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I. PROGRAMME DESCRIPTION

In 2012, the Partnership for Economic Policy (PEP) was granted support by the Department for International Development (DFID) of the United Kingdom (or UK Aid) and the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) of Canada to lead a new research initiative entitled “Policy Analysis on Growth and Employment” (PAGE). The initiative supports rigorous, locally-led analyses generating reliable evidence to assist in promoting inclusive growth and female empowerment through improved policies related to labour markets, social protection and entrepreneurship in developing countries.

Projects supported under the PAGE initiative not only contribute to building and promoting local expertise in beneficiary countries - with priority given to low-income countries (LICs), fragile and conflict states¹ - but also help fill current evidence gaps in the scientific literature on growth and employment through the application of cutting-edge methodologies to the specific contexts of these countries.

Through agreement (or IDRC project) number 106950-001, IDRC granted PEP CAD 3M to support 28² projects led by teams of individual researchers (at least 50% female) based in developing countries, under the PAGE program initiative. As reported initially in the 2nd PAGE Annual Report (submitted in July 2014), the total number of projects was adjusted from 28 to 23 projects, in 2014, in consultation with IDRC. This reduction was to partially cover the losses from the exchange rate fluctuation (reduce 2 projects), the additional cost of CBMS projects (reduce 1 CBMS project), as well as reallocation of USD 388,000 towards institutional development costs (reduce 2 projects)³. In 2015, a further two projects were removed – bringing the final total to 21 projects - with agreement from IDRC due to continuing exchange rate losses.

Through component code 203049-101, DFID has granted PEP £5.15M to:

¹ See the list of targeted countries, as updated in September 2014: [www.pep-net.org/fileadmin/medias/pdf/PEP_official_documents/PAGE_LICountry_list.pdf](http://www.pep-net.org/fileadmin/medias/pdf/PEP_official_documents/PAGE_LICountry_list.pdf)
² An initial target of 30 projects was soon lowered to 28, in agreement with IDRC, after acknowledging that CBMS projects would require more resources than initially planned.
³ Based on the decision of the PEP Board of Directors, the reallocation for institutional development was achieved by dropping only two projects, as the remaining balance was covered by the four administering partner institutions without dropping grants and based on individual and respective budget decisions. The reallocation has enabled the Secretariat to recruit a Senior Finance Officer and establish the financial systems required to ensure accountability and fiduciary responsibility to donors, an important step in strengthening corporate capacity for fundraising and project development.
1) support 45 projects led by teams of individual researchers (at least 50% female) based in developing countries, with priority given to LICs, fragile and conflict states (at least 40% of all DFID-funded projects), under the PAGE program initiative

2) finance various research activities to be carried out by lead research staff based at the four PEP partner institutions in order to complement, support and draw lessons from research conducted through the PAGE grant mechanism

3) finance the institutionalization of PEP as a legally incorporated entity.

One of the five randomized control trials (RCTs) selected initially selected for support under the first (2013) round of the PAGE initiative was replaced (in 2015) by two field experiments. However, two less grants were awarded than initially planned to free up additional funds for PEP’s Best Practice Awards, to cover a small funding gap for the second field experiment, as well as to finance the participation of former PEP researchers (including the best of PAGE’s first two rounds of projects) to present at the June 2016 PEP general meeting.

This is the seventh⁴ report submitted by PEP to both donors (DFID and IDRC) to provide information on the overall progress achieved during the first 3,5 years of activities undertaken in the context of these agreements.

II. OVERVIEW OF THE YEAR

2.1. Progress and achievements

2.1.1. Calls for proposals and selection process

A first call for proposals was launched in September 2012, generating quite an encouraging response from 169 applicant research teams based in 52 different countries, of which 42% (22) are LICs, fragile or conflict states (or LFCs) - 77 or 46% of the submitted proposals were from LFCs. After two rounds of evaluation/revisions, a shortlist of 27 project teams from 20 different countries, including 16 teams (59%) from LFCs – were invited to send representative(s) to present their proposals (and receive training) during the 10th PEP general meeting⁵, held in Cape Town, South Africa, on May 2-10, 2013.

A second call for proposals was launched in October 2013, generating response from 144 applicant teams based in 48 different countries, of which 38% (18) are LFCs – a total of 50 (35%) proposals came from LFCs. The multi-stage evaluation process resulted in shortlisting of 24 finalists - from 17 different countries, including 6 (25%) teams in LFCs - who were invited to present their proposals at the 11th PEP general meetings – held during what is now called the

---

⁴ Three previous annual reports were submitted in July 2013, 2014 and 2015 (in the same format as the current document, following the DFID template), each preceded by interim technical reports in January 2013, 2014 and again in January 2015 (according to a format/template requested by IDRC)

⁵ http://www.pep-net.org/10th-pep-general-meeting-development-researchers-and-practitioners-around-world-gathered-share-0
2014 PEP Annual Conference⁴ – in Santa Cruz de la Sierra, Bolivia, from April 30 to May 8, 2014.

A third and final call for proposals was launched in August 2014, generating response from 117 applicant teams based in 45 different countries, including 14 LFCs – a total of 33 (28%) proposals were from LFCs. The initial rounds of evaluation by PEP resource persons resulted in shortlisting of 24 finalists – from 18 different countries, including 7 (29%) teams from LFCs – who were invited to present their proposals during the 12th PEP general meetings, held in the context of the 2015 PEP annual conference⁷ in Nairobi, Kenya, from April 29 to May 8, 2015.

In all cases (three competitions), PEP’s review and evaluation process was quite successful in providing detailed comments and suggestions on all long-listed proposals – as well as some of those rejected as early as the first stage of evaluation – to help the research teams revise and improve their research proposals, and thus learn from their PEP application experience. Moreover, in addition to scientific evaluation, all shortlisted proposals were also evaluated in terms of policy relevance and outreach strategy by the PEP communication and M&E staff⁸, as well as the PAGE Policy Group members⁹.

Following presentation and discussion of these 75 shortlisted proposals, as well as individual meetings between PEP resource persons and each applicant research team, during the PEP annual conferences (or general meetings) a total of 66 project teams were selected – often after a final revision of their proposal, based on comments received during the meeting - for support under the three PAGE funding rounds, including 25 in the first round, 20 in the second round and 21 in the third and final round.

2.1.2. 2016 PEP Annual Conference and 13th general meeting
Manila, Philippines – June 4-8, 2016

Of these 66 projects, 33 teams supported under the two first rounds have already completed their research cycle – i.e. with research final reports approved/published following, in most cases, their presentation during the 2014 or 2015 PEP annual conferences. One of these projects (selected under the first round, in Burundi) was cancelled – see more details below.

In 2016, 29 of the remaining research teams¹⁰ – from 21 different countries, including 12 teams from LFCs – were invited to present and discuss their research results (and draft final reports) at the PEP Annual Conference in Manila, Philippines. These presentations were made during a series of parallel technical sessions (June 6-7) and grouped according to different

---

⁸ See sections IV and V
⁹ Find them here: http://www.pep-net.org/people/page-policy-group/
¹⁰ 28 of them were able to travel, but one project (MPIA-12849, Ethiopia) was presented by its team leader via Skype
research methods/approaches - in front of their peers, PEP resource persons and lead researchers, as well as other international experts attending the PEP conference.

On the afternoon of June 7th, each of the research teams also met individually (individual meetings) with the PEP program committee members and resource persons who specialize in their specific project’s research methods and areas to receive further (and customized) guidance and advice for the writing of their final research report.

Some of the LFC teams (mostly from CBMS projects) were allowed to have two members attend the meeting, one team from India (PIERI) used their own funding to allow a second team member to participate, while the others had one representative. A total of 38 researchers from PAGE-granted projects – including 18 (47%) women and 17 (45%) from LFCs - attended the meeting. One team (MPIA-Ethiopia) made their presentation via Skype. There were also 9 researchers from partner-led institutions (2 from Peru and 7 from the Philippines), who are not PEP resource persons and were invited to present the results of some of the PEP Partner-led projects also funded by the PAGE grant (see ANNEX F).

See ANNEX D for the list of developing country researchers who attended the 2016 PEP Annual Conference (or 13th general meeting).

Globally, and ultimately, the main purpose of the PEP general meetings is to ensure maximum knowledge transfer (guidance and preparation) to those developing country research teams that have been supported for the conduct of policy analysis through the PAGE initiative.

In the end, for various reasons, a few teams were unable to attend the PEP meetings in which they were scheduled to present their research results, but the completion of their projects (and evaluation of the final reports) were followed closely by their respective mentors and PEP thematic research group (TRG) leaders.

Find out more about the 2016 PEP Annual Conference and 13th general meetings here: https://www.pep-net.org/section-de-la-page-2016-pep-annual-conference-was-held-june-4-8-manila-philippines

The 2016 edition of the PEP Annual Conference also featured a series of special events that were focused on increasing the linkages of PAGE research findings with policy action in beneficiary countries.

• The first was a special (one-day) workshop on best-known practices and tools for research communication, given by PEP communication and M&E staff for all attending MPIA, PMMA and PIERI teams’ representatives. Each representative then met individually with the same staff to discuss the strategy and calendar for the dissemination of their PAGE research findings. This was a first and very successful experience, which was very well received by the participants (see results of ex-post evaluation survey in ANNEX H).

• The second was a special CBMS policy forum, or series of dialogues, held between (22) PEP-PAGE researchers whose projects involved the use of a community-based
monitoring system (CBMS) and (9) local policymakers from some of the project countries (Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Kenya, Philippines, Togo). The policymakers, mostly from local government units, were requested to share how they have used or plan to use the findings from CBMS in the preparation of local development plans, formulation of projects and monitoring of impacts of interventions.

- Then on June 8, PEP organized a new kind of high-level and interactive Policy Forum on the theme "From policy engagement to research uptake: Lessons for and from developing country researchers". The event featured a keynote presentation, followed by a two-phase roundtable discussion between a panel of distinguished speakers - including researchers, practitioners and policymakers – and the audience (nearly 100 participants), around specific issues and challenges related to bridging research and policy in developing countries. These discussions were broadcasted online and via PEP social media pages. The recordings will be used to produce a set of specific conclusion and recommendations for the general improvement of the research-policy action agenda. These will be published and publicized widely throughout the PEP network over the next few weeks (July or August 2016).

Find out more about this series of special events here: https://www.pep-net.org/2016-pep-annual-conference-policy-forum

2.1.3. Progress of the support and monitoring of PAGE-granted projects

Following presentation/discussion and assessment of the finalist proposals, in the context of PEP annual meetings (2013, 2014 and 2015), a total of 65 research projects, in 34 different countries (16 LFCs), were selected (by PEP evaluators and program committees11) and have been or are currently being supported under the PAGE program.

25 proposals were selected in the first round (2013), 20 in the second (2014) and 21 in the final round (2015). However, one of the LFC projects (in Burundi) selected for support under the first round of PAGE funding was cancelled in 2014 (due to lack of cooperation and excessive delays in submitting outputs), but the remaining funds (12K) from the cancelled project were allocated to another LFC research team (who had nearly completed their project from Round 1), in Niger, to conduct a new project under Round 2. Hence the total of 65 projects that will have been supported and completed under the PAGE program.

29 (45%) of these projects are in LFCs, and 16 (25%) focus primarily on gender-related issues.

Find the lists of projects selected/supported the three rounds of PAGE in ANNEX D.

Together, these (65) projects involve a total of 292 project team members (including 156 women), but as 16 of them (8 women) are part of two different teams, the actual TOTAL

11 This selection was also validated by the PAGE policy group: www.pep-net.org/people/page-policy-group/
number of individuals supported via PAGE grants is **276 developing country researchers, including 148 (54%) women and 126 (46%) from LFCs.**

A Research Support Grant Agreement was signed between the leader of each of the selected projects and the PEP partner institution (CRES, GRADE and AKI) in charge of administering and monitoring the progress of these projects.

Of these 65 projects:

- **57** have benefited from an international study visit (1 to 3 members per team – total of 74 researchers, including 38% female and 46% from LFCs);
- **33** are now completed with final research reports approved;
- **30** of them with the outcomes published/translated into both working paper and policy brief formats;
- **44** have presented their work and preliminary or final results directly to local/national stakeholders, and at least **32** have presented their work at high-level international (mostly academic) conferences. More information on the dissemination of the PAGE research findings is provided in Sections V and VI below, and ANNEX G of this document.

**Find summaries and publications of those completed PAGE projects on the PEP website at:** [https://www.pep-net.org/pep-research-findings/](https://www.pep-net.org/pep-research-findings/)

**Round 1**

Of the 25 projects selected/supported under the first round of PAGE funding:

1. **Thirteen (13)** did not involve data collection – from the MPIA and PMMA programs
   - 1 LFC project (in Burundi) was cancelled before submission of the final report
   - All (12) other projects are now completed and have been published/translated into both working paper and policy brief formats.
   - 9 have completed an international study visit
     - 1 was granted a visit but failed to obtain visa
     - 2 could not apply for the related grant in time
   - 4 of these papers have been published or accepted for publication as articles in peer-reviewed scientific journals. A few more have been asked to “revise a resubmit”.
   - All (12) project teams have also presented their findings:
     - in at least one international conference (of academic and/or policy audience)
       - 7 of these teams received PEP support/funding to participate in the event
       - 5 of these teams have presented in more than one event of the kind

---

12 Find them here: [http://www.pep-net.org/working-papers](http://www.pep-net.org/working-papers) or in ANNEX E
13 Find them here: [http://www.pep-net.org/policy-briefs](http://www.pep-net.org/policy-briefs) or in ANNEX E
14 See also Annex E
directly to key policy stakeholders at the national level, during at least one policy conference (or seminar or roundtable) or individual advisory meeting
  - 6 of these teams organized the events (national policy conferences) themselves, with PEP support/funding
  - 7 of these teams presented their work in more than one event of the kind

The table below summarizes the outputs and progress of those 13 projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Interim</th>
<th>Study or field visit</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>WP</th>
<th>PB</th>
<th>Nat'l conf</th>
<th>Int'l conf</th>
<th>Ext. publ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PMMA program</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12400</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12415</td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12488</td>
<td>DR Congo</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12384</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12379</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12367</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12366</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPIA program</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12394</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12424</td>
<td>C.A.R.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12453</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12499</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Cancelled</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The list and links of all publications (working papers, policy briefs and external publications) are in Annex III

**Notes:**
- ✓: Published, completed or achieved, with PEP support/funding
  - In blue (✓): activity undertaken or achieved without PEP support/funding
- X: Did not occur due to timing and other personal constraints of the teams
- Failed: Visiting researcher did not obtain visa

2. **Four (4)** involved data collection through randomized controlled trials (RCTs) - **PIERI**.

In terms of research progress/support:

- Three (3) of these project teams (Nigeria, Mongolia and Ghana) participated in the 2016 PEP Annual Meeting in Manila to present their final reports/results (or progress to date, in the case of Ghana – see below). Their final reports are currently under revision following comments received during the PEP meeting.
- The Uganda project is already complete (with final results/report approved) and the draft working paper is currently under evaluation by external referees.
- Ghana:
This project was initially and considerably delayed due to problems with the implementation partners. Considering the limited span of the PAGE initiative/support, the team managed to receive extra funding from Innovations from Poverty Action in order to account for the delay in implementation, and to finance a more comprehensive follow up. In order for PEP to finalize its support with a specific research output, it was arranged that the team would focus their (PEP project’s) analysis on the effect of the intervention on product uptake, according to different types of treatment. However, the final (PEP) research output can be submitted no sooner than March 2017 (once follow up data has been collected) and thus beyond the scope of the current PAGE initiative.

- Study/field visits:
  - The Uganda team benefited from two field visits from its PEP mentor
  - The Mongolia team benefited from both a field visit by the PEP mentor, and one team member participated in an international study visit at the PEP mentor’s institution
  - One team member of the Nigeria team also benefited from an international study visit at the PEP mentor’s institution
  - The Ghana team will not benefit from their study visit grant

In terms of dissemination:

- 3 of these teams (Mongolia, Nigeria and Uganda) presented their work and/or preliminary findings during:
  - at least one international conference – 3 of these participations were supported by PEP.
  - a special (individual) advisory meeting with key national policy makers (government institutions)

  - The Mongolia team has officially scheduled its PEP national policy conference (submitted a proposal) at the end of September 2016

The table below summarizes the outputs and progress of those 4 projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Interim</th>
<th>Study or field visit</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>WP</th>
<th>PB</th>
<th>Nat’l conf.</th>
<th>Int’l conf.</th>
<th>Ext. publi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIERI program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12375 Mongolia</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓✓1</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12451 Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓✓2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Edition</td>
<td>Wait</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12506 Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12515 Ghana</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Progress of the experiment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Baseline survey</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Follow up survey 1</th>
<th>Data process/analysis</th>
<th>Follow up survey 2</th>
<th>Data process/analysis</th>
<th>Report results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12375 Mongolia</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12451 Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12506 Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12515 Ghana</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>To be continued beyond 2016 and with other sources of funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. This team benefited from both a field visit from their PEP mentor (in Mongolia) and an international study visit (one team member, in Argentina)
2. The Uganda team benefited from 2 field visits from the PEP mentor
3. See notes about Ghana project above

Notes:
✓: Published, completed or achieved, with PEP support/funding
In blue (✓): activity undertaken or achieved without PEP support/funding
N/A: Did not or will not occur due to changes or differences in the project’s timeline
Revision: Report or paper has undergone a first round evaluation and is currently being revised by the team before resubmission.
Upcoming: Activity/outputs is scheduled but not yet achieved

3. Eight (8) projects involved data collection through community-based monitoring system (CBMS),

The table below summarizes the outputs and progress of those 4 projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBMS program</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project code</strong></td>
<td>12566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country</strong></td>
<td>Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity building</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Payment 1</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study visit</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milestones and grant payments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status report 1 Payment 2</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status report 2 Payment 3</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status report 3 Payment 4</td>
<td>Outputs in revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status report 4 Payment 5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status report 5 Payment 6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress of outputs
### CBMS design

- **Paper 1**
  - Final in revision
  - Final in revision
  - N/A
  - ✓
  - Draft in revision
  - Draft in revision
  - Draft in revision
  - Draft in revision

### Thematic analysis

- **Paper 2**
  - Final in revision
  - Final in revision
  - Final in revision
  - ✓
  - Draft in revision
  - Draft in revision
  - Final in revision
  - Draft in revision

### Poverty profile

- **Paper 3**
  - Final in revision
  - On-going cleaning of Core dataset
  - Final in revision
  - ✓
  - On-going data collection
  - Data processing being finalized for profiling

### Policy brief

- ✓ In edition
- In edition
- ✓
- In edition

### User's manual

- ✓ In edition
- ✓ In edition
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓
- ✓ Draft in revision

### Consultation and dissemination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting stakeholders</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Follow up with stakeholders</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. conf</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internat. conf</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In the case of CBMS projects, the “final report” stage of the project’s cycle corresponds to the submission of the status report and release of 4th grant payment.

**Notes:**
- ✓: Published or completed
- Status of the report/output: on time

### Round 2

Of the 20 projects selected/supported under the second round of PAGE funding:

1. **Sixteen (16)** do not involve data collection – from the MPIA and PMMA programs – and have completed their research cycle, with approved final research reports.

- 15 of these reports have been translated into working paper format
  - 13 of them have already been published, and 2 are currently being edited/formatted for publication
  - 1 has been delayed due to the project leader’s serious health issues.
- 15 were translated into policy brief format
  - the remaining one is the same project whose leader is facing health issues
- 11 have presented their work in at least one international conference (academic and/or policy)
  - 9 of these participations were supported by PEP
  - 4 were presented in more than one event of the kind
11 have presented their findings directly to key policy stakeholders at the national level, during at least one policy conference (or seminar or roundtable) or individual advisory meeting
  o 3 of these teams organized the events (national policy conferences) with PEP support/funding, and 3 more are planned in 2016
  o 6 of these teams presented their work in more than one event of the kind

The table below summarizes the outputs and progress of those 16 projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PMMA program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12673</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12660</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12668</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12680</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12699</td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12704</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12594</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12583</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12579</td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12576</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPIA program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12595</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12598</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12617</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12618</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12659</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12805*</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The list and links of all publications (working papers, policy briefs and external publications) are in ANNEX D

Notes:
*: This project was selected on a later date, following reallocation of a cancelled R1 project. They have also disseminated their findings along with those of their first PEP-PAGE project (from Round 1) in the context of both national and international conferences.
✓: Published, completed or achieved (or approved and awaiting editorial review, in the case of WPs or PBs) with PEP support/funding
✓ in blue: activity undertaken or achieved without PEP support/funding
Upcoming: Activity/outputs is scheduled but not yet achieved
Revision: Report or paper has undergone a first round evaluation and is currently being revised by the team before resubmission.

2. Four (4) projects involve data collection through CBMS:

The table below summarizes the outputs and progress of those 4 projects
## CBMS program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project code</th>
<th>12548</th>
<th>12555</th>
<th>12896</th>
<th>12895</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country</strong></td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capacity building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Togo</th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Payment 1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study visit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Milestones and grant payments

| Status report 1 Payment 2   | ✓    | ✓        | ✓     | ✓             |
| Status report 2 Payment 3   | ✓    | ✓        |       |               |
| Status report 3 Payment 4   | Outputs in revision | |
| Status report 4 Payment 5   | N/A  | N/A      | N/A   | N/A           |

### Progress of outputs

| CBMS design Paper 1         | Final in revision | Final in revision | Draft in revision | Draft in revision |
| Thematic analysis Paper 2   | Final in revision | Final in revision | Final in revision |
| Poverty profile Paper 3     | Final in revision | Final in revision | Data processing being finalized for profiling |
| Policy brief                | In edition        | In edition        | In edition        |
| User’s manual               | ✓                | ✓                | ✓                | ✓               |

### Consultation and dissemination

| Meeting stakeholders        | ✓    | ✓    | ✓    | ✓    |
| Follow up with stakeholders | ✓    |      |      |      |
| Nat. conf                   | ✓    |      |      |      |
| Internat. conf              |      |      |      |      |

1. In the case of CBMS projects, the “final report” stage of the project’s cycle corresponds to the submission of the status report and release of 4th grant payment.

**Notes:**

✓ : Published or completed

Status of the report/output: on time
Round 3

Of the 21 projects selected/supported under the third round of PAGE funding:

- **Seventeen (17) do not involve data collection** – from the MPIA and PMMA programs
  - Sixteen (16) of them have submitted and presented (in Manila) their draft final research report for evaluation and completed an international study visit
  - One (1) is still preparing the final research report
    - The MPIA-India project team was delayed in the submission of their draft final research report and thus not invited to present during the 2016 PEP annual meeting. Also it was decided that, as time is limited, instead of a study visit, the mentor would dedicate more time to follow their progress and work very closely, in order to help them finalize their research results. This additional support is expected to ensure that the final research outputs are published on time.
  - 5 have presented their work in at least one international conference (academic and/or policy) – none have requested PEP support
  - 7 have presented their word or preliminary findings directly to key policy stakeholders at the national level, during at least one policy conference/seminar or individual advisory meeting – none have requested PEP support

The table below summarizes the outputs and progress of those 17 projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PMMA program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12808</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12830</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12869</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12800</td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12791</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12783</td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12769</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12880</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12814</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPIA program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12799</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12804</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12838</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12849</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upcoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12823</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Wait</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12867</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12868</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12872</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Two (2) projects involving data collection through field experiments (PIERI):**
  
  o Both have submitted and presented (in Manila) their draft final research report for evaluation, and completed an international study visit

The table below summarizes the outputs and progress of those 2 projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIERI program</td>
<td>12792</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12883</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Progress of the experiment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Design protocols &amp; survey instruments</th>
<th>Conduct Intervention &amp; (collect data)</th>
<th>Data process/analysis</th>
<th>Report results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12792</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12883</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• **Two (2) projects involve data collection using CBMS:**

The table below summarizes the outputs and progress of those 2 projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBMS program</th>
<th>Project code</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Capacity building</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Study visit</th>
<th>Milestones and grant payments</th>
<th>Progress of outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Status report 1</td>
<td>CBMS design Paper 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12901</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Partial output submitted</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12897</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Partial output submitted</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Payment 1: ✓
Payment 2: Partly submitted
Payment 3: ✓
Payment 4: Partial output submitted
Payment 5: N/A
Payment 6: N/A
Payment 7: N/A
Monitoring of project teams’ policy outreach initiatives

Meanwhile, the PEP monitoring and evaluation staff has also been monitoring the progress of the supported research teams in terms of policy outreach activities (including consultation and dissemination activities), resulting in several remarkable impact stories, as well as in the nomination of three teams as winners of each edition (2014, 2015 and 2016) of the PEP Best Practice Awards. These teams were rewarded for their outstanding efforts in linking their PEP research work/findings to policy action/influence at the national level, as well as for the quality of the research work conducted, during the first year of the project lifecycle.

Find more information on this competition and each edition’s winning projects through the following links:


More information on the monitoring of PAGE projects is provided in Sections III to VI and in Section X below, as well as detailed accounts of the projects’ policy outreach initiatives and related outputs in ANNEX G.

2.1.4. Incorporation of PEP

After becoming a legally incorporated international non-profit organization (in 2013), PEP has now been recognized as an IRC Sec. 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization with public charity status under Sec. 509(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Service of the US Department of Treasury. As a legally registered and tax-exempt public charity organization, PEP is now qualified to receive tax-deductible funds, bequests, gifts and transfers for its non-profit research and capacity building activities.

The organization has also been granted residence in Kenya, based on a comprehensive host-country agreement signed with the national Government, to establish its global head office in Nairobi. This agreement gives PEP a full-fledged international status with certain diplomatic
and tax-exemption privileges that facilitate recruitment of international staff as well as planning and implementation of its operations in Kenya and other target regions of the world.

New staff members (senior Financial Officer, Program Officer, Executive Assistant, etc.) have also been recruited and taken office at the PEP Office in Nairobi\textsuperscript{15}. After completing his mandate, the current executive director had attained all of his key objectives (incorporation, host country agreement, 501(c)(3) tax-exemption, renewed and expanded funding, formalization of governance/financial procedures, staffing of Nairobi office, etc.) and preferred to give an opportunity to others to take it to the next level. PEP’s board is consequently guiding the global recruitment of a new executive director to take office by late Summer or early Fall. Former PEP deputy director (and current PMMA program committee member) Jane Mariara has accepted to step in as interim executive director in the meantime.

Annual and five-year plans have been approved by PEP’s board and internal financial management procedures formalized. PEP’s governance document is currently under review to respond to comments received from PEP’s core donors.

\textbf{2.1.5. “Next steps”}

PEP is currently gearing up to launch the first call for proposals (July 1, 2016) for the PAGE II program. The first round of grants will be made following presentations at the next PEP general meeting (June 2017). This process will include the notable innovation of offering online training courses for all members of shortlisted teams in methodologies relevant to their specific research proposal. Three courses – policy evaluation, poverty and inequality analysis and computable general equilibrium modelling – are currently being prepared. A smaller call has already been launched for expressions of interest for randomized control trials, as these projects take longer to prepare and execute.

\textbf{2.2. Challenges and disappointments}

Whereas the transition process is generally expected to be uneven, PEP has managed to overcome major challenges in the incorporation process while implementing the on-going projects. Indeed, the implementation of the core PAGE programme has ran smoothly and not faced any particular challenges.

With over 40\% of PAGE projects led in LFCs, and many research teams facing difficult situations of social unrest, political instability and/or insecurity in undertaking activities such as data collection, PEP resource persons had to follow a more adaptable approach – e.g. granting extensions to submit reports on initial results - and follow some of the beneficiaries very closely throughout the project’s cycle, to ensure best possible quality of research outputs.

\textsuperscript{15} Find them here: \url{https://www.pep-net.org/coordinating-teams}
In the end, only one project (in Burundi) was cancelled due to lack of cooperation from the team, and the expectations from another (RCT in Ghana) project, in terms of outputs and deliverables, had to be lowered due to considerable delays imposed by the intervention’s implementing partners.

One major challenge faced in the implementation of the PAGE program relates to unexpected financial constraints that have resulted from:

- a drop in the exchange rate of the Canadian dollar – initial currency of IDRC funding
- costs related to the establishment and operation of the new PEP governance structure and headquarters
- underestimated costs related to the implementation of CBMS projects in certain countries

To overcome this challenge, it was agreed with IDRC to lower the initial objective in terms of number of granted projects to be supported with IDRC funds from 28 to 21 projects. DFID has also later agreed to reduce the target of 1 project (from 45 to 44 projects supported with DfID funds), bringing the overall target number of projects to be supported through the PAGE program (with both IDRC and DfID funds) to 65.

Finally, in 2016, the recruitment of a new executive director represents a challenge, although the maturity and depth of PEP’s management team make this manageable. Former deputy director, Jane Mariara, has accepted to act as the interim executive director. She is assisted by the whole management and administrative team, in particular key members of the board and PEP’s former executive director, John Cockburn.

2.3. Context (update)

There are no contextual changes or new evidence (literature or data) to report, that may challenge the PAGE programme’s design or rationale. The programme includes an in-built mechanism to reorient the key priority research issues as the project – and external context – evolves. Indeed, the PAGE Policy Group\(^{16}\) – composed of five high-level individuals closely involved in the policy making process throughout the developing world – is charged with identifying priority policy research issues for each round of the PAGE program, taking into account emerging debates and concerns throughout the developing world.

The continued relevance of the initial and core themes identified for the overall project has even been checked and further enhanced through adjustments suggested by the Policy Group members to focus on the highest priority issues around Policies for Inclusive Growth and Employment to be examined in the context of the different rounds of PAGE competitive grants. In this manner, PAGE has managed to continually enhance the availability of scientific evidence and bridge the wide knowledge gaps on growth and employment issues in the developing countries.

\(^{16}\) Find them here: [http://www.pep-net.org/people/page-policy-group/](http://www.pep-net.org/people/page-policy-group/)
III. LOGFRAME OUTPUTS

3.1. Output 1 - CAPACITY BUILDING

Members of selected developing country research teams trained in the use/application of cutting-edge methodologies for policy analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 1.1</th>
<th>Number of (male/female) researchers from LICs, fragile and/or conflict states who participated in a PEP School or other training workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MILESTONE 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>September 2013 - for PAGE Round 1 (RI) projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 (40% female) researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATUS: EXCEEDED – 42 (40% female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILESTONE 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>September 2014 - for PAGE Round 1 (RI) and Round 2 (R2) projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 (40% female) researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATUS: EXCEEDED - 76 (36% female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILESTONE 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>September 2015 - for all PAGE projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 (40%) female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATUS: EXCEEDED – 123 (39% female)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of June 2016, a total of 123 researchers – of which 48 (39%) are female and 59 (48%) from LFCs – have participated in at least one of the PEP training workshops organized and provided in the context of the PAGE programme.

A series of parallel (intensive) training courses were held during each of the 2013, 2014 and 2015 PEP Annual Conferences:

- in Cape Town, South Africa, May 2-6, 2013: involving a total of 42 participants, of which 17 (40%) are women and 29 (69%) from LFCs.
- in Santa Cruz, Bolivia, April 30-May 3, 2014: involving a total of 26 participants, of which 9 (38%) are women and 8 (31%) from LFCs.
- In Nairobi, Kenya, April 29-May 2, 2015: involving a total of 29 participants, of which 17 (59%) are women and 12 (41%) from LFCs.

Three additional training workshops were organized for specific groups of PAGE researchers in:

17 More on this event, including the various training workshop programs, can be found here: http://www.pep-net.org/news/news/article/the_10th_pep_general_meeting_development_researchers_and_practitioners_around_the_world_gathered_t/
18 More on this event, including the various training workshop programs, can be found here: http://www.pep-net.org/news/news/article/the_2014_pep_annual_conference_in_bolivia_another_successful_gathering/
19 More on this event, including the various training workshop programs, can be found here: https://www.pep-net.org/2015-pep-annual-conference-nairobi-kenya
- Manila, Philippines, October 21-25, 2013: to provide additional (more advanced) training for all PAGE round-1 research teams using community-based monitoring systems (CBMS). This activity involved 8 participants – all CBMS round 1 projects’ team leaders, 5 (63%) of which are from LFCs and 1 (13%) is a woman – but half of them had already received training in Cape Town, so only 4 additional beneficiaries.

- Dakar, Senegal, November 9-11, 2013: to provide additional (more advanced) training for some (4 out 5) of those PAGE round-1 research teams using CGE modelling and simulation techniques\(^20\). This activity involved 8 participants – all from LFCs, and 2 (25%) women – but half of them (including 1 woman) had already received training in Cape Town.

- Manila, Philippines, February 9-13, 2015: to provide training in the use of CBMS tools for research teams selected under the second round of PAGE funding. This activity involved 8 participants, including 4 women and 6 from LFCs (all new to PEP training).

**These results far exceed the initial targets.** This was made possible by the decision to combine the PEP Schools with the PEP general meeting: thus combining the two budgets, make savings on travel costs and allow two members – and even three members in the case of a few teams who offered to finance the third member’s participation themselves – to attend both the PEP School and the PEP general meeting. It is also noteworthy that over 60% (5/14) of the PEP workshop trainers were based in or originated from developing countries, illustrating the strong South-South aspect of PEP’s capacity building activities.

In terms of capacity building, the attending researchers also benefited from peer-review and direct assistance/mentoring through the parallel sessions and individual meetings described in Section 2.1. All of the researchers involved in proposals submitted for each of the programme’s rounds of funding have benefited from the detailed comments and review of their proposals by the PEP evaluators, throughout the selection process (including those rejected).

Finally, during the last (2016 PEP meeting in Manila) representatives from 19 different project teams also benefited from a special one-day training workshop in best practices and tools for effective research communication, followed by individual meetings with PEP communication advisors to review and discuss their dissemination strategy.

**Strengths, challenges and lessons learned**

The decision to combine the PEP Schools with the PEP general meeting was a major strength. It not only allowed a larger number of researchers to attend both events, but it also made it possible to involve a larger number of PEP resource persons – already participating in the PEP general meeting – to contribute to the training activities, considerably enriching their scope

---

and depth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 1.2</th>
<th>Number of (male/female) researchers who participated in a study visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILESTONE 1</strong></td>
<td>September 2014 - for PAGE Round 1 (RI) projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
<td>25 (40% female) researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATUS: ACHIEVED – 25 (24% female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILESTONE 2</strong></td>
<td>September 2015 - for PAGE Round 1 (RI) and 2 (R2) projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
<td>45 (40% female) researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATUS: ACHIEVED – 48 (38% female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILESTONE 3</strong></td>
<td>September 2016 - for all PAGE projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
<td>65 (40% female) researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATUS: EXCEEDED – 74 (38% female)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of June 2016, 74 researchers – including 28 (38%) women and 34 (46%) from LFCs - have benefited from an international study visit. And 18 more researchers (incl. 7 women and 13 from LFCs) have benefited from a field visit by their respective PEP mentors.

All of the PAGE research teams were entitled to benefit from an international study visit (in which one appointed team member can participate) at an institution of their choice, to receive direct support/assistance in by world-renowned experts in the field and methods of their particular project. Over the course of the programme, a total of 74 researchers, from 57 different project teams, have benefited from this activity/grant, including 28 women and 34 from LFCs. In the case of CBMS projects, the teams were allowed to have up to three members participate in a study visit (all at AKI, in Manila) Find the list of granted study visits in ANNEX D.

Of the other 8 project teams were either denied an entry in the selected country of visit, faced specific time or personal constraints, or had not achieved the necessary outputs/milestones in time to be eligible to apply for the grant.

However, in order to maximize the number of PAGE-supported researchers who can benefit from this type of direct support/mentoring (such as provided during a study visit), two complementary “field visits” by PEP resource persons were also organized to provide further assistance and guidance to several research teams. A total of 18 PAGE researchers* (including 7 women and 13 from LFCs), from different project teams, benefited from these “field visits”, which have shown to contribute to strengthening the mentoring role that is pursued by the concept of the “study visits”.

**Strengths, challenges and lessons learned**

The addition of “field visits” is a considerable strength as, for the same cost as one “study visit”, it allows a greater number of researchers to benefit from the direct support/assistance and mentoring of international experts.
### Indicator 1.3
Number of (male/female) researchers to have participated in conducting policy analysis using cutting edge methodologies under the supervision/mentoring of the PAGE program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILESTONE 1</th>
<th>September 2015 - for PAGE Round 1 (RI) projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>75 (40% female) researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATUS:</td>
<td>EXCEEDED – 118 (49% female)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILESTONE 2</th>
<th>September 2016 - for PAGE Round 1 (RI) and Round 2 (R2) projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>135 (40% female) researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATUS:</td>
<td>EXCEEDED – 199 (43% female)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILESTONE 3</th>
<th>September 2017 - for all PAGE projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>195 (40% female) researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATUS:</td>
<td>EXCEEDED – 276 (53% female)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **65 projects** that were selected for support under the three rounds of PAGE funding involve a **total of 276 individual researchers**, including 54% (148) women and 46% (126) from LFCs. All of these researchers have been actively involved, over the past in conducting the granted projects of policy analysis using either of the cutting-edge methodologies fostered through the four PEP thematic research groups\(^{21}\), and so “under the supervision/mentoring” of appointed PEP resource persons engaged in the PAGE programme.

This number largely exceeds the objective of 195 (40% female) researchers for the final target set for September 2017.

**Strengths, challenges and lessons learned**

The quality of proposals, the motivation of the research teams and the intensity of the policy engagement are all considerably stronger than we could have hoped. It was a major challenge to ensure strong participation of teams from LFCs, which required intensive efforts to reach out to research institutions and researchers in these countries. The share of successful proposals from these countries exceeds the objective of 40% and constitutes a major strength. Female participation also exceeds objectives.

---

**3.2. Output 2 - RESEARCH**

---

\(^{21}\) Community-based monitoring systems (CBMS), macro-micro policy simulations (MPIA), experimental research (PIERI) and microeconomic analysis (PMMA). Find out more about PEP research programs: [http://www.pep-net.org/programs/]
All selected research teams produce new and scientifically-sound evidence to inform policy debates/initiatives on issues related to inclusive growth and/or women’s economic empowerment in targeted countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 2.1</th>
<th>Number of research project proposals approved by members of PAGE policy group (policy relevance) and scientific committee (feasibility)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILESTONE 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>June 2013 - for PAGE Round 1 (RI) projects</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILESTONE 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>June 2014 – for PAGE Round 1 (RI) and Round 2 (R2) projects</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILESTONE 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>June 2015 – for PAGE Round 1 (R1), 2 (R2) and 3 (R3) projects</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As planned in the PAGE proposal and logframe, all projects supported under this programme were selected via three competitive calls for proposals, launched on a yearly basis in 2012, 2013 and 2014.

**Together, the 66 projects selected in all three rounds of PAGE funding, included 16 (24%) that focus primarily on gender issues, and 30 (45%) in LFCs.** One of these LFC project was cancelled, for a resulting total of 65 supported projects, including 29 in LFCs.

In order to ensure the policy relevance and responsiveness of the projects, PEP has called upon a small group of policy specialists and stakeholders from different regions of the world\(^\text{22}\), to identify a list of priority issues – under the broad (PAGE) theme of inclusive growth and employment – that each group/round of PAGE projects shall focus on to respond to current/emerging policy needs in terms of evidence base\(^\text{23}\). PEP staff has also reviewed and adapted the selection criteria (review process) and related documentation (templates and guides to submit proposals) to fit the specificities of the PAGE programme\(^\text{24}\).

Another research result that exceeds initial expectations was the preparation by PEP resource persons of an exhaustive review of the scientific literature for each of the priority issues identified by the policy group – also revised according to each call/round’s specific set of issues – to help applicants design their proposals. This literature review was widely publicized.

---

\(^{22}\) See PAGE Policy Group: [http://www.pep-net.org/people/page-policy-group/](http://www.pep-net.org/people/page-policy-group/)


\(^{24}\) See the 2013 PAGE call for proposals: [http://www.pep-net.org/funding/call-for-proposals/](http://www.pep-net.org/funding/call-for-proposals/)
and is available to the general public, including the 11,500+ subscribers to the PEP website.

**Strengths, challenges and lessons learned**

The quantity and quality response to the three calls for proposals far exceeded our expectations given both the strong focus of the policy research issues identified – compared to PEP’s much broader calls in the past – and the focus on LFCs. PEP devoted major efforts to ensure a wide dissemination of the calls for proposals and also provided substantial guidance in identifying research techniques – through extensive literature reviews – that could be adopted to address the specific research issues identified by the PAGE policy group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 2.2</th>
<th>Number of final research reports approved by members of PEP scientific committee (soundness of results)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILESTONE 1</strong></td>
<td>September 2014 - for PAGE Round 1 (RI) projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
<td>12 final research reports (30% primarily gender issues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATUS: ACHIEVED – 12 (17% primarily gender issues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILESTONE 2</strong></td>
<td>September 2015 – for PAGE Round 1 (R1) and 2 (R2) projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
<td>26 final research reports (30% primarily gender issues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATUS: ACHIEVED - 31 (26% primarily gender issues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILESTONE 3</strong></td>
<td>September 2016 – for all PAGE projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
<td>58 final research reports (30% primarily gender issues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATUS: ONGOING - 33 (27% primarily gender issues)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of June 2016, **33 of the 44 projects supported under the first two rounds of PAGE funding have completed and published their final research reports**, after several rounds of evaluation and revisions requested by PEP scientific mentors/committees.

The other 11 projects from Rounds 1-2 are among those involving data collection, either using RCTs or CBMS, and have all submitted/presented their draft final research report/results for evaluation in the context of the 2016 PEP Annual Conference in Manila; as have all those (21) other projects supported under the third and final PAGE round. All **(32) ongoing projects are thus on track to have their final report approved** by the end of August – i.e. in time for the next and final milestone.

More detailed information on the progress of each round’s projects is provided in section 2.1. above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 2.3</th>
<th>Number of projects with outcomes (policy findings) acknowledged by members of PAGE policy group as new and contributing evidence for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Debates/Initiatives on Inclusive Growth and/or Women's Economic Empowerment Issues in Targeted Countries (Policy Relevance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILESTONE 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>September 2014 - for PAGE Round 1 (RI) projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 final research reports (30% primarily gender issues)</td>
<td>STATUS: ACHIEVED – 12 (17% primarily gender issues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILESTONE 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>September 2015 – for PAGE Round 1 (R1) and 2 (R2) projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 final research reports (30% primarily gender issues)</td>
<td>STATUS: ACHIEVED - 31 (26% primarily gender issues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILESTONE 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>September 2016 – for all PAGE projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 final research reports (30% primarily gender issues)</td>
<td>STATUS: ONGOING - 33 (27% primarily gender issues)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When final research reports have been approved by the relevant PEP scientific committees, they are sent to one of PAGE Policy Group members – according to the member/project region - who are mandated to validate the projects’ policy findings, as well as to suggest other possible policy implications. These are then used by the team for a final revision of their report and to prepare a policy brief and national policy conference. Policy Group members are also asked to suggest people to invite to this conference, and possible ways to disseminate the research findings to policy makers and other stakeholders in the region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 2.4</th>
<th>Number of Publications in Peer-Reviewed Journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILESTONE 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>March 2015 - for PAGE Round 1 (RI) projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 publications (30% primarily gender issues)</td>
<td>STATUS: Not achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILESTONE 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>March 2016 - for PAGE Round 1 (RI) and Round 2 (R2) projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 publications (30% primarily gender issues)</td>
<td>STATUS: Partially achieved – 3 (33% primarily gender issues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILESTONE 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>March 2017 - for all PAGE projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 publications (30% primarily gender issues)</td>
<td>STATUS: ONGOING – 4 (25% primarily gender issues)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are confident of attaining this ambitious goal. **Four papers, based on projects supported under Round 1, have already been published as scientific journal articles** (see list in ANNEX E), which is encouraging given the long delays involved in peer-reviewed journal publications. Eight others from R1 and R2 are already in various stages of submission.
and more will follow. R3 (and RCT) final reports are slated for approval this Summer and publication as working papers in early autumn. Some of these will also hopefully be published by March 2017. We also expect additional peer-reviewed journal publications to follow after the March 2017 milestone. We are particularly proud of PEP’s success in peer-reviewed journal publications, both as external validation of the scientific quality of the research we support, and given that PEP’s core mission is to strengthen the capacities of researchers in developing countries (with priority given to research teams based in LFCs in PAGE), where the general level of research capacity is especially low and academics face a critical lack of resources and knowledge base.

### 3.3. Output 3 – POLICY OUTREACH

All selected research teams establish direct contact with policy makers and stakeholders in targeted countries to discuss research initiative/findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 3.1</th>
<th>Number of research projects designed/conducted in direct consultation with local/national policy makers or stakeholders (for inputs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MILESTONE 1</td>
<td>September 2013 - for PAGE Round 1 (RI) projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>25 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATUS: ACHIEVED - 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILESTONE 2</td>
<td>September 2014 - for PAGE Round 1 (RI) and Round 2 (R2) projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>45 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATUS: ACHIEVED - 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILESTONE 3</td>
<td>September 2015 - for all PAGE projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>65 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATUS: ACHIEVED - 66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each round of PAGE funding, after the technical resource persons short-listed the finalist proposals, both the PEP Comm/M&E staff and the PAGE Policy Group (PG) reviewed each proposals prior, before presentation at the PEP general meetings and prior to final selection - in order to assess and validate policy relevance (PG) and the policy outreach strategy (PEP M&E staff).

Amongst the main criteria for selection of those shortlisted proposals to be presented as finalists at PEP general meetings, applicant researchers had to clearly demonstrate that the research issues/questions:

- were responsive to specific needs in terms of evidence base to inform development policy choices in the concerned country,
- have been identified following consultation with relevant national policy makers and stakeholders – evidence must be provided that these consultations have, in fact occurred. Such evidence can take various forms.
The latter criterion ensured that all shortlisted research teams had already established contact with the most strategic potential research-users and decision-makers, who were thus informed of the project and its objectives at the earliest stage (to maximize chances of collaboration and take-up). Shortlisted teams were also provided with specific and customized advice to enhance these components in their revised proposals, through individual meetings with the PEP Comm/M&E staff (during PEP general meetings).

The researchers who were selected to represent their teams at the PEP annual meetings were also required to participate in special workshops to present PEP’s requirements and best-known practices and tools for effective research communication and policy advocacy. PEP’s monitoring and reporting requirements in that area - mainly related to consultation and dissemination activities that were to be undertaken throughout the project cycle - were also incorporated in the PAGE grants’ contracts, as mandatory deliverables.

As a result, all of the (66) research projects selected for support under the three rounds of PAGE funding have been designed/conducted in direct consultation with local/national policy stakeholders. This includes the R1 project from Burundi which was later cancelled but had initially been designed in consultation with national stakeholder.

As the PAGE programme was the occasion for PEP to implement its new monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system (see section X below), PEP decided to also introduce a new "Best Practice Award scheme" to reward (on an annual basis) those research teams who most actively engage in the implementation of a successful “policy outreach” strategy (i.e. to link their PEP research findings to policy action at the national level) while achieving high-quality research. The 9 winning teams, selected using the information collected through the PEP M&E system’s survey tools, were presented during the PEP Annual Conferences in 2014 (Bolivia), 2015 (Kenya) and 2016 (Philippines).

**Strengths, challenges and lessons learned**

It has become clear that policy engagement is a key component of the capacity PEP is fostering among developing country researchers, and the strategies adopted to encourage and support strong policy engagement have proven extremely effective. Teams have reported having very useful and stimulating discussions with intended research users, which have led to refocusing project objectives, accessing valuable and relevant information and data, and solid interest and support from these users.

Sustained efforts have been made to monitor and ensure that all research teams maintain their contacts with policymakers all throughout the project cycle, resulting in several testimonials of strong policy linkages and early impact over policy-related decision-making at the national level – see ANNEX G. As the last of PAGE projects have now reached the “dissemination stage”, further efforts have recently been made by PEP staff to help researchers learn to effectively communicate their findings to a non-technical audience (e.g. special training and advisory provided in the context of the 2016 PEP Conference in Manila).
**Indicator 3.2**

Number of research projects with outcomes published as working papers AND policy findings translated in policy brief format

| MILESTONE 1 | Target: December 2014 - for PAGE Round 1 (RI) projects | 12 projects | STATUS: PARTIALLY ACHIEVED - 10 |
| MILESTONE 2 | Target: December 2015 - for PAGE Round 1 (RI) and Round 2 (R2) projects | 26 projects | STATUS: PARTIALLY ACHIEVED - 25 |
| MILESTONE 3 | Target: December 2016 - for all PAGE projects | 58 projects | STATUS: ONGOING - 30 |

Once a final research report has been approved by the relevant PEP scientific committees, as well as commented by a PAGE Policy Group member to validate the projects’ policy findings, the researchers are then provided with an additional USD 2000 grant to publish the latter into working paper format (as well as to translate the findings into a policy brief). In order to be published by PEP, however, a working paper must also be revised and approved by two external (non-PEP) evaluators. The policy briefs are initially drafted by the research teams and then reviewed/edited and formatted by the PEP communication staff.

Of the 33 projects with approved final research reports, **30 have been published/translated into working paper format, and 27 of them were translated into policy brief format.** These papers/briefs are published on the PEP website and disseminated widely across the PEP network, and the papers listed on both SSRN and RePEC websites.

It is expected that all (36) remaining projects, including those who presented their results during the 2016 PEP meeting in Manila, will have a final report approved and reviewed in time to be published as working paper and policy brief by December 2016.

---

**Indicator 3.3**

Number of research project teams who communicated findings to policymakers/stakeholders via national policy conferences or direct advisory work/meetings

| MILESTONE 1 | Target: December 2014 - for PAGE Round 1 (RI) projects | 12 projects | STATUS: ACHIEVED - 12 |
| MILESTONE 2 | Target: December 2015 - for PAGE Round 1 (RI) projects | 26 projects | STATUS: ACHIEVED - 27 |
In the context of the PAGE programme, PEP has introduced new requirements (along with a sophisticated monitoring system to enforce them) to ensure that all granted research teams would actively engage/communicate with local/national-level policy processes and stakeholders. Find out more in section 4.1 and section X below, as well as in ANNEX G.

As of June 2016, according to information provided by the research teams – either through M&E surveys (for PMMA, MPIA and PIERI projects), or directly to their PEP coordinating team (in the case of CBMS projects) – 33 of those projects supported under R1 and R2 (i.e. all “completed” projects) have presented and discussed their research results with local/national policy makers, either in the context of a national conference, or a special advisory meeting. According to recent reports from project teams supported under the third PAGE round, 7 of them have already held such advisory meetings to discuss their preliminary findings with stakeholders.

For a total, so far, of 40 PAGE research project teams who have communicated findings to policy makers/stakeholders via national policy conferences or direct advisory work/meetings.

In only 11 cases, however, were the national policy conferences organized with PEP support – i.e. research teams applying for the USD 2500 grant made available in each project’s budget to organize this kind of dissemination event.

Many more of these events are expected to take place until the end of 2016, as all R3 projects, as well as most RCT and CBMS projects, are now entering the dissemination phase.

### 3.4. Output 4 – INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF PEP

Launch and legal incorporation of the "PEP global think tank"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 4.1</th>
<th>Legal incorporation of PEP in country of headquarters' location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MILESTONE 1</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>Selection of country/location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATUS: ACHIEVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILESTONE 2</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>Recruitment of legal advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATUS: ACHIEVED in 2013 (HURWIT &amp; ASSOCIATES – US firm recruited to support the incorporation process)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILESTONE 3</td>
<td>September 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After becoming a legally incorporated international non-profit organization (in 2013), PEP has now been recognized as an IRC Sec. 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization with public charity status under Sec. 509(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Service of the US Department of Treasury. As a legally registered and tax-exempt public charity organization, PEP is now qualified to receive tax-deductible funds, bequests, gifts and transfers for its non-profit research and capacity building activities.

As the new PEP Executive Director (Dr. Bekele Shiferaw, see below) was already based in Nairobi, a new PEP office was initially established through a hosting and partnership agreement with a local institution with diplomatic status, ICIPE (www.icipe.org). Based on a thorough assessment of several potential locations, it was finally decided (in December 2013) by the new Board of Directors that the future “PEP headquarter” would be based in Nairobi, Kenya as well.

Soon after, PEP was granted residence in Kenya, based on a comprehensive host-country agreement signed with the national Government. This agreement gives PEP a full-fledged international status with certain diplomatic and tax-exemption privileges that facilitate recruitment of international staff as well as planning and implementation of its operations in Kenya and other target regions of the world. New staff members (senior Financial Officer, Program Officer, Executive Assistant, etc.) have since been recruited and taken office at the PEP Office in Nairobi.

**Strengths, challenges and lessons learned**

A substantial investment of time and effort was first devoted to incorporating and establishing headquarters for PEP in South Africa. For a variety of reasons – costs, low probability of obtaining a tax-free host country agreement and administrative barriers to international hiring – it was decided to explore elsewhere. This lost time was recovered with the decision to incorporate in the US and establish headquarters in Nairobi, and did not cause any significant problems. Good local contacts were essential in facilitating the procedures in Kenya.

Another challenge was the lack of the funding for establishing the formal administrative structure and financial systems to achieve fiduciary responsibility. PAGE donor support and new external funding have made it possible to overcome most of this gap.

Another challenge has been the declining value of the Canadian dollar and British Pound, relative to the US dollar. Various accommodations by the donors and adjustments by PEP have made it possible to absorb these losses with limited impacts on the PAGE program from which PEP has lost about USD 250,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 4.2</th>
<th>Recruitment of the new PEP Executive Director (ED) and HQ staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MILESTONE 1</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>Announcement of ED position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILESTONE 2</td>
<td>April 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>Recruitment of ED and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILESTONE 3</td>
<td>July 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>New ED and staff in post</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A new Executive Director, Dr. Bekele Shiferaw\(^{25}\) was recruited, through a highly competitive selection process, and began a three-year mandate on October 1, 2013. Dr. Shiferaw has operated from the new PEP office in Nairobi (hosted by ICIPE – see below) and has been very active in introducing and raising the profile of PEP to (and creating promising new linkages with) several donor organizations, and through various platforms, especially in Africa, North America and European countries. Since he took office, PEP has been either recruited (to lead new research initiatives) or asked to submit applications/proposals, by organizations such as the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO), the World Bank, UNICEF, the MasterCard Foundation, AfDB, ADB, the FAO and IFAD.

After completing his mandate, the current executive director had attained all of his key objectives (incorporation, host country agreement, 501(c)(3) tax-exemption, renewed and expanded funding, formalization of governance/financial procedures, staffing of Nairobi office, etc.) and preferred to give an opportunity to others to take it to the next level. PEP’s board is consequently guiding the global recruitment of a new executive director to take office by late Summer or early Fall. Former PEP deputy director (and current PMMA program committee member) Jane Mariara has accepted to step in as interim executive director in the meantime.

The new PEP office in Nairobi has also been staffed with a new senior Financial Officer, a Program Officer, an Executive Assistant, an Administrative Assistant, and a few visiting consultant researchers who were contracted to work on either of the new research initiatives granted by various donors (CGIAR, NWO-Wotro, World Bank, etc.). Find them here: [https://www.pep-net.org/coordinating-teams](https://www.pep-net.org/coordinating-teams)

**Strengths, challenges and lessons learned**

Following the successful incorporation, strengthening and diversifying the funding base remains one of the key challenges. Along with the development of the new strategic plan (2015-2020), PEP is pursuing an aggressive “fundraising and program development” initiative with enhanced communication and outreach activities to improve visibility and impact of PEP. Program development and expansion, facilitated through direct funding from donors, is an important step for sustainability and overall viability of PEP as an organization.

25 [portal.pep-net.org/users/view/id/10353](https://portal.pep-net.org/users/view/id/10353)
in the long term. With the setting up of the financial and banking arrangements as well as an
operational and effective Board of Directors which provides close oversight functions, PEP
has already started receiving direct funding from some donors and DFID and IDRC have
already begun to channel funds directly to PEP. This will be crucial for covering the indirect
costs related to central institutional management and oversight provided by the Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 4.3</th>
<th>Recruitment of the new PEP Governing Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MILESTONE 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List of 12 candidates for GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MILESTONE 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment of 7 GB members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All 7 members of the **Board of Directors** were recruited in 2013, including nominees
from DFID and IDRC; [www.pep-net.org/people/board/](http://www.pep-net.org/people/board/). Appointments of the Board’s
Chair (Mustapha Nabli), Treasurer (Marie-Claude Martin) and Secretary (Stephen
Wainaina) were also made during the first official meeting of the full Board in London, in
November 2013 (see below).

The PEP Board of Directors is in charge of determining broad PEP strategic directions
(lines of actions) and institutional composition (approval/selection of partners and
directors), providing managerial oversight and monitoring of the organization’s overall
performance. Through its consecutive official meetings - held in May 2013 (Cape Town,
partial Board), November 2013 (London, full Board), May 2014 (Santa Cruz, full Board),
January 2015 (teleconference), May 2015 (Nairobi, Kenya), December 2015
(teleconference) and June 2016 (Manila) the Board has contributed to and/or made
major decisions in regards to the institutionalization and main lines of action for PEP.

**Strengths, challenges and lessons learned**

In order to undertake its governance and oversight functions, the full Board meets at
least twice a year: one face-to-face meeting during the PEP Annual Conference in
Spring and the second virtual meeting in Fall. There was insufficient committed funding
for the operations of the Board in the PAGE grant, but this has been resolved through
some PAGE donor-approved reallocation of funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 4.4</th>
<th>Establishment and staffing of headquarters (in country to be determined)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MILESTONE 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>Selection of country/location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILESTONE 2</strong> Target:</td>
<td>September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILESTONE 3</strong> Target:</td>
<td>September 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2013, an agreement was signed with a host institution in Nairobi, ICIPE, to provide office space and a set of logistical and administrative services at favourable cost (based on partnership agreement) to the new Executive Director and assistant. PEP has furnished the space that it now occupies at ICIPE and, since then, financed the recruitment of several new staff members, including a new senior Financial Officer, a Program Officer and an Executive Assistant. Find them here: [https://www.pep-net.org/coordinating-teams](https://www.pep-net.org/coordinating-teams). A few visiting consultant researchers who were contracted to work on either of the new research initiatives granted by various donors (CGIAR, NWO-Wotro, World Bank, etc.) were also temporarily based at the PEP Nairobi office.

**Strengths, challenges and lessons learned**

Following the important discussions with IDRC, agreement has been reached for reallocation of USD 400,000 in support of the institutional development of PEP to fully establish the financial and administrative structures at the PEP office base in Nairobi. This has allowed PEP to recruit staff to work with the ED in project management, budgeting and fund raising efforts.

Considering the initial challenges to finance the staffing of the new office and the functioning of the new global structure (Board, etc.), the key lesson is that PEP must now receive and manage all grants directly to cover the indirect costs related to central management, fund raising and oversight functions of the Board.

---

**IV. OUTPUTS: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**4.1. Highlight(s)**

Research:
- A total of 430 proposals were submitted following the three PAGE calls for proposals, from over 70 developing countries - of which nearly 30 are LFCs. 160 (37%) of all the proposals submitted came from LFCs.
- A total of 75 applicant research teams were shortlisted and invited to present their proposals during the three subsequent PEP general meetings (May 2013 in South Africa, May 2014 in Bolivia and May 2015 in Kenya)
- 66 projects were selected for support under the three PAGE funding rounds. These selections were made after several rounds of evaluation, and following presentation and discussion of proposals at (either of) the PEP meeting, with PEP-affiliated international experts in the relevant research methodologies. See ANNEX D for the list of these projects and links to the related documents/reports.
- Of these 66 projects, only one was cancelled – for a total of
- 65 projects supported to completion:
  o Include 16 (24%) that focus primarily on gender issues, and 29 (45%) in LFCs
  o involve a total of 276 researchers, including 54% (148) women and 46% (126) from LFCs.
  o 33 have completed the research cycle - with results approved and published as the teams’ final research reports.

Policy outreach:

- A PAGE Policy Group26 (5 members) was created to:
  o identify a list of priority issues27 for the PAGE Round 1 projects,
  o review, comment and validate the shortlisted proposals
    in order to ensure that each project responds to current/emerging policy needs in the terms of evidence base
- Prior to selection, all shortlisted project proposals are revised by the PAGE Policy Group and PEP Comm/M&E staff, to ensure that the proposed projects have been designed in consultation with national policy makers and stakeholders. The comments and ratings ensued from this revision were sent to all research teams prior to their arrival at the PEP meeting where they were invited to present their proposal for final evaluation.
- During the PEP meetings, all attending research teams have also been provided, individually by PEP communications and M&E staff, with specific advice and guidance to enhance the components of “policy responsiveness (consultation) and influence plan” in their revised proposals. All teams must also attend a special workshop (provided, again, by PEP communications and M&E staff) to receive information regarding PEP’s expectations and requirements for implementation (and reporting on) their research communication (policy outreach) strategies/activities. In 2016, this was extended to a full-day “how-to” training workshop (for all projects about to complete and thus enter

26 http://www.pep-net.org/people/page-policy-group/
the dissemination stage) on the best-known practices and tools for effective research communication.

- After/since project selection, all research teams have been closely monitored by PEP M&E staff (until 6 months after the end of the project cycle) to follow up on all policy-related consultation and dissemination activities, using the PEP M&E system – i.e. submission/periodic updating of an online “technical report”.

Specific information regarding the outcomes and impact of these policy outreach activities (including statistics collected via the teams’ technical reports), is presented in Section VI below (see pages 38-45) and ANNEX G.

**Capacity building**

- All applicant research teams of the three PAGE calls for proposals were provided with/benefited from:
  - an exhaustive list of recommended readings (review of the scientific literature, prepared by PEP resource persons) for each of the priority issues identified by the PAGE policy group, to help them in designing their proposals28
- All (140) long-listed research teams were provided with/benefited from:
  - detailed comments and advice/guidance on the design of their proposals from PEP resource persons (scientific experts) and the PAGE programme coordinator
- All (75) shortlisted research teams (invited to the PEP meetings) were provided with and/or benefited from:
  - detailed comments and advice/guidance from PAGE policy group members and PEP Director of communications for the improvement of the “policy dimension” of their proposals (i.e. policy responsiveness and outreach strategy)
  - intensive training workshops in the different (cutting-edge) methodologies they intend to use/apply for the conduct of their proposed policy analysis project
  - peer-review, comments and evaluation of their proposals by other developing country researchers, international experts and PEP evaluators, through both group sessions and individual meetings
- All 65 selected research teams (and 276 researchers involved) were provided with/benefit from
  - ongoing and personalized support (mentoring) by PEP resource person to help them overcome technical difficulties in the application of cutting-edge research methodologies, to prepare the research outputs/reports, as well as to achieve the highest level of scientific rigor/quality
  - assistance in the preparation of their interim and final research reports from their PEP mentors (resource persons), as well as from international experts during their international study visits

---

peer-review, comments and evaluation of their final research reports by other developing country researchers, international experts and PEP evaluators, through both group sessions and individual meetings during the PEP meetings.

- evaluation of their final research reports by external evaluators (international experts in the relevant methods and issues).
- guidance/advice and logistical support in the implementation of their research communication and policy outreach strategy.

### 4.2. Other outputs

The **PEP general meetings** are a unique opportunity to bring dozens of young and promising developing country researchers together with several international development experts and practitioners, including world-leading researchers and representatives from international organizations – e.g. ACBF, AfDB, CAF, IDB, IDRC, IFPRI, UNICEF, UNIDO, UN Foundation, the World Bank, etc.

Moreover, the various high-level panels held in the context of the four meetings (2013 in South Africa, 2014 in Bolivia, 2015 in Kenya and 2016 in the Philippines) also gave the opportunity to the participating researchers to expand their knowledge and understanding of the various policy issues, needs and implications related to the themes and analytical perspectives promoted through the PAGE programme, as well as to better inform the policy action agenda, through presentations from and discussions with several international research and policy specialists.

The special **high-level Policy Forums** organized in the context of the last three PEP Annual Conferences have resulted in the publication of a set of specific conclusions and recommendations for the definition of a more effective research-policy action agenda, related to the specific theme:

- **Philippines** – June 8, 2016: “From policy engagement to research uptake: Lessons for and from developing country researchers”. The publication of conclusions/recommendations is forthcoming, but more information on the event can be found here: [https://www.pep-net.org/section-de-la-page-2016-pep-annual-conference-was-held-june-4-8-manila-philippines#overlay-context=2016-pep-annual-conference](https://www.pep-net.org/section-de-la-page-2016-pep-annual-conference-was-held-june-4-8-manila-philippines#overlay-context=2016-pep-annual-conference).

In the context of the PAGE programme, PEP has also created a new “**Best Practice Awards**” scheme in order to reward active policy engagement by the granted research teams. Find out more about these awards and winners of the three first editions through the following links:

PEP communications staff has used video interviews (recorded during the PEP Annual Conferences) to produce a series of video clips describing some of the projects supported under the PAGE programme. Find all PEP-PAGE videos (produced to date) here: http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLEbg1KdW55e4pHAh4ICrR9QcikXeY257 These videos were posted on the PEP website, disseminated in PEP news, and made available for researchers to use for dissemination/promotion purposes.

A new series of "PEP impact briefs" is now being produced to report on the impact of projects supported by PEP under the PAGE programme. Four items of this series have already been published – find them here: https://www.pep-net.org/pep-impact-stories – and at least a dozen more will be produced before the end of the programme (December 2016):

Another important output yielded in the context (and with the support) of the PAGE programme is the development and launching of the CBMS Accelerated Poverty Profiling (CBMS-APP), which combines the use of the latest IT tools (e.g. tablets), with CBMS-related instruments (e.g. for data collection/management and poverty mapping).

- Over 300 local government units (already using CBMS for data collection) have already adopted the CBMS-APP, through official policy issuances, and with combined local-national budget ranging between 4000 to 1million USD.
- An additional and outstanding outcome of this particular initiative is the training of more than 14,500 individuals in the use and implementation of the CBMS-APP within the LGUs
- Find out more in ANNEX G, or through the following link: http://www.pep-net.org/home/page-interne/article/cbms_network_launches_cbms_app/

Finally, since the last update of PAGE activities provided (in the 4th interim report) to DFID and IDRC in January 2016, PEP has published its 2015 Annual Report, which is available online here: https://www.pep-net.org/2015-pep-annual-report-now-available-online

For further and continual updates on the outputs of PEP, please follow our news releases through: http://www.pep-net.org/

V. UPTAKE / ENGAGEMENT WITH BENEFICIARIES

Given the specificities of the PAGE initiative – i.e. a series of policy analysis projects conducted by developing country research teams through the PEP support and capacity building)

29 Although we intend to complete this series, lack of time and resources have forced the team to interrupt this work in 2015.
program – PEP has ensured that each of the selected proposals have been designed in direct consultation with relevant policy makers and stakeholders (acknowledged and validated as potential end-users) at the local/national level - as described in Section 4.1 above and Section X below. In each case, most of these beneficiaries had already been clearly identified in the proposals, and mobilised to participate in further consultation and dissemination activities throughout and after completion of the said analysis project\textsuperscript{30}.

**For projects supported under the MPIA, PMMA and PIERI research programs\textsuperscript{31}**

The feedback and inputs provided by these policy makers/stakeholders, through initial consultations and as reported in the applicants' proposals, have been carefully analysed - by the PEP M&E staff and members of the PAGE policy group - to ensure that they truly reflected the projects’ responsiveness to actual policy needs. Both assessments (of the proposals’ policy responsiveness and effective outreach strategy, by the PEP M&E staff and PAGE policy group members) are communicated to and taken into account by the scientific committees for final selection of grantees.

Where need be, the research teams were reminded (by the PEP M&E staff) that the consultations initiated while designing their proposal had to be pursued throughout (or at different stages of) project execution.

In most cases, these initial contacts have resulted in early agreements towards further consultations and even collaboration between the local researchers and the stakeholders’ institutions, for 1) the latter to benefit from the former’s findings and expertise throughout and beyond the said project., and 2) for the former to benefit from the latter’s support in disseminating the findings to other key institutions and decision-making processes.

As a result, and according to information collected through the PEP M&E surveys/technical reports (see below), virtually 100% of the projects selected for support under the three rounds of PAGE funding were designed AND conducted in (continual) consultation with relevant local/national policy makers and stakeholders. A total of 424 individuals/institutions have been consulted in the context of the 51 MPIA, PMMA and PIERI projects and 85% of these consulted parties were considered (by the research teams) as potential direct end-users of the research findings.

Moreover, the consultation activities undertaken in the context of the PAGE projects have often contributed to raise awareness\textsuperscript{32}, amidst government institutions and policymakers, of the:

- importance and implications of certain issues (identified by the research teams and related to the PAGE themes) for policy and development at the national level

\textsuperscript{30} Find description of the selected projects’ policy engagement and communication strategy in ANNEX G

\textsuperscript{31} Find out more about the PEP research programs here : [http://www.pep-net.org/programs/](http://www.pep-net.org/programs/).

\textsuperscript{32} Testimony of the impact of each project teams’ consultation activities can be found in ANNEX G.
- need for reliable (scientifically-sound) evidence to be produced – from both a local and international perspective, and used to inform related decision-making
- existence and/or upcoming strengthening of local capacity/expertise in the use of cutting-edge methodologies to produce such evidence

As a result, in some cases, the consulted institutions have requested:

- for some of their own staff to join the research team, to ensure both the responsiveness of the project’s outcomes with specific policy needs, and direct feeding of these outcomes into internal decision-making processes.
- to hold a series of special advisory/consultation meetings, to keep updated on the project’s progress and results

PEP has been closely monitoring the effective occurrence of such consultations – between research teams and those potential end-users identified in their proposals – as well as all activities undertaken to disseminate/communicate information about their research work/findings, through the project teams’ technical reports. These reports, which are the main tool and source of data in the PEP monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system, are to be completed and updated by each of the research teams at various stages during and after their project cycle (grant payments are also conditional to these updates).

More information regarding the PEP M&E system (and related calendar for PAGE projects) is provided in Section X below (see pages 53-54). Information regarding the specific outcomes and impact (in terms of research uptake) of these “engagement” activities is provided in Section VI below (see pages 38-45), and detailed, for each project, in ANNEX G.

For projects supported under the CBMS program33

“In the duration of the review process of the shortlisted CBMS proposals, the CBMS Network Team34 worked closely with the shortlisted project proponents in improving their project proposals. In particular, technical guidance was provided in terms of the key components and policy issues that need to be addressed in their adoption of the CBMS methodology, data collection and processing instruments, as well as in preparing their work plan for engaging key stakeholders in the project sites35. Technical inputs were also provided in planning out their development of indicator system and analytical frameworks taking into account local context of PAGE research themes (social protection for the informal sector and youth employment and entrepreneurship) among others in the respective countries where the projects are being implemented.”

33 Idem
34 Based at the PEP partner institution in Asia, the Angelo King Institute (AKI) of De La Salle University (DLSU) in Manila, Philippines.
35 The selection criteria of CBMS proposals, more specifically, include the project’s prospects for scaling up or institutionalization of the CBMS research methodology by key stakeholders in the country where it will be implemented.
This process ensures that ALL CBMS projects create strong policy linkages, and the descriptions provided in ANNEX G testify to the nature/extent of the influence that CBMS data and tools can exert over relevant decision-making processes, by providing reliable and household-level data and evidence bases. Indeed, four of the PAGE-CBMS projects have won the PEP Best Practice Awards, two of them in the most recent edition.

**PEP Best Practice Awards**

As mentioned in section 4.2. above, PEP has created a new “Best Practice Awards” scheme to reward those PAGE research teams who would most actively engage in the implementation of an effective policy outreach strategy - i.e. to maximize chances for their research findings to translate into policy action (research uptake) – from the onset of the project (design) and up to the final report stage (validation of findings).

Those winners of the 2014 (round 1), 2015 (round 2) and 2016 (round 3) editions of the PEP Best Practice Awards are also identified and described in ANNEX G.

**VI. OUTCOMES AND IMPACTS**

One of the unique and greatest characteristics of the PEP capacity building and research support mechanism, is that while building the capacities of researchers in the application of cutting-edge methodologies to achieve high-quality scientific research, PEP also ensures that all granted research teams engage in activities of research communications and policy outreach/influence.

As a result, and now that several of the projects supported under the first two rounds of PAGE funding are now completed, substantial progress has already been achieved in regards to the two ultimate objectives of the PAGE programme (in terms of expected outcome and impact - see Logframe in ANNEX A).

**6.1. Expected outcome of the PAGE programme** : “Developing country researchers enabled to influence policymaking”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 1: Capacity building</th>
<th>Number of (male/female) researchers who have learned how to use/apply new tools/methodologies for the analysis of PAGE policy issues in consultation with policymakers and other stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILESTONE 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>58 (40% female) researchers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MILESTONE 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>101 (40% female) researchers</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MILESTONE 3**  
**Target:**  
150 (40% female) researchers  
**STATUS:** EXCEEDED - 276  
(54% female researchers)

A total of 276 developing country researchers - including 54% (148) women and 46% (126) from LFCs - have benefitted from the PEP research support mechanism, through the 65 research projects selected under the three rounds of the PAGE programme.

On the one hand, this mechanism includes training (as well as ongoing mentoring and assistance) in the use/application of cutting-edge methodologies, tools and techniques for the conduct of high-quality policy analysis. On the other hand, all granted research teams are not only encouraged but required (and monitored) by PEP (as both selection criteria and condition to the release of grant payments) to consult with and engage key potential users of the research findings – and especially with relevant policy makers and/or stakeholders at the local/national level - from the onset/design of the project to validation and dissemination of its results.

The initial targets of this particular indicator have thus been largely exceeded.

Below are some further statistics regarding the outcomes of the programme in terms of capacity building, collected from the technical reports of 51 (MPIA, PMMA, PIERI) PAGE research teams - through the M&E system (see section X below). These projects and surveys involve a total of 219 developing country researchers. The (14) research teams conducting CBMS projects have not taken part in M&E surveys.

**Impact of PAGE in terms of capacity building**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average age of supported researchers (at the time of project selection by PEP)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of supported (surveyed) researchers who are female</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of supported (surveyed) project team leaders who are female</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of surveyed researchers who have learned and/or taken up in research practice:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New research methodologies</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New analytical concepts</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New software tools</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New scientific literature</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project teams who experienced technical difficulties/obstacles that were overcome with PEP assistance</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of supported project findings published externally (in scientific journals)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 2:**  
Research  
Number of completed research projects with clear (evidence-based) policy recommendations in favor of inclusive growth and/or women’s
As explained in section 3.2 (indicator 2.3) and section 3.3 (indicator 3.2) above, when final research reports have been approved by the relevant PEP scientific committees, they are sent to one of PAGE Policy Group members – according to the member/project region - who are mandated to validate the projects’ policy findings (and ensued recommendations), as well as to suggest other possible policy implications. Their comments and suggestions are then used by the team for a final revision of their report, as well as to prepare a policy brief and national policy conference.

All 33 research teams who have completed their research cycle with the approval of their final research reports have thus undergone this “validation process”.

The research teams are then provided with an additional incentive (USD 2000 grant) to translate the research outcomes into both working paper and policy brief formats. The working paper must also be revised and approved by two external (non-PEP) evaluators, who validate all aspects of the paper, including the suggested policy implications and recommendations.
According to information provided by the research teams – either through their technical reports (for PMMA, MPIA and PIERI projects), or directly to their PEP coordinating team (in the case of CBMS projects) – a total of 40 research teams have already presented and discussed their findings with local/national policymakers, either in the context of national policy conferences, or special advisory meetings. Also, 10 (25%) of these teams’ research projects focus primarily on gender issues.

For detailed information regarding each of these projects/occurrences, see Annex G

Below are further statistics regarding the outcomes of the programme in terms of policy engagement and dissemination of findings, collected from the technical reports of 51 research teams, through the M&E system

### Consultation and dissemination activities of PAGE project teams

**% of projects that were:**

- designed and conducted in consultation with national policy makers/stakeholders
  - 100%

- presented during a national policy conference or stakeholders’ meeting
  - From 16 project teams of PAGE Round 1: 94%
  - From 16 project teams of PAGE Round 2: 88%
  - From 19 project teams of PAGE Round 3: 41%

- reported in the press (radio, newspapers, television, etc)
  - From 16 project teams of PAGE Round 1: 63%
  - From 16 project teams of PAGE Round 2: 25%
  - From 19 project teams of PAGE Round 3: 26%

- presented at an international conference
  - From 16 project teams of PAGE Round 1: 88%
  - From 16 project teams of PAGE Round 2: 69%
  - From 19 project teams of PAGE Round 3: 26%

- published as articles in peer-reviewed scientific journals
  - From 16 project teams of PAGE Round 1: 25%

---

1. According to information provided by the research teams in their technical reports, a total of 424 individuals/institutions were consulted in the context of these 51 research projects, 85% of which are considered as potential direct users of the findings (i.e. to assist in policy/decision-making).
6.2. Expected impact of the PAGE programme: “Evidence-based policymaking promoting inclusive growth and women’s economic empowerment”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 1:</th>
<th>Number of occurrences of policy design/change based on PEP-PAGE project findings and in favor of inclusive growth and/or women’s economic empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **MILESTONE 1** | **Target:** March 2016 - for PAGE Round 1 (RI) projects  
4 (30% primarily gender issues) | **STATUS:** EXCEEDED – 11 (36% primarily gender issues) |
| **MILESTONE 2** | **Target:** March 2017 - for PAGE Round 1 (RI) projects  
10 (30% primarily gender issues) | **STATUS:** EXCEEDED – 19 (37% primarily gender issues) |

According to (self-reported) information provided by the research teams – either through the technical reports (M&E system) or directly to the CBMS coordinating team - 19 of the PAGE research projects have already resulted in findings taken up to assist in policymaking (design/change) - 7 (37%) of these projects focus on gender issues. This already and largely exceeds the target of the next milestones, set in March 2017. More information on these projects and the process/nature of their influence over policymaking is provided in ANNEX G.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 2:</th>
<th>Number of PEP-PAGE supported researchers who experience career-promoting events, leading to increased policy influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **MILESTONE 1** | **Target:** March 2016 - for PAGE Round 1 (RI) projects  
38 (40% female researchers) | **STATUS:** ACHIEVED  
– 117 (56% female) researchers with important career events,  
– 23 (30% female) researchers with events leading to increased policy influence |
| **MILESTONE 2** | **Target:** March 2017 - for PAGE Round 1 (RI) projects  
66 (40% female researchers) | **STATUS:** ONGOING  
– 122 (54% female) researchers with important career events  
– 52 (44% female) researchers with events leading to increased policy influence |
According to (self-reported) information provided by the research teams – either through the technical reports (M&E system) or directly to the CBMS coordinating team - 122 (44%) of the 276 researchers supported under the PAGE programme have experienced important career-promoting events, due to their involvement in the PEP-PAGE project.

PEP’s analysis of the reported events shows that for 52 of these researchers - 23 (44%) of whom are women - the nature of the new positions/jobs or contracts obtained would allow the researchers to exert increased influence over policy decision/debates.

This progress results mainly from the consultation and dissemination activities undertaken by the research teams with relevant policy makers and stakeholders at the national level, but also because of the new scientific expertise built through their PEP project which, in several cases, have been not only acknowledged by the consulted parties, but also called upon to serve to inform further/related policy debates/decisions.

Below are further statistics regarding the outcomes of the programme, collected from the technical reports of a sample of R1 (16) and R2 (16) research teams - through the M&E system (and thus not involving CBMS research teams).

Impact of the PAGE programme in terms of promotion of the beneficiaries’ expertise at the national level – to exert increased influence over policymaking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of researchers who have experienced:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• career-promoting event(s), due to their involvement in a PEP project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From PAGE Round 1 project teams (73 researchers)</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From PAGE Round 2 project teams (70 researchers)</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From PAGE Round 2 project teams (76 researchers)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• career-promoting event(s) leading to increased involvement in policymaking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From PAGE Round 1 project teams (73 researchers)</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From PAGE Round 2 project teams (70 researchers)</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From PAGE Round 2 project teams (76 researchers)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of projects that resulted in:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• research team members getting hired or promoted, due to their PEP experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 16 project teams of PAGE Round 1</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 16 project teams of PAGE Round 2</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 19 project teams of PAGE Round 3</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the undertaking of parallel research studies, commissioned by other institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 16 project teams of PAGE Round 1</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 16 project teams of PAGE Round 2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From 19 project teams of PAGE Round 3 11%

- **further funding for the researchers or their institutions**
  - From 16 project teams of PAGE Round 1 50%
  - From 16 project teams of PAGE Round 2 44%
  - From 19 project teams of PAGE Round 3 16%

- **publication of (at least one) journal article, or book chapter**
  - From 16 project teams of PAGE Round 1 25%

1. Any event that has contributed to or resulted from the acknowledgement, promotion or exposure of their new expertise. E.g. recruitment or promotion to a higher position (in either academic or policy institutions), winning a scientific award, earning an important research grant, presentation of their work/findings in a national or international event, or in a stakeholders meeting, etc.

**Impact of the PAGE programme in terms of policy influence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of projects that resulted in:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>findings taken up to assist in policy formulation/ program design</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From PAGE Round 1 project teams (16 teams)</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From PAGE Round 2 project teams (16 teams)</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From PAGE Round 3 project teams (19 teams)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>new program/policy design/implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From PAGE Round 1 project teams (16 teams)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From PAGE Round 2 project teams (16 teams)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>change or abrogation of actual policy/program</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From PAGE Round 2 project teams (16 teams)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Find out more about the “PAGE impact stories” in ANNEX G.

Beyond those anticipated outcomes and impacts (as defined in the logframe), the activities undertaken in the context of the PAGE programme have also contributed to:

- Increased South-South and North-South networking amongst researchers, experts and research institutions, as well as between these researchers/experts and international development organizations/institutions.
  - Including the signing of MOUs and co-submission of proposals between two or more (Southern-based) institutions of PAGE grantees – as a result or effect of networking during the PEP meetings.
- Capacity building beyond the selected research teams, including those whose proposals were long-listed (but not selected) through PEP’s selection process and who benefited from the detailed comments and evaluation of their proposals by PEP resource persons, as well as the larger network of researchers who benefit from the literature reviews and other training material (DAD/DASP program, PEP standard models, training material,
recommended readings, literature search tools, etc.) that is publicly available on the PEP website.

- Moreover, several of the research teams have reported to organize (or been contracted to provide) special training workshops to share the knowledge and expertise built through the PEP project with other researchers at their institutions or policy analysts in national government ministries.
- Training of nearly 14,500 users/implementers of the CBMS-APP

VII. COSTS, VALUE FOR MONEY AND MANAGEMENT

7.1. Costs

The financial report for the period from July 1 2015 to June 30 2016 (ANNEX B) will be submitted in August 2016.

7.2. Value for money

Most PEP-PAGE research grants are provided on a lump-sum, fixed amount ($US 20,000-22,000) basis through a competitive call for proposals (to obtain the best possible projects in terms of feasibility, policy/scientific contribution, capacity building, etc. for this amount). These research grants are complemented by a series of publication, dissemination and professional development grants.

All grant payments are tied to the satisfactory delivery of outputs (approved proposal, interim and final research reports, working paper/policy brief, national policy conference reports, etc.) and submission of regular updates of the projects’ technical reports (refer to Section X).

Additional grants are provided for data collection in projects using experimental or CBMS techniques, based on detailed, approved budgets.

The performance measures for the PAGE programme’s “value for money” have been determined as follows:

- Use of best available partners
  The effectiveness of PEP’s unique international partnership and networking structure – involving research institutions and experts based all around the world – has again been proven through the success of:
  - the launching of the three PAGE calls for proposals throughout the developing world, resulting in submission of 420 proposals:
    - 1st call (2012-13) : 159 proposals submitted, from 52 countries (22 LFCs)
    - 2nd call (2013-14) : 144 proposals submitted, from 48 countries (18 LFCs)
    - 3rd call (2014-15) : 117 proposals submitted, from 45 countries (14 LFCs)
  - the processing (review/select/advise) of these proposals by the four, international PEP program committees and resource persons from PEP’s partner institutions
- **Focus on capacity building and/in priority countries**
  
  o While all (140) research teams from long-listed proposals have benefited from detailed/tailored comments and recommendations in terms of scientific and technical performance (of proposal design), by PEP evaluators, the 75 shortlisted/finalist project teams - including 29 (39%) teams from LFCs – who were invited to the PEP meetings (in South Africa, Bolivia and Kenya) have all been provided with advanced/intensive training in the use/application of cutting-edge research methodologies.

  o A total of 143 representatives (from the 83 shortlisted or selected research teams) from 35 different countries, including 64 (45%) women and 67 (47%) from LFCs, had the opportunity to participate in one or more PEP annual meetings and thus benefit from both intensive training workshops and a unique international networking and peer-review experience.

  o Combined with additional training activities held in Africa and in Asia for selected PAGE researchers (see indicator 1.1, on pages 17-19), the number of developing country researchers who have benefited from PEP intensive training workshops organized in the context of the PAGE programme sums up to 123 researchers – of which 48 (39%) are female and 62 (50%) from LFCs.

  o The 65 projects selected and supported under the three rounds of PAGE funding – of which 29 (45%) are in LFCs - involve a total of 276 individual researchers, including 148 (54%) female and 126 (46%) from LFCs. All of these researchers have been (and some continue to be) provided with continual and customized support in the conduct of high-quality policy analysis, using cutting-edge research methods and techniques.

---


Moreover, the 29 research teams (and 126 researchers) from LFCs have, comparatively, benefited from more PEP training and support activities – with participation of 2 or more representatives in PEP meetings and, for several, in 2 different PEP schools (see Section 3.1, indicator 1.1 on pages 17-19).

- **Guarantee of scientific rigor/quality of outputs:**
  - All PAGE project proposals were selected on a highly competitive basis, through several rounds of evaluation, revisions, and based on a variety of criteria (including technical feasibility, policy relevance and responsiveness, capacity building, scientific contribution, etc.), as determined by world-renowned experts and lead researchers in the relevant methodologies and issues.
  - Each of the selected research teams has been appointed a mentor (expert in the relevant research method/s) and placed under the supervision of one of the PEP program committees\(^{38}\) (composed of 3-5 PEP resource persons and one coordinator) to monitor and support their progress and evaluate their project’s outputs.
  - All final research reports undergo, as well, several rounds of evaluation/revision, to improve the scientific rigor and quality of the research work and results. They are then sent to members of the PAGE Policy Group for evaluation of the “policy findings and related implications”. Finally, the reports are sent to external evaluators, selected amongst international experts in the relevant research methods and issues, to revise and comment on the overall quality of the paper, which is revised one last time (according to these final comments) before publication as a working paper.

- **Broad geographic/global coverage**
  The 65 projects supported under the PAGE programme are from 34 different developing countries, of which:
    - 16 are low-income countries, fragile and/or conflict states,
    - 8 are in Asia
    - 7 are in Latin America and the Caribbean
    - 16 are in Africa (both French and English-speaking countries)
    - 1 is in the Middle-East
    - 2 are in Eastern Europe

- **Policy relevance of research agenda/outputs**
  The general policy relevance of the projects supported under the PAGE programme, has been ensured by:

---

o Establishing different lists of priority policy issues, identified by the PAGE policy group (and revised in for each annual call for proposals) as especially relevant to address specific knowledge gaps and policy needs in terms of evidence base
o Reviewing each finalist (short-listed) proposals against criteria of responsiveness to expressed policy needs (through consultation of local/national policy stakeholders)

Refer to Sections V and VI above for more information on how PEP ensures the policy relevance and engagement of selected projects.

- **Local embedding and perspective**
  Beyond the general correspondence of the project’s topic with the call’s priority policy issues, the identification of the specific policy research issues to be addressed by the different country studies has been led by the individual applicants, in consultation with national/local stakeholders. Refer to Sections V and VI (pages 35-45) above for more information on how PEP ensures that selected projects are embedded into local policy needs and perspectives.

- **Long-term impact (policy influence and promotion of Southern/local expertise)**
  Refer to Section VI above (pages 38-45) and ANNEX G.

**Furthermore, to ensure continual value for money (VfM) of the overall PAGE programme:**

- The decision to combine the two major planned events of the PEP Schools and PEP general meetings – have ensured VfM by allowing a larger basin of researchers and resource persons to benefit in both of these activities.
- The addition of field visits, where possible (e.g. in the context of PEP resource persons’ independent travel) is also a source of VfM, reinforcing the mentoring and support provided to participating research teams within the overall PAGE budget.
- The Board conducts two meetings per year, one during the Annual Conference and the other one a virtual meeting. The program committee also meets at least quarterly, with only one meeting conducted face-to-face during the Annual Conference. These are cost-saving measures that have been widely practiced to save time, as well as financial resources. This is not however without difficulties as connectivity is often a problem and time zone differences for members, located across regions sometimes make it difficult to have an efficient and productive conversation.
- The sharing of the management of PEP grants between PEP’s Southern partners seeks to maximize on the geographic location and specific expertise of each partner to maximize VfM.
- PEP has developed – and continues to improve – a sophisticated intranet-based system to monitor the progress and administrative follow-up on all research grants.
- PEP’s highly-developed internal monitoring and evaluation system continuously draws new lessons from PEP’s work and communicate these to PEP staff, partners and researchers.
Several members of PEP staff cumulate a broad range of tasks, having developed expertise and skills in different areas of activities – thus allowing PEP to run with a relatively small staff.

7.3. Management

PEP is a pioneer in the creation of a cohesive, multi-partner management system reflecting its global nature. This has required the development of unique governance structures, such as the PEP program committee, composed of the research director (or designate) of each program, which is the main, driving force of the institution.

Through the incorporation process, several improvements have been made in this regard. First, the creation of an independent Board of Directors in charge of defining and monitoring the overall strategic development of PEP and, notably, evaluating the performance of the executive director and each of PEP partners, is a welcome development.

Second, the program committee – composed of the research directors of all four programs, the ED and the director of communications (non-voting) – has taken a leading role in charting the scientific and strategic development of PEP.

The four key partners who constitute PEP have worked together successfully for several years and continue to do so within the context of the PAGE programme. The governance reforms undertaken over the past few years (from 2013 to 2016) have contributed to further define and strengthen their roles in the ongoing development of the institution.

The creation of an additional component to the PEP governance structure is also underway, as PEP has set up an internal ethical review board39, which will review studies that require interaction with human subjects or primary data collection (e.g. CBMS, RCTs and Field Experiments) where a local ethical review board is not available.

With the establishment of the new PEP Global Office in Nairobi, Kenya, PEP has created a strong partnership with its hosting institution, ICIPE (www.icipe.org).

VIII. WORK PLAN & TIMETABLE

Refer to ANNEX C for detailed timetables and calendars for all activities (including reporting and costs and procurement management) to be undertaken in the context of the PAGE programme.

39 https://www.pep-net.org/research-ethics-review-committee
No major change in the general calendar of the PAGE programme has occurred since the postponement of the overall programme’s timetable and milestones by 6 months, as agreed upon following submission and approval of the 1st PAGE progress report, in January 2013.

Some minor changes have been introduced in the calendar and nature of activities planned in relation to:

- Output 2 (research) changes related to (a) the reduction of the target number of projects to be funded by IDRC (as described and explained in Section 2.2, page 15), and, (b) the additional time needed for completion of RCT and CBMS projects Round 1 projects. The latter mainly because of the nature of the CBMS and RCT projects selected (strategically) under this first round as they, require a longer period for data collection (as described in all of Section 3.2, pages 21-24).

- Output 4 (institutionalization of PEP) - as described in Section 2.1 (pages 14-15) and in Section 3.4 (pages 27-31). Those changes were announced and discussed in the 1st PAGE Annual Progress Report, submitted in August 2013. The Legal advisor for legal incorporation was recruited in 2013 and the legal status was achieved in June of 2013.

However, these changes will neither alter nor impede the achievement of the overall targets and objectives of the PAGE programme.

In all other regards, the implementation of the PAGE programme’s calendar of activities has been going precisely as planned, and all outputs are expected to be delivered/achieved as scheduled (i.e. according to the revised version of the logframe, ANNEX A, and the timetables presented in ANNEX C).

IX. RISK

9.1. List of previously identified risks (mitigations and changes)

For the PAGE programme, main risks consist in:

a. potential interruptions and/or withdrawals of projects selected for support – e.g. due to external reasons/factors, scientific infeasibility, or lack of response/collaboration from the project teams (historically, PEP has been able to limit this to less than 5% of PEP-funded projects).

   o In order to mitigate this risk, PEP ensures close monitoring of each supported project team’s progress and activities, simultaneously by PEP scientific (mentors

---

40 A revised version of the logframe (see ANNEX A) – with new calendar – was submitted with the 1st interim technical report (January 2013), and agreed up on with DFID.
and resource persons, also supervised by program coordinators), communications and administrative staff.

- In the beginning of the PAGE initiative, one RCT project that was selected under Round 1 withdrew, due to internal problems (amidst the project team), quickly after its selection. Fortunately, not much had been spent yet on this project at the time of the withdrawal. After consultations with DFID, it was decided to convert this RCT grant to into two small grants for field experiments, which were included as part of Round 3 call for proposals.

- One project supported in Burundi (MPIA-12499) was cancelled, as the team showed serious lack of collaboration with PEP mentors, including lack of compliance with requested deadlines and improvements of outputs.

**b. supported researchers do not obtain the necessary visas to attend training activities, meetings and study visits (historically, this can be accommodated through intensified distance support or addition “field visits” by PEP resource persons).**

- This has caused some problems, but have generally been overcome by substituting other members or relying more heavily on distance communication tools.

**c. non-compliance of supported researchers in translating their research findings into publishable material, or in taking the necessary measures/initiatives to contact/consult with policy makers and stakeholders (this is monitored/supported continuously through PEP’s proposal evaluation and technical report system to allow timely interventions).**

- All supported research teams are informed that grant payments will be withheld in case of non-compliance – i.e. non-submission of the research or technical reports.

- So far, – except for the cancelled project in Burundi, only a few of the selected PAGE research teams have delayed submission of revised versions of their reports, but in the end, all have complied and published/disseminated their project’s outcomes.

**d. unavailability or non-cooperativeness of policy makers/stakeholders to acknowledge the researchers’ work and findings, and take part in consultation/dissemination activities (consultation and dissemination are continuously monitored/supported – see previous point; take-up is encouraged through the whole range of these consultation and dissemination activities)**

- All (100%) of those research teams selected for support under the PAGE programme have succeeded in consulting with key policy makers and stakeholders at the local/national level.

For the institutionalization of PEP, the main risks consist in:
e. possible decision to change location, which could result in some delays.
   o a decision was actually made to change location of incorporation (from South Africa to Delaware, USA) and of future PEP headquarters (from South Africa to Nairobi) in 2013. This has not substantially delayed the incorporation process – now completed – nor has it prevented the new ED from beginning operations in Nairobi, which is to officially become PEP’s new headquarters when the host-country agreement is completed. The recruitment of the new ED is undertaken with the clear understanding that s/he will be located in Nairobi.

f. unexpected difficulties in recruiting executive director
   o An ED was recruited and completed his mandate.
   o Recruitment is currently under way for a new ED, but no difficulties are expected.

9.2 New risks identified

A new and (unforeseen) risk was identified in 2013, in relation to major fluctuations in currency rates (drop of the Canadian relative to the US dollar), which has resulted in a significant loss or reduction of the value of the IDRC grant. While the IDRC grant is signed and transferred in Canadian dollars, all the competitive grants to the projects are budgeted and signed in US dollars. With the declining value of the Canadian dollars, it became difficult to cover the costs of these approved projects. This was remedied by an agreement, with IDRC, to reduce the number of projects to be funded/supported under this particular grant.

A similar exchange rate loss has resulted from the recent devaluation of the British Pound. Partners have each developed strategies to absorb their share of the losses. This will generally take the form of cuts in additional and optional activities that would add value to the PAGE program, but do not endanger the attainment of its milestones. A request has been submitted to DfID to increase the overall budget to cover these exchange rate losses to allow these activities to be maintained.

9.3 Risk of funds not being used as intended

Funds are being used as intended and PEP continues its historical tradition of closely following the initial budget structure approved by funding organizations. The release of funds to project leaders is conditional on satisfactory progress, quality of scientific reports and achievement of agreed milestones. Compliance is regularly monitored by the Program research directors, the Mentors, the PAGE coordinator and the PEP Comm and M&E staff. Although this is not directly relevant to this section and as indicated earlier, some funds from IDRC have been reallocated (based on IDRC and Board agreement)\(^\text{41}\) to support institutional development of PEP to provide funds for establishing and staffing the new Secretariat including the costs of

\(^{41}\) The IDRC reallocated funds are hence being used as intended and cannot be reported as “funds not being used as intended.”
the Board (2013-2014) which were not specifically budgeted under the PAGE grant. This will lead to the reduction of two projects under the IDRC grant.

9.4 Climate and Environment Risk : N/A

9.5 Current assessment of the overall risk level for the programme : Low

X. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

10.1 PEP’s internal monitoring and evaluation system

In 2010, PEP initiated the implementation of a new “Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy” to ensure systematic and periodic review of each of its supported projects’ achievements and progress, in terms of capacity building, research outcomes, promotion of the team members’ expertise, consultation and dissemination activities, as well as policy influence.

The system is based on an online (intranet) “technical report” (which comprises a total of 6 forms, to report on different aspects of their PEP project), that must be completed by each of the research teams at different stages of the research cycle, enabling supervising bodies to quickly assess whether all recommended initiatives have been undertaken, initial strategies are being implemented and achievement of objectives is on track. The integration of the report in PEP’s intranet system also allows the systematic compilation of data, statistics and report, which are available at all times.

The technical report forms were designed to collect information regarding the achievement of a list of specific performance indicators, designed to assess the progress and impact of PEP activities in terms of research, capacity building, promotion of local expertise and policy influence.

The form has 6 different “sections”: capacity building, consultation, research, dissemination, impact and evaluation of PEP.

Ultimately, these reports provide crucial information on the main successes, challenges and obstacles encountered in the realization of PEP’s global initiatives - which often comprise a great number of individual projects or country studies, such as the PAGE programme - as a sum of its components, to draw important lessons for future strategies.

They also allow for PEP to collect and compile qualitative information and testimony regarding each of the supported project’s impact and ramifications at the national level, in the concerned countries. Find examples of the testimony collected from past (non-PAGE) projects in the PEP impact stories42.

It is important to note, however, that this M&E/survey system applies only to the projects supported under the PEP-MPIA, PIERI and PMMA projects – which are all monitored by the

42 See http://www.pep-net.org/about/pep-impact-stories/, and see also http://www.pep-net.org/about/pep-impact-stories/careerimpactstories/
PEP communications and M&E staff. The supported projects using CBMSS are not required to fill out the technical report, and are monitored individually by the PEP-Asia/CBMS coordinating team.\(^{43}\)

## 10.2. Monitoring and evaluation of PAGE projects

Indeed, the PEP Monitoring and Evaluation System has also been (and will continue to be) applied to those projects supported under the PAGE programme. In the context of PAGE, the monitoring of the technical reports have led to the collection, by PEP staff, of the information presented in ANNEX G, as well as to identify the winners of the 2014, 2015 and 2016 editions of the PEP Best Practice Awards. They have also allowed PEP staff to make sure that all PAGE Round 3 teams had also initiated proper consultation strategies (see below).

Each supported research team is required to fill out and update its PEP project’s technical report at least 4 times during and after completion of their research work (approximately every 6 months). Again this applies only to the projects supported under the MPIA, PMMA and PIERI research programs.

Initial completion: upon signing of the research grant agreement, and before release of 1\(^{st}\) grant payment
Focus sections: capacity building, consultation
   Round 1: by the end of July 2013
   Round 2: by the end of June 2014
   Round 3: by the end of June 2015

First update: upon submission of the interim research report, and before release of 2\(^{nd}\) grant payment
Focus sections: update + research + dissemination (strategy only)
   Round 1: by the end of December 2013
   Round 2: by the end of December 2014
   Round 3: by the end of December 2015

Second update: upon submission of the final research report, and before release of 3\(^{rd}\) grant payment
Focus sections: update + PEP evaluation
   Round 1: by the end of July 2014
   Round 2: by the end of July 2015
   Round 3: by the end of July 2016

Third update: after completion of the main dissemination activities (conditional to release of additional grant payments - publication grants, national policy conference grants, etc.)
Focus sections: update + dissemination + impact

\(^{43}\) Find them here: [http://www.pep-net.org/people/coordinating-teams/](http://www.pep-net.org/people/coordinating-teams/)
XI. FURTHER INFORMATION

11.1. Theory of change - Nothing to add..

11.2. Research methods - Nothing to add..

11.3. Challenges and lessons learnt

PEP is striving to become an institution that brings together the very best researchers from the South and North on equal footing to combine knowledge of local context with experience and expertise from throughout the world in order to provide new and context-relevant insights into the important policy challenges to combat poverty and promote social and economic development.

It must continue to develop its reputation for generating the highest quality, professional and relevant policy analysis in order to change the way national and international development policy debates are conducted and defined. This requires constant attention to the quality of its work, the development of effective communication strategies and techniques, greatly enhanced international visibility and ongoing investments in developing and catalysing research capacity in the South.

We believe the transformations that PEP has undertaken in recent years, thanks to the support of PAGE donors – legal incorporation, new governance structures, establishment of headquarters in the South, etc. – are essential to the success of this strategy. Yet PEP has also learned the importance of evolving gradually and carefully to ensure that its strategic focus, reputation of excellence and culture of inclusiveness and innovation is not lost.

PAGE has certainly made a major and historic contribution for the creation of PEP as a global institution. However, institutional development and creation of a viable global institution is a long-term process and cannot be fully achieved in a short time. We have also learned that its long term viability, success and impact will depend on creativity, innovation and alignment with changing demand, both from the policy community and from the donor community. Along with the successful institutional developments accomplished during the past year, PEP has initiated wide-ranging consultation to refresh its strategy, sharpen its focus, expand its programs and diversify the funding base. Indeed the future seems promising as the interest on the work and activities of PEP is growing significantly. We look forward to increased discussion
and consultation with DFID, IDRC and other donors to make this a successful initiative for stakeholders involved.

11.4 Other or supplementary information - Nothing to add..

ANNEXES

A. PAGE programme logframe
B. Financial documents
C. PAGE work plan and timetable
D. Lists of selected PAGE projects and researchers
E. List of publications from PAGE projects
F. Summary of PEP Partner-led projects
G. Summary of PAGE projects’ policy outreach activities and other PAGE outputs
H. Results of participants’ evaluation (survey) of the 2016 PEP Annual Conference