches confidentiality or has political repercussions, if it is not completely objective, or if it is not culturally appropriate.

Knowledge communicators need to be aware that over-simplification e.g. media “sound-bites” can be harmful. As research communicators we need to be careful of taking a “transmitter” role; “brokering” requires more thought about who are the interested and affected parties. Research communicators should also think about how to bridge the gap between public perception (winters are not getting warmer…) and scientific evidence. Could the arts (exhibitions, theatre) play a role in turning research results into something that could be experienced? But note that a potential harm of failed communication is that a topic might be “burned” (Example: JCCP’s Climate Change report and the effects of the data mistake)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Question 2: next steps
- Promote a more informed debate around bringing different knowledge together: no knowledge is better than any others. This needs to be done at a local level to help dispel myths around different knowledge, which means there is a need to understand the different knowledges better.</td></tr>
</table>

- Taking a participatory approach to research could help mitigate the tension between local knowledge and “scientific knowledge” by helping to inform the research agenda.
- Be wary of assumptions that suggest that:
  - “Local” knowledge is rural and traditional and ‘pre-modern’. It could be urban, political or reflecting a way of life of different demographic groups.
  - Knowledge can only be engaged with as a continuous block. The point is that everyone’s knowledge system could be interrogated to identify what is relevant for local application. E.g. herbal remedies for HIV may be problematic but understanding can reveal how communicators can make meaning around HIV.
- Need time and space for general collaboration to develop understanding of different knowledge and context in order to build long-term relationships. We’re still talking about research as something “we” do and communicate to “them”.
- Use of non-written formats – use of different tools e.g. the arts to communicate messages.
- There are different lenses through which people view research, political, cultural etc. There is a need to understand how these groups view the work of researchers.
- Intermediaries can do harm if they are not trained or if they are driving the debate. There is always a certain amount of info “lost in translation” – we need to minimise this.

Question 3: Improving engagement with the private sector on research uptake and use *Adolph et al* (2010, pp 54-59) *– see Annex A –* a *notes that there are differences between agriculture and human development in terms of the structure of the private sector and how it interacts with national and global policymaking. The questions below set out to explore the implications of this, and any effects this may have on how research communicators work.*	
3a. Is there a general need to improve interactions with the private sector? What ways in which the private sector works need to be understood and accounted for in shaping research and communication activities?	There are mixed views on the need or not to improve research communication and uptake with the private sector. If yes, then there is a need to create spaces for joint private sector and research lesson sharing, exchange in a non-threatening and open environment. However ‘private sector’ is a broad term. It encapsulates a range of different sectors / stakeholders, e.g. health, agriculture. In some sectors, research communication link with private sector is already happening, in others it is not: we need to understand why this is. We also need to be clear why we want to work with the private sector, and why they want to be involved; what is their incentive for involvement, how can they help researcher communicators to disseminate their knowledge, how the marketing power of the private sector can be harnessed as intermediaries. But can private sector research become a public good? One example given was Shell’s investment in scenario planning, which moved from being a private good to being a public good. The private sector interaction tends to be purpose/interest driven. So interaction with researchers will be attractive if it meets a need (probably a profit motive) or fulfils a corporate social responsibility objective. Do we want or believe that the private sector should influence national and global policy-making? The group had different views on this, but generally felt that it should not. Also, the definition of impact and uptake can be different between the private sector and the public sector, making it not necessarily applicable for public sector use.
3b. How does research and research communication deal with potentially conflicting objectives in independent and private sector research and communication?	Potential conflict may lie in the different underlying objectives of the private sector (profit maximisation) and the public sector (benefit to all segments of society). So we need to expose differences where they exist and get the debate into the public domain, with additional supportive evidence, where possible. Where there are common / shared interests we could explore ways of undertaking research, combining public and private sector which might minimise conflict and build common understanding around mutual or overlapping agendas. Some private research communication is sometimes similar to that of publicly funded bodies – so there may be no big conflict. In other contexts (e.g. agrochemicals, pharmaceuticals) it may be hard to remove the strong commercial incentive to sell products which may raise the potential for conflict.

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other points included:
There is a public responsibility to address the balance of research agendas and communication, i.e. public sector (bilateral, multi-lateral), private sector and foundations. How transparent are the research and research communication processes within each of these three groups? There is a need for more research on these drivers and the transparency of these drivers.
The open access movement should embrace the challenge of encouraging the private sector to be more open in publishing their results as part of their corporate social responsibility (CSR – this would not apply to commercially sensitive information/their competitive advantage)
Need to use research communications to make it the private sector’s objective, to give the private sector an incentive to change their behaviour, e.g. access to medicine index. If there is a conflict, this should be exposed, e.g. through innovative methods such as drama in a non-partisan way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Much independently-funded research has a pro-poor emphasis: how can this effectively be maintained by research communicators when dealing with the private sector?</td>
<td>The question assumes that the private sector had not and cannot have a pro-poor agenda. However, there are many examples where this is not the case – e.g. telecoms. The main messages: in some cases the private sector does understand that the bottom of the pyramid represents good business opportunities and is thus pro-poor beyond the normal demands of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). More can be done by research communicators to:
Target investors as well as companies,
Raise contentious issues,
Show how interventions can bring pro-poor benefits.
Other points included a general debate on whether research communicators have any responsibility to try and influence the research priorities of private companies. One proposal was that research communicators may have a role in challenging the motivations behind the research priorities of private companies. In the developed world, the example of the Which? Report offers a means of helping civil society and citizens become aware of choices, e.g. become intelligent consumers of products and services: such examples are not available in developing countries. Another point was that hybrid enterprises are being established from CSO/NGO organisations, which are now developing entrepreneurial principles, such as social venture capital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2">Question 3: next steps
Increased understanding of how research communication is or can work with the private sector
Provide more funding for dialogue between research, private sector, NGOs at local, national and global levels, to:
Link supply and demand side
Address specific issues
Beyond the major known shared research opportunities for public –private partnerships (e.g. HIV Aids, malaria) there may be other opportunities for collaborative interactions.
There is a need to investigate the role the private sector can play in various fields of development
Need to capture examples (e.g. smallholder agriculture) of good collaboration between the public and the private sector – focussed research outside of those areas, which are well known (e.g. malaria)
Where there are conflicting perspectives in public and private spheres, there is a need for open debate and to shine light on the issues (i.e. more research, more debate). Examples may include biofuels, GMOs, climate change.</td>
</tr>
</table>

Question 4: Improving engagement with civil society on research uptake and use *Civil society organisations play an important part as knowledge intermediaries, are conduits for research in their own right, and are an increasingly important part of the 'audience' for publicly-funded research outputs. But their different constituencies and mandates mean that researchers and research communicators need to carefully consider whether they demand specific uptake pathways, or whether they can be viewed as one of many actors in more general uptake strategies.*	
4a. CSOs can be conduits for research, not just another audience. What are CSO's particular needs in terms of how research is communicated?	Improved linkage between researchers, extension workers and farmers, local NGOs. Research needs to be communicated and 'translated' so that it is clear what it means for the constituency (of the CSO) and its values. CSOs will be good conduits for dissemination of research but only if it fits with their agendas. CSOs can facilitate interaction between different stakeholders, bringing researchers directly in contact with local people. In addition, CSOs have an opportunity to communicate research and influence policy-making while governments consult with stakeholders during the development of their policies. CSOs are not only conduits – they may be researchers or policy-makers themselves – but CSOs can be a good conduit because they often have large membership and therefore good outreach.
4b. What can help to bring CSOs and researchers closer together? Where has this worked and what lessons can we learn?	The NCCR North-South research programme has 'partnership actions' component, in which researchers together with other actors (NGOs, CSOs) can apply for funding for a 6-month project to test research results in real-world settings. The HIV/AIDS programming provides a number of cases where CSOs utilise the outcome of research in their educational and advocacy work. Engaging with CSOs in the design and providing them with research findings may help them to do their jobs better, providing them with macro and international perspectives: SIDA is trying out a new instrument called partner-driven cooperation, which may help in this regard. Joint 3-year programmes with public, private and CSO entities could also be beneficial. Funding research universities and local research capacity leads into engagement between local researchers and CSOs: NGOs could pool researchers in specific research areas in low-income countries, e.g. in the social sciences.
4c. How might we measure the impact of research on CSO activities?	Do we measure the take-up of research and/or its impact on peoples' lives? We have to ask 'was the research intended to influence/be used by CSOs, was it commissioned by CSOs, or was it undertaken by CSOs themselves?' But the term 'CSOs' is a very broad category – we need to break it down because different groups may have very different perspectives of relationships with research): the impact is very dependent on positions; and CSOs are a very big group; we need to build methods (like social audits) which recognise and value all the different positions.

Question 4: next steps

- CSOs, where relevant to the research objective, need to be stakeholders in the research agenda-setting and being part of the continuum of putting the research into use
- Enlightened program funders need to share their research uptake approach with others.
- Researchers need to make their research understandable and useful to CSOs; there needs to be a greater funding incentive to encourage this.
- We must consider that there are different types of CSOs and research.
    - There needs to be channels to enhance communication between them;
    - funding should support coordination rather than competition;
    - capacity development in communities to conduct/utilise research;
    - research consortia to encourage collaboration
    - greater level of education and public engagement is required.
- We need to be more articulate about what 'impact' means via the theory of change, or develop a better matrix of success.

- Map the role and influence of CSOs – how do the CSOs influence and support delivery?
- More engagement between key stakeholders could help shape how to measure impact, particularly maintaining relevance for those who are delivering policies.

Question 5: Improving availability and access of research results to the end users

As well as 'pushing' research results to end users and working to improve the strength of the 'pull' from end users to researchers, it is also important that end users are enabled to search for evidence themselves. There are various ways in which this could be done: by building relationships between the producers and users of research evidence, and by using technology to make that evidence readily accessible.

5a. What are the most effective ways of ensuring that end users know of the availability of evidence? How can we be sure they are up to date with the best sources of evidence?	The main message was that there needs to be pro-active targeting of messages to diverse target groups. Use diverse channels, but note these can be expensive. We also need to proactively identify audiences before or at inception of a project, to get to know them and to provide appropriate materials, e.g. policy briefs for policy-makers in languages other than English; or messages delivered to citizens via loudspeakers, mobile phones, radio programmes. There is a need for a 'one-stop-shop' where possible, with information collated in one central and accessible location. Land & Water Australia had a good example: they identified their top 100 influencers in their field (either top people or up-and-comers) and sent them information on a regular schedule. If the potential end users are involved in the research as it develops, i.e. research is being done within their context / place, they will be aware of it from the start, rather than it being passed over to them out of context. User involvement in research will ensure that it is driven by local, national and regional needs. We could also consider working with 'stable' groups of intermediaries, such as parliamentary researchers or parliamentary librarians, not just with parliamentarians or the public who tend to 'move around'. We also need to build capacity of these groups in a more long-term way, raising awareness about evidence that is available. There are good examples of targeted research communication: for example, newspaper and radio dissemination which was targeted to herders in Kirgizstan, worked well initially, as a high rate of literacy is present, but problems were experienced in getting follow-up funding. In general, customising media to disseminate research results can be expensive: users can't always pay for it. Another example is Environment Canada's 'science alert' system, which is an example of a system that can provide two things: first, a "heads-up" on new science, coming from the departments' science and technology community. Second, it acts as an easily accessible and authoritative database available online to the policy community, to search at will (or subscribe to).
5b. What role do different communication channels play (ie online, paper copies)? How can information be packaged or organised in a way that ensures decision-makers can easily extract the information most relevant to them?	The main message was that there is a need for outputs at a number of different levels: repository / archives, making research findings available – also in a decentralised way, e.g. knowledge centres, or via professional associations. Customised systems build on interaction, trust relationships, facilitated by brokers as part of a longer-term relationship. These two systems need to complement each other, but access issues for practitioners, such as doctors in developing countries need to be addressed – people such as these require research results to make their decisions, and we need to work with them to remove barriers which block access such as problems with internet access or the expense of paid subscriptions. For example, medical practitioners and other professional associations can help to synthesise evidence and thus influence change in practice. Researchers who serve on government committees can directly influence use of evidence. Although the ACU has done some research which shows that in some contexts there is access to original research (paid subscriptions), there is a lack of awareness about the availability of such services, and there still remain bandwidth issues which limit access. And while 2-page summaries (for example) are important, there may also be a need for direct interaction with technical people in ministries, who may

	need also the in-depth analysis.
5. c) Is one limiting factor that there are no international protocols about open access for publicly available research? What is the effect of this? If there is a need for them, what might these protocols cover?	The main message is that making data available is only a first step. Much is happening already, but many people are not aware of what that is. Thus the key issue is how to use existing systems to access data / research findings and make sense of them – but to enable this we need protocols, which could cover: o Citation and plagiarism issues, giving researchers reassurance and recognition. Thus enticing them to make their work openly available. o These protocols could also guide the manner of presenting research work, e.g. indexing, tagging key words, etc. There is an issue of quality control and credibility: we need to ensure repositories are clearly indexed and quality controlled. Where that is the case, researchers are more likely to be willing to share their research, i.e. there are standards of citation and meta-tagging. There are OECD and other protocols available, but these only relate to publicly funded research, and they may not be clear and may not be reinforced. They also would need to be reinforced by donors and government, to ensure the release of findings.

Question 5: next steps

- Good practice in research communication in different contexts needs to be pulled together: issues to be covered could include cataloguing and summarising the main methods of research communication, indicating in which context each might be appropriate, evaluating what has already been done, or creating a community of practice in development research communication
- There needs to be a framework for understanding research communication, so experience and good practice can be shared. Need for new tools

Question 6: The role of the ICTs and the media in research communication and uptake

The capacity of the media (radio, tv, newspapers, the internet, social media) to influence research communication and uptake is considerable, and it contributes to the public debate around how research and other forms of evidence influence policy outcomes. Carter & Paulus (2010) note that the media is an important factor 'shaping the character of governance... (it)...can constitute the most powerful accountability mechanisms of all democratic institutions.' But the relationship between researchers and the media is not always an easy one, with researchers frustrated by journalists' searches for good news stories, and journalists frustrated by the ifs, buts and caveats which characterise many research reports.

6a. What needs to be done to improve relationships between researchers and the media, particularly journalists? Is it part of a general need for researchers to be better communicators, or does the media have a particular need for improved engagement from researchers? Does this differ across countries and regions?	There is still an element of 'us' versus 'them'. To get over this, researchers need to be willing to engage when an issue is "hot" – not to just want a peer review. They also need to be able to make the link between research and policy impact on readers/viewers/listeners. For TV soap it's an on-going dialogue between researchers and TV production team (story-lines, scriptwriting); and this process builds the relationship. The gap is in the way researchers communicate their research and the technical capacity of media to understand basic research. Specialist journalism is declining; it needs to be supported. Opportunities for researchers to communicate directly to the public/policy-makers are increasing – blogs and buying up airtime – but this may reduce the scope for intelligent questions to be asked of researchers.
6b. How important is it to ensure	The World Federation of Science Journalists interviewed 40 editors/directors in Africa and Arab countries and found that: 34 showed

that editors and managers in the media are research-literate? How can that be achieved? How can we improve the mutual responsibility of researchers, editors and managers to report research accurately and in an interesting way to enhance uptake?	interest in science-related reports (health, environment etc.); 17 were excited by science topics; 15 planned more space/time for science stories. But is there an audience for the research? Why should anybody care about this? If there is an audience, media editors will be interested: researchers need to be trained to think about audience needs and drawing out engaging insights from their work, which means that media training is therefore crucial. Editors and managers themselves do not need to know about the content of research, but must understand the significance of the research and how it is carried out (note that there also need to be better incentives for good science journalists).
6c. How can new technologies and media outlets such as social networks be useful and what are the factors limited their use (eg is internet connectivity or speed a key problem in access some countries or groups?	Mobile telephony reaches the bottom of the pyramid and uniquely accesses the poorer parts of society, but new technologies are needed to package the content more efficiently for low bandwidth or mobile devices. We should investigate more the use of mobile technology; mapping systems; information systems and new tools for research: social networks allow researchers to participate in a two-way conversation with audiences interested in a particular topic. Social media crowd sourcing is more than a word – it's a method of understanding the demand, but we need to be careful as new technologies can have narrow social/economic profiles of users e.g. Twitter.

Question 6: next steps

- Training target audiences (eg researchers and various stakeholders) on using social media – acknowledging its importance as a communication tool.
- Connect journalists and researchers on Facebook.
- Use social media to promote research for CSO advocacy.
- Use web tools e.g. Googlemaps to make research more accessible.
- Mobile telephony is almost ubiquitous: new research could possibly be made available to rural farmers?
- Make knowledge searchable to end users and make it context specific.
- Limit the capacity of social media to legitimise poor research.
- Traditional methods of communication remain critical. Do not leave them behind for the sake of new media.
- Identify and engage early on who research is for, and who might find it useful.
- Social media can be used for "interactive" discussions on research.

Question 7: Issues and challenges in resourcing successful research communications projects *While projects funded under research programme budgets can fund their own research communication activities, there are still opportunities to fund separate research communication projects whose purpose is to improve communication activities across a range of types of research.*	
7a. Does specific investment in research communication and uptake projects make a difference? What incentives, rewards or requirements can support successful research communication and when are they most appropriate?	The main message from participants was the need to institutionalise capacity building for research communication and uptake through results-based management and incentives for synthesis such as cross-programme communication. Funders should include a requirement to take communication seriously in a proposal from the outset, and to incentivise researchers to think / publish / share beyond peer review. There may be a need for new funding mechanisms for programmes which work across research, business and policy. Funding communication programmes will help to synthesise evidence and go beyond project specific findings. In addition, joint calls targeting researchers working jointly with the public and private sector (partner driven co-operation, as first initiated by SIDA) could be replicated. However, it is not enough for donors to require research communication from projects that they support: there should be a dialogue addressing *why*, i.e. what is the rationale (and maybe guidelines on how to do it). It is important to build capacity to understand the value of communicating strategically when research projects start to think of communicating the project *and* linking it to other projects. Within this, it could be useful to spend resources to synthesise research projects, rather than assigning funds to individual projects on their own for specific research communication activities.
7b. What are the costs or resources required for successful communication and engagement activities that are often ignored?	Participants identified several issues about the hidden costs required for successful communication and engagement. They include: the challenge of not underestimating the level of human resources required for effective research communication (including networking), the large investment of time and money that needs to be spent to understand when the policy windows are likely to arise and when/where interactions are needed. Time is also needed to invest in building trust and building partnerships/relationships, and to professionalise media markets in developing countries – perhaps recognising skills through higher education courses. This may be challenging where there is no entertainment budget! Networking is seen as essential but hard to fund: not all networks are self-sustaining and many of them rely on goodwill, or key individuals, to maintain them. A separate issue of per diems was identified: participants noted that some groups, such as Parliamentarians, are difficult to engage if per diems are not offered. Research communication and uptake is a very fast-moving field with constant change (such as in ICTs). We need new vehicles and interventions – but we're often locked into deliverables outlines at the start of the programme: we need greater flexibility to innovate and adapt. However the budget and resources to monitor / track impact are never adequately funded (eg baseline data collection is resource intensive), and there are transaction costs in consortia models (partnership development/trust). Constantly changing donor requirements are a challenge, as there is little time to familiarise with the subject matter (such as technical specialists acquiring communication skills, or communication specialists acquiring technical skills). In addition, there is often little time to understand the local context, to invest in acquiring trust (like with a new brand) or to scope and test new models or innovative approaches. Finally, it was noted that it is important not to resource communication posts at too low a level, either in terms of grade or pay.

7c. What types of funding channels or mechanisms can be used to stimulate more effective research communication and uptake? Are there possibilities for recovering the costs of these from end users or must they always be subsidised? If so, what are the implications for longterm sustainability of these services?	• There are mixed messages from donors on resourcing for research communications: it is not possible to expect free or open access to research knowledge as well as cost recovery or payment for information • Consulting can provide some funds for core knowledge brokering work, but it is a cost – it distracts from core services • If the focus is on poor and marginalised people, you're very unlikely to get payment for information • There needs to be more focus on 'little c' (research communication) rather than 'big C' – traditional press office etc • There is a very small private sector in developing countries, and even fewer interested in research communicatoin

Question 7: 'Take home products' and next steps

- A quick straw poll done at the table provides a bit of a reality check and shows that we are collectively suffering from a funding crisis and political uncertainty about the future of research communication activities.
- Longer-term funding streams / funding schemes for dedicated 'relationship managers' would be useful, and could be one way to help. Payment by end users is unlikely to be realistic in a development context – we know of no successful examples. But research communicators can be innovative in diversifying their funding sources, eg discrete commercial sponsorship / pro bono contributions from private-sector firms
- More emphasis could be put on aligning the interests of research institutions with those of the research users, so that the cost of the research is borne by the research producers and users, so that users begin to value research to a level that they will begin to actively contribute to it. Such institutions could also build a strong capacity in research communication which can then become a resource that other institutes can use (and which could bring in more funding)
- All research funders must insist all proposals for funding should have a good communication or impact plan, such as is already required by the UK's Research Councils. It would also be helpful to have a relatively standardised yearly assessment tool, to measure and evaluate the effectiveness of hidden costs and incorporate them into next year's budget.

Question 8: Assessing the impact of research communication

How we define effectiveness has an important bearing on our ability to demonstrate value for money. Adolph et al (2009 & 2010) note that while some individual research communication and uptake projects have done a considerable amount of work to develop parameters for measuring effectiveness of different channels, this has not been done at a strategic level. Nor have there been any comparisons between the effectiveness of different strategies. It is unclear, however, whether research communications and uptake activities are context-specific, or whether it is possible to develop more generic indicators of impact which could be used in all different contexts and would help clarify messages about the value of research communications.

8a. Could the seven categories of uptake channel set out in Table 3 (of the background paper) be helpful in terms of developing broad categories for assessing impact of different approaches to research	These seven categories can be helpful, but they need to be measured in terms of articulated goals; and are missing: generators of knowledge (at the beginning), debate (in the middle), and more about how research uptake happens once it is communicated. They will only really be useful if they are part of a broader change process which is made up of multiple approaches and combinations of channels. What needs to be articulated more strongly is the type of research that being considered (blue skies, applied, etc.) – what it is aiming to illustrate, and the uptake issues which surround it. The framework should also include a channel for generating knowledge of

communication and uptake? Could this lead to better opportunities to replicate and scale up good practice, or is it always context-specific?	all kinds from all actors, which would link research and policy communities together in order to assess the relevance of the research. The seven categories
8b. How can we assess impact effectively whilst recognising that the time-frame for real impact may be a very long one, and that research communication activities are one of only many influences on the uptake and use of research? For example, even if it was not possible to demonstrate impact in the short-term, are there any predictors of research use which could be incorporated into monitoring and evaluation activities?	In assessing impact, we need to distinguish between the process of assessment (the steps and activities) and the methods used for data collection. Knowing what to assess is also important, especially the distinction between shorter-term outputs and longer term outcomes. So the question is, what do we need to measure, and how will that be measured? Surveys are good for getting a picture of short-term results, but these need to be set against data over a longer time frame, in order to assess impact, but a long time is required to harvest data and relevant information, and to measure impact. We have much to learn from the past (over a longer time frame). Some forensic analysis of past research and decisions that were based on it can be important / useful. An example was the analysis at Environment Canada of work on pulp and paper that resulted in Canada not adopting a certain path and ending up in saving of billions for the paper and pulp industry.
8c. There are two aspects to improving the way we demonstrate impact: collecting better information, and persuading funding bodies to change the way they demand evidence of impact. For research communications and uptake, where does the balance lie?	We need to be clear about the theory of change to better explain how we think our research contributes to policy / practice outcomes and impact – only then will the numbers and anecdotes make sense on the progress we are making. Numeric data needs to connect to a theory of change and be validated by qualitative case studies. Developing good case studies is important – a good narrative on science into policy is more meaningful than metrics (which are difficult for science to policy, because this is not a linear process) There is a need to have a clear long-term policy influence strategy with milestones, so that donors know where they stand and how their support contributes to it. It is also important to be aware of the main questions for the M&E, instead of starting with accountability to funders, in order to avoid it becoming a public relations effort. This means having clear objectives on what information one is trying to collect, what impact on is trying to achieve.. Funding cycles and delivery or impact may not always correlate – the real impact may take longer than the funding cycle. Donors need to invest and plan from the outset for: a baseline; an M&E framework; monitoring deliverables and milestones. There is a need for lesson sharing across programmes: donor-driven baseline surveys can be set up across projects, and then evaluation can work at project-specific level for impact. However, donors also need to recognise that a specific project contributes to a larger 'patchwork quilt' when attempting to assess impact, i.e. the need to identify a contribution within a larger context. It would be helpful to share knowledge on this topic into donor dialogue. There needs to be better understanding of donors ' own indicators and plans, and this needs to be fed back to the wider donor and research community.

6. Marketplace

On the morning of the second day, fourteen organisations were given the opportunity to showcase their work. In the first session participants were guided around this 'marketplace' rapidly, so that as many as possible could be visited and participants could get a flavour of the wide range of research communication and uptake activities being undertaken around the world. The second session allowed participants to pick four for more detailed discussions and follow-up.

Organisations represented in the marketplace were:

Organisation	Website
R4D	http://www.dfid.gov.uk/r4d/
GDNet	http://cloud2.gdnet.org/cms.php?id=gdn_development_research
Practical Action	http://practicalaction.org/technical-information-service/technical_information_service
SciDevNet	http://www.scidev.net/en/
Panos	http://www.panos.org.uk/
INASP	http://www.inasp.info/
IDS	http://www.ids.ac.uk/go/ids-knowledge-services
WRENMedia	http://www.wrenmedia.co.uk/
FAO	http://www.fao.org/waicent/portal/about_en.asp
BBC World Service Trust	http://www.bbc.co.uk/worldservice/trust/
ODI RAPID	http://www.odi.org.uk/work/programmes/rapid/
World Federation of Science Journalists	http://www.wfsj.org/sjcoop/
Pacific Institute for Public Policy	http://www.pacificpolicy.org/
Prolinnova	http://www.prolinnova.net/

7. Knowledge intermediaries session

The final session of the workshop looked at the roles and functions of knowledge intermediaries. In the era of impact and accountability, demonstrating the value of knowledge intermediaries is becoming increasingly important – and one of the ways of doing this is to clarify their impacts. As noted in the background paper, there is no clearly recognised framework for doing this; so the workshop sought to mesh the outputs of two sets of discussions to see whether it was possible to create one. The two discussions – the I-K-Mediary workshops and the Canadian workshop on Knowledge Translation and Knowledge Brokering – had slightly different emphases, as outlined by Faye Reagon and Elin Gwyn.

7.1 Faye Reagon: the roles of knowledge intermediaries

Enabling access, making information edible, creating demand for information, enabling marginalised voices, creating alternative framings, connecting spheres of action, enabling accountability

Faye spoke of the development of the I-K-Mediary Network, explaining that it began several years ago and grew out of a feeling that there were many different people and organisations working as knowledge intermediaries who would benefit from being part of a more formal network. A particular issue of concern was that the literature on information and knowledge flows did not look specifically at the roles of intermediaries - not only in international development but in the wider literature as well.

Since its inception there have been three I-K-Mediary Network workshops (with a forthcoming one in Bangladesh in early 2011) which have looked in detail at understanding the roles of knowledge intermediaries and the potential impacts they can have. Some of the issues the groups have identified as affecting how knowledge intermediaries work include weak infrastructures and wide geographical dispersion, both of the intermediary organisations and the groups they serve. This makes it difficult to reach those who need knowledge: given that many end users have low literacy levels and there are very few who have access to ICTs, this means that the work of knowledge intermediaries can be resource-intensive. Added to the fact that many governments do not have a strong commitment to the use of evidence in policymaking, and decision-makers who often have their own agendas, the result is generally a weak culture of knowledge sharing and a lack of trust in the system.

The I-K-Mediary Network is continuing to work to develop standards of good practice, share understanding of impact and effectiveness, and be a hub for innovation around the work of knowledge intermediaries. The website www.knowledgebrokersforum.org has produced some interesting discussions recently, and participants were encouraged to join it.

7.2 Elin Gwyn: the different functions of knowledge intermediaries:

Informing, linking, matchmaking, focused collaboration, strategic collaboration, building sustainable institutions

Elin explained that while she does not work in the field of international development, understanding and systematising the role of knowledge intermediaries is crucial for her work. She is a research analyst for OMAFRA (the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs) in Canada, with a portfolio that includes knowledge translation and transfer (i.e. research communication and uptake).

For Elin, her work is all about connectivity – it doesn't really matter what this activity is called (knowledge intermediary, knowledge broker) as long as everyone realises that its purpose is to enable connections among knowledge producers and knowledge users. But it is not always easy to explain what is involved in knowledge mobilization, the approaches used, why they are important and how they are the best way of accelerating research into use. So she appreciated the need to have a more formalised, systematic approach which could provide the rigour and structure to the work she and her colleagues are doing. Not only would it provide the explanation of the work they do, it would also illustrate more clearly the achievements they are making.

The Montreal workshop generated a list of activities that knowledge brokers perform (as set out in the background paper). Elin took that list back to OMAFRA and found that it fit with the work to get knowledge or evidence into use in policy, programmes and commercialisation efforts. A basic case study assessed one area of OMAFRA's work (environmental sustainability research) and generated examples for each of the steps of the knowledge broker framework. Developing this sort of systematic framework not only helps Elin do her job better by giving her the ability to critically analyse where and why different tools would be useful and to develop defined work plans, it also helps explain to others the value of knowledge mobilization work.

7.3 Group work: developing indicators of the impacts of knowledge intermediaries

The background paper discussed how these two complementary understandings of the role of knowledge intermediaries could be brought together to develop a first set of indicators of the impacts they might have. The first session asked each group to consider one of the classifications that Faye had spoken about and to brainstorm indicators of impact onto post-its. Once this had been done they were asked to assign the post-its to the categories outlined by Elin, to see whether there were any differences between the types of impact we might look for as the functions of the knowledge intermediaries change. The groups were then mixed up to encourage different discussions, and the second set of groups was asked to review the first groups' outputs to see if it was possible to aggregate the impacts into broad categories. These final categories, and associated methods for assessing impacts, are given in the tables below.

Informing: disseminating content, targeting decision makers with information, making information easily accessible and digestible. Examples include factsheets, research synopses, web portals, databases, end-of-project seminars	
Issue	***Measures of impact***
Understanding	• User surveys to check understanding after delivery with the audience: that they have received, understood and retained the message
Activity	• Usage statistics (citations, # of hits on repositories, # users or attendees at events, # of hard copy publications being demanded, # of document downloads...) • Content analysis to show shifts in reporting and coverage of research-based issues in print, audio and visual media • Availability of research reports and evidence; corrections and adjustments made to existing reports
Credibility and valuing	• Willingness to pay for particular information • Feedback/requests for additional information from policymakers • Meetings with policymakers and other target groups • Demand for information on issues (measuring both levels and sources of demand, particularly from new users/audiences)
Methods of communication	Returns from user surveys and Google Analytics could indicate the impact of: • Multiple packaging and editing of the same issue for different audiences (principle of collect once, use many times) • Diversity of engagement methodologies (language, medium) • Good practice in communication information (CIARD standard): list of pathways, list of standards and approaches (availability, accessibility, applicability
Ensuring marginalised voices are heard	• Number of voices captured in case study/video activity

Linking: linking expertise to need for a particular policy area, helping policymakers address a specific policy issue by seeking out the necessary experts. Examples include project or programme advisory committees, focus groups,	
Issue	***Measures of impact***
Interaction	• Usage statistics such as # of speaker requests, # of dissertations or presentations in policy discussions, citations of documents or references in policy discussions • Quantity and quality of stakeholder comments on government policy documents • Invitations to present to policymakers (by technical experts) orat public hearings
Ensuring marginalised voices are heard	• The marginalised are seen as experts in their own right • Extent to which marginalised people feel they are being heard
Metrics	• Number, type and location of people registered to receive research updates via SMS or email
Process	• Understanding of the current ‘framing’ of the issue in different

	audiences before and after the intervention • Reflection of local knowledge in planning and assessing the process • Diversity of engagement methodologies (language, virtual and online)
After the event...	• Generated 'buzz' after the event • Diversity of actors participating (more = better) • Records of contact and attendance (recognising that not everyone needs to physically attend), such as customer relation management journals

Matchmaking: matching expertise to need across issues and disciplines, helping policymakers think more broadly about a topic, finding experts with relevant knowledge from another discipline, helping them take a strategic overview to address the fullness of the issue. Examples include Departmental expert advisory committees, general conferences, university internships in government, mapping the evidence base for an issue	
Issue	***Measures of impact***
Design stage	• Number, type and location of people registered to receive research updates via email or SMS • Diversity of engagement methodologies (language, medium) • Reflection of local knowledge in planning and assessment
During the intervention	• Establishment/initiation of expert committees on particular issues • Levels of participation in spaces for dialogue created by government, or by knowledge intermediaries • Speaker requests
After the intervention	• Generated 'buzz' after the event: number of online and offline dialogues convened by the intermediaries • Communication between different stakeholders • Use of diverse and alternative sources of information • Promotion processes / tools for engagement, eg notices in the local press • Increased awareness by policymakers of the sources of research and who to contact

Focused collaboration: beginning to construct formal relationships to focus on a particular issue, contracting people or organisations to provide knowledge on an as-needed basis. Examples include contracted research programmes, electronic knowledge networks, working groups, wikis	
Issue	***Measures of impact***
No distinct categories were identified	• Establishment/identification of expert committees, • Number of task forces or discussion forums where target groups are actively involved in informed debates • Development of a project/programme plan (produced through participation) which identifies who the marginalised are, what they need to be heard on and how they should be involved • Number of infomediary organisations • Number of invitations from policymakers for briefings from technical experts

	• Feedback on research commissioned to address the issue

Strategic collaboration: lengthening and deepening the collaborative process, strengthening relationships and moving to a situation where all sides jointly negotiate the questions to be asked Examples include joint agreements where the emphasis is on equality in the relationships between actors such as MOUs, joint agreements, communities of practice.
(note that the categories below were developed after the event, to try to make sense of a very long list of post-it notes)

Issue	***Measures of impact***
Tools	• Longer-term studies and programme descriptions of civil society programmes reference the information • Use of mapping tools/processes, network mapping • References in documents, numbers of quotes • Promotion tools for engagement, eg notices in local press
Roles	• Collaborative expertise across government parastatals on particular issues • Clarity of role and communication for participants • Cross-professional task forces producing specific outputs for application in policy • Technical assistance by research or a research organisation to implement a policy • Formal institutional strategies and policies regarding uptake and use of research information • Policymaker demand for think tanks; government funding into think tanks, intermediaries and research

Inclusivity	• Reflection of local knowledge in planning and assessment
	• Policy process itself becomes more participatory/gender aware
	• Systematic involvement of different stakeholders in the framing of issues, including:
	    o Who is involved in decision-making?
	    o Whose knowledge is systematically incorporated?
	    o What is the editorial membership?
	• The fact that a 'group of friends' peer review has taken place to establish the availability, accessibility and applicability of information

Building sustainable institutions: deepening the collaborative relationship to the extent that all parties jointly frame the issue; broadening institutional capacity of institutions to respond to several issues simultaneously. The focus is on co-production of knowledge and joint learning from doing; the arrangements are self-sustaining in terms of both funding and function, with all sides contributing resources. Examples include co-management arrangements, local enterprise partnerships, self-sustaining consortia

Issue	***Measures of impact***
Bodies	• Government funding into think tanks, intermediaries and research • Policymaker demand for think tanks • Number of infomediary organisations providing these services
People	• Engagement of champions around an issue • List of contributors and knowledge sources – an indicator of the

	involvement of a broader range of stakeholders and the incorporation of their knowledge • Stakeholder reports of autonomous contact without intermediaries
Information support	• Technical assistance by research or research organisation to implement policy
Policies	• Formal institutional strategies and policies regarding uptake and use of research information • Governance of democratic institutions require a formal public/scientific consultation process to inform policymaking
Evidence-base	• Hard decisions are based on up to date and accurate information (the best available) – can be measured by savings in budget or the lack of duplication
Outcome/behaviour change	• May be a culture change involved: that spontaneous Communities of Practice or formal online dialogues emerge

7.4 Knowledge intermediaries: summary comments

In spite of the challenges of this session (coming at the end of the workshop meant participants were tired and overloaded with information), it is possible to see the outline of a set of measures that will help us to assess the impact of knowledge intermediaries as they perform their different roles. Some are quantitative (usage statistics, numbers of downloads), some are qualitative (whether formal institutional strategies exist regarding the uptake and use of research information) and some are a mixture of the two (content analysis, systematic involvement of different groups in the policymaking process). What is interesting to note is that the types of indicator change as the functions move from 'linking' to 'building sustainable institutions'. This does suggest that it is legitimate to separate out these functions – that they each have a distinct set of impacts that we might seek if we were to invest in knowledge intermediaries as a distinct group of actors linking research to policy.

However, none of the groups shared a similar view on how best to categorise the different assessment tools: some (such as 'Matchmaking') took a more functional approach and divided the post-its into 'before', 'during' and 'after' the intervention took place, reflecting how a monitoring exercise might be carried out. Others (such as 'Linking') mixed these functions with values, looking at how it might be possible to assess issues such as credibility. More work will need to be done to see if it is possible to develop a common set of sub-categories crossing all the different functions of knowledge intermediaries.

What is presented above should not be seen as definitive, but instead as the useful beginning of a conversation about the roles, functions and methods for assessing the impacts of knowledge intermediaries.

8 Summary of the funders' session

(Issued 30 November 2010)

8.1 Background

A funders' session was organised as part of a two-day workshop on "*Improving the impact of development research through better communication and uptake"* held in London on 29-30 November 2010 and organised by AusAID, DFID and the UKCDS.

The aim of this closed funders' session was to discuss and agree on key gaps and opportunities in the current research communication 'landscape', and on the basis of this, explore the potential for future funder collaboration and coordination. The session also provided opportunities to discuss funders' approaches, and share lessons learnt and future plans.

8.2 Attendees

It was attended representatives from the following organisations:

- The Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID)
- The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)
- The UK Department for International Development (DFID)
- The UK Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC)
- The International Development Research Centre (IDRC)
- The UK Natural Environment Research Council (NERC)
- The OECD Development Co-operation Directorate (OECD DAC)
- The Rockefeller Foundation
- The Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA)
- The UK Collaborative on Development Sciences (UKCDS)
- The United States Agency for International Development (USAID)
- The Wellcome Trust
- The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation

The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DGIS) had planned to attend, but were unable to reach London due to weather conditions and other travel associated disruptions.

The session started with a presentation by Felicity Proctor (available on www.researchtoaction.org), summarising (a) information provided by funders in advance of the session about their current research communication (RC) activities and future plans, and (b) a donor review undertaken for DFID by Triple Line Consulting Ltd. in 2009, including 17 research funders. This was followed by brainstorming sessions and discussions to identify and prioritise key gaps and opportunities related to research communication and uptake.

8.3 Agreements and next steps

It was agreed that different types of research require different types of research communication and uptake activities. Each funder has its comparative advantages and particular interests, depending on its respective mandate and programme portfolios. It would be inappropriate for every funder to cover and support all aspects of RC. Hence it is useful for funders to maintain an overview of who is doing what, where and how (e.g. through workshops/meetings), in order to continue to increase coordination and share of experiences and lessons, and to identify and fill key gaps requiring further investments and / or activity.

8.4 Key areas for possible future collaboration

Key areas for possible future collaboration prioritised by the participants included:

(a) Development of a common conceptual framework for research communication and uptake (which accommodates differences between funders' priorities), and following from this, a framework for monitoring and evaluation of RC;

(b) Sharing of good practice around strengthening user demand and overcoming barriers to research uptake;

(c) Exploring options to develop an 'intelligent' search engine that would enable searching for research findings across the range of research repositories supported by different funders;

(d) Collating good practices around research partnerships between research users and generators, and the associated incentives and rewards.

Participants agreed that the workshop had been useful. The funders represented were interested in supporting and participating in future events, possibly on an annual basis. In addition, they plan to liaise via an e-forum/web based group to follow up on prioritised areas. Linkages with IFORD will also be explored.

9. Synthesis of participant evaluation forms

This synthesis draws on the 42 participant evaluations received by workshop organisers.

1. Overall summary

The workshop represented a diverse participant group with over 80 participants from the Asia-Pacific, Africa, the Australia, the United Kingdom and Europe as well as North America and Latin America. Participants also represented a range of professional groups involved in research communication and uptake, including research funders, research communication practitioners, journalists, researchers, policy makers and civil society representatives.

Overall, a high percentage (83%) of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the workshop **expanded their professional networks** and was likely to **lead to new collaborations** (81%). 69% agreed that the workshop provided an opportunity to **share their perspectives and experiences**, and the majority found the workshop content **relevant or useful** (Table 1 provides a full breakdown of responses).

Table 1

	Strongly disagree 1	2	3	4	Strongly agree 5
The workshop expanded my professional networks.			15%	32%	51%
The workshop provided me with an opportunity to share my experiences and perspective.		7%	24%	43%	26%
The workshop is likely to lead to new collaborations for myself or my organisation.	2%		17%	48%	33%
Workshop content was relevant and of interest.		5%	33%	33%	26%

All respondents agreed that the workshop **ran smoothly** and that they were provided with satisfactory administrative support. The vast majority (95%) considered the **preparatory information useful** and the **facilitation effective** at focussing discussion.

Table 2

	Disagree	Agree	Other
The preparatory information was useful and met my needs	3%	95%	3%
The workshop ran smoothly and efficiently		100%	
The logistical and administrative support was satisfactory		100%	
The facilitation was effective at focussing discussion	2%	95%	2%

Overall respondents were enthusiastic overall about the program, its execution and the networking and learning opportunities provided by the workshop:

- 'A great undertaking, well run, engaging activities, excellent facilitation. Thank you very much DFID and AusAID for putting this together and providing a great opportunity for learning' (funder)
- 'Please do an Asia–Pacific equivalent. More focus on practical and productive methods of research communication and less focus on 'methodologies', ' researching research communication' or 'systematic reviewing of research communication.' All in all it was certainly a valuable workshop, thank you' (journalist)
- 'Overall very helpful, however, we might have been trying to fit too much into a short space of time. It was very obvious that we were all fatigued. In any event congratulations to all involved in organising this effort – very impressive start!' (funder)

- ‘well organised bringing people from different countries, regions and research institutes’ (knowledge broker)

2. World café

The World Café was considered the most useful session by 7 participants and the least useful session by 4 participants.

21 respondents agreed that the world café provided **new insights** ‘it was probably the most interesting and productive session’ (journalist). Several commented that the subject matter was important ‘the questions were very pertinent and interesting and gave rise to discussions that touched on many different aspects (funder)’.

Several said that the format enabled ‘**a lot of information to be obtained** in a short time’ (knowledge broker) and ‘**encouraged interaction** between participants, making it easier to talk and network in the coffee breaks’ (knowledge broker). A couple of respondents commented that they ‘liked the format, but the final round of synthesis resulted in the slightly bland’ (funder).

11 respondents did not agree that the world café facilitated new insights. Their reasons included that the timing was **too rushed** and **lacked depth** ‘we covered so much that it wasn’t in depth’ (funder) and that the session was **fragmented**, ‘it is difficult to see the big picture when its broken down’ (development practitioner).

3. Marketplace session

The marketplace was considered the most useful session by 22 respondents. No participants considered it the least useful aspect.

21 respondents agreed the marketplace was an effective was to discover new tools, approaches or possible partners:

- ‘most definitely, a great way to understand the diversity and scope of research communications and uptake globally’ (knowledge broker)
- ‘it was excellent’ (knowledge broker)
- ‘it was rapid but very useful’ (development practitioner).

A few funders commented that they’d have liked ‘**more time** to absorb and digest materials’, and more discussion of the **strengths and weaknesses** of different program approaches to knowledge brokering.

4. Intermediary session

The knowledge intermediary session was considered the most useful session by 2 respondents. 11 participants found it the least useful aspect.

Feedback on the relevance and usefulness of the intermediary session feedback was mixed. Many participants found the session useful as it ‘**pulled together** strands into a framework’ (knowledge broker) and it was good to hear **peer perspectives** (knowledge broker).

Others reflected that the session ‘didn’t realise its potential’ (journalist), perhaps because the issue itself was ‘extremely **challenging**’ (journalist) and there was a diverse range of experience in the room (knowledge broker). Others reflected that **tiredness** reduced participant focus on detail (knowledge broker), and that while it was hard work ‘no pain, no gain’ (funder/practitioner).

5. Funders session

All respondents were positive about the usefulness and relevance of the funders session: ‘very useful **concrete actions** and steps’, ‘very relevant – focussed on a clearly expressed need’. A couple commented that the agenda was **ambitious** and that the discussion represented ‘the **first step** in a much longer dialogue’. One asked ‘can someone else carry forward a similar workshop next year?’