

ASSOCIATION OF AFRICAN UNIVERSITIES

REGIONAL CAPACITY MOBILISATION INITIATIVE (RCMI) FOR REVITALISING HIGHER EDUCATION IN AFRICA

Planning Consultation

December 05 - 06, 2006
Accra –Ghana

REPORT

BACKGROUND

1. The Association of African Universities (AAU) convened a consultative meeting with some of its regional partners in Accra on December 05 – 06, 2006. The main objective of the meeting was to prepare and plan for the operationalisation of a major four-year programme to be funded by a £3.5 million grant from the Department for International Development (DFID) of the United Kingdom. A key feature of the programme, the Regional Capacity Mobilisation Initiative (RCMI), which is to be led and managed by the AAU, is a Challenge Fund for the strengthening of partnerships between the AAU and the main sub-regional and national bodies representing higher education institutions in Africa, as part of the drive for sustainable development of the continent.
2. Represented at the Consultation, in addition to the AAU, were
 - a. *African Virtual University (AVU)*
 - b. *African Union Commission*
 - c. *Agence Universitaire de la Francophonie (AUF)*
 - d. *Association of Arab Universities (AArU)*
 - e. *Commission for Higher Education (CHE), Kenya*
 - f. *Inter University Council for East Africa (IUCEA)*
 - g. *Portuguese-speaking African Countries (PALOPs)*
 - h. *South African Universities Association (SARUA)*
 - i. *Vice-Chancellors Ghana*
3. The list of participants is set out in Annex 1.
4. In preparation for the Consultation, the AAU circulated a lead paper to selected national and sub-regional higher education organisations in Africa, with an invitation to send representatives to the meeting. The lead paper provided background information and a high-level framework for the discussion of the key themes of the RCMI. It also set out draft operating principles for the Challenge Fund and how the

RCMI would enable higher education assist African countries in the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), suggested eligibility criteria for accessing the Fund, and an outline programme for the period 2006/07 - 2009/10.

OPENING REMARKS

5. The Opening Session was chaired by Professor Arlindo Chilundo, Ministry of Science and Education, Mozambique, representing PALOPs. Professor Chilundo welcomed participants to Ghana and to the meeting, which he said, offered an opportunity for reflection on the reform of African higher education and its contribution to development. He then invited Professor Akilagpa Sawyerr, the Secretary General of the AAU to open the Consultation.
6. After welcoming participants to Accra and to the AAU, the Secretary General gave a brief background to the Regional Capacity Mobilisation Initiative (RCMI) and the purpose of the Consultation. He referred to the relative neglect of higher education in Africa during the 1980s and 1990s, under misguided notions about the low returns to investment in the sector. Happily, the indispensable role of higher education in development has now come to be generally acknowledged, as is reflected in such recent landmark events as the *Africa Commission Report* and the *Gleneagles Declaration* at the G8 Summit of July 2005, and the African Union's *Plan of Action for the Second Decade of Education for Africa (2006-2015)*. He noted that, as representative of African higher education, the AAU had been actively involved in advocacy and preparatory work in all these initiatives, and was gratified to see the turning of the tide.
7. The Accra Consultation brought together regional and sub-regional bodies to discuss ways of boosting the capacity of their member institutions to promote development in their societies. The role of the AAU in the revitalisation of African higher education would be to mobilise resources and facilitate interaction in order to enhance the capacities of its members and partner organisations, which in turn will support the contribution of their constituents and networks to the development process throughout the continent. Professor Sawyerr noted that the Challenge Fund, which was a major factor in this connection, was within the context of the US\$5 billion estimated in the Report of the Africa Commission as needed for the revitalisation of African higher education, science and technology over the next ten years, and would be operated within the broad frame of the African Union's Plan of Action for the Second Decade of Education for Africa. In conclusion, he observed that the AAU was counting on the insights and inputs of the partner agencies for developing the main concepts and the modalities for the operationalisation of the Fund, hence the Consultation.

THE LEAD PAPER

8. The AAU Director of Research and Programmes, John Ssebuwufu, summarised the Lead Paper, outlining the role of the AAU and partner organisations at the sub-regional and national levels, the nature of the Challenge Fund, as well as the background to the RCMI, its key objectives, anticipated outcomes and benefits. The presentation covered other key aspects of the Initiative, including an outline of a four-

year work plan, proposed focus areas, monitoring and evaluation, and modalities for operationalisation. Concluding the presentation, Professor Ssebuwufu reminded all that the Lead Paper was intended to provoke discussion of the Challenge Fund and how the RCMI outcomes would tie in with the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals.

9. In the discussion that followed the presentation, participants observed that the RCMI was the first concrete action to have emerged from the Africa Commission Report and the Gleneagles Declaration, and commended the British Government for taking the lead. In relation to the criteria for selecting partners for the RCMI, it was explained that existing collaboration between the selected organisations and the AAU was a consideration, with a proviso that there was room for admitting additional relevant thematic and professional bodies.
10. Attention was drawn to a number of issues, including the Bologna Process, its influence and impact on the harmonization of African higher education systems and the potential challenge to the higher education revitalisation effort in Africa. The experience of the AUF in making use of professional networks to bridge the gap between universities and their communities was highlighted as an example to be drawn upon in shaping the Initiative. While noting the crucial role of applied research and policy support, it was emphasised that basic research could not be ignored, primarily because of the role it plays in generating new knowledge and ideas. In any event, much of applied research is dependent on the outputs of basic research. It was further noted that the premise of the RCMI was that African higher education was being challenged to make original contributions to the development of the continent.
11. Given the importance of quality assurance and accreditation in the revitalisation of African higher education, it was suggested that there should be a strong focus on assuring effective networking of quality assurance and accreditation agencies as well as professional and thematic bodies.
12. It was emphasised that the RCMI should foster partnerships with policy-makers as a means of marshalling additional funds from local sources to support higher education revitalisation and to ensure its sustainability.

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES

13. To capture preliminary feedback from the partner organisations, participants were invited to outline their initial responses to the RCMI and plans for the operationalisation of the Challenge Fund. These presentations are summarised at [Annex 2](#).
14. In further discussion, a number of issues were brought up.
 - a. In relation to the selection of partners for the RCMI planning meeting, it was noted that, though not exhaustive, the selection was broadly representative of the African higher education landscape. It was, however, imperative to decide quickly what other organisations and bodies should be included in the Initiative.

- b. A main objective of the Consultation was to provide a forum for the AAU and its partner organisations to discuss all aspects of the RCMI and the Challenge Fund, and work towards the success of the Initiative. Therefore, participants at the Consultation constituted, in effect, a planning group.
- c. The role of the private sector as an end-user of higher education was an important dimension that needed to be provided for, if the RCMI is to achieve its overall goal.
- d. Taking note of the relatively weak position of higher education institutions in Portuguese speaking countries, it was emphasised that the Initiative might encourage and support higher education networks, as a means of helping national institutions in circumstances of unusual weakness.

ROLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN THE AFRICAN UNION'S SECOND DECADE OF EDUCATION

15. Dr. Beatrice Njenga, representing the African Union Commission, made a presentation on the role of higher education institutions in the African Union's Second Decade of Education. The presentation covered the background to the First Decade of Education and the Plan Of Action for the Second Decade of Education. She noted that the Plan covered Gender and Culture, Education Management Information Systems, Teacher Development, Tertiary/Higher Education, Technical and Vocational Education, Curriculum Development and Quality Management.
16. Dr. Njenga emphasised the need for an agreed framework within which the African Union would work with African regional, sub-regional and national organisations to achieve the goals of the Second Decade of Education. She then outlined arrangements for the implementation of the Plan of Action, emphasising that under the Plan of Action, the AAU has a coordinating role, working with universities and other higher education institutions through regional, sub-regional and national higher education bodies. She highlighted the imminent merger of UNESCO's Conference of African Ministers of Education (MINEDAF) and the AU's Conference of Ministers of Education of the African Union (COMEDAF) to create a unified forum for discussing issues affecting education in Africa. It was emphasised that the African Union considered higher education as a key player in achieving the MDGs in Africa and the realisation of the Plan of Action for the Second of African Education.
17. Discussion focused on what plans and strategies the African Union had so far put in place to address the problems that limited the capacity of African higher education institutions to play their full role in the continent's overall development. Other issues included the monitoring of the Plan of Action and sanctions for non-compliance by member states. Dr. Njenga noted that the African Union was in the process of setting up an African Education Observatory, which, *inter alia*, would monitor the implementation of the Plan of Action and advise on the nature of sanctions for non-compliance. The existing peer-review mechanism was another means by which the implementation of the Plan of Action could be monitored. The African Union intended to link up with the Association for Education in Africa (ADEA), among others, for the same purpose. Additionally, the AAU, regional and sub-regional education bodies, as implementers of the Plan of Action, had a role to play in monitoring the execution of the Plan. They would, in the process, ensure that separate initiatives fed directly into the Plan as a strategic way of pulling together and, thus, minimising duplication of effort and the lack of coordination that had characterised

the First Decade of African Education. It was hoped that, in the long run, this would ensure better harmonisation and coordination, leading to the attainment of the common goals of all such initiatives. Above all, every effort should be made to ensure that the RCMI was implemented within the framework the African Union's Plan of Action for the Second Decade of Education for Africa.

18. On how the African Union intended to fund the implementation of the Plan of Action, Dr. Njenga explained that African governments had committed themselves to funding a large portion of the Plan, and that funding was already being mobilised from within AU member states with promising results. The AU had already launched a Scholarship Scheme of \$650 million to sponsor students for first-degree courses at universities in Africa in strategic disciplines.
19. Concern was expressed that the AAU, in light of its position in the governing structure of the Plan of Action, risked losing its autonomy and becoming an agent of the African Union. The Secretary-General allayed any such fears, confirming that the AAU would remain as an independent membership organisation, making its expertise available to the AU on agreed terms.

MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS

20. In a discussion of the implications of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) for the Initiative, Terry Allsop, DFID's Consultant on the RCMI, underscored the fact that the MDGs constituted guiding principles for any project drawing support from the Challenge Fund, reflecting DFID's strong commitment to the MDGs. This had to be borne in mind in the design and implementation of the Initiative. It was pointed out that, as it happens, most of the work of Africa's universities was in support of the MDGs. The Initiative could further this by emphasising the role and importance of local research, its impact and relevance in poverty alleviation and the pillars of DFID support, such as gender and education within the broad framework of the MDGs. At the same time, attention was drawn to the special and often indirect kinds of contribution that higher education institutions and umbrella organisations, such as the AAU and sub-regional bodies are peculiarly able to contribute to the attainment of the MDGs - advocacy, capacity building and the creation of enabling environments. It was, finally, noted that, to ensure the sustainability of the RCMI beyond the Challenge Fund support, it would be necessary to build capacity to raise funds from a variety of sources.

THE CHALLENGE FUND

21. Giving the background to the Challenge Fund, Terry Allsop reported that DFID had vested the management and the coordination of the RCMI in the AAU, which, with its partner organisations, was responsible for operationalising the Fund. He emphasised that the Fund was meant to be competitive, in the sense that project proposals had to be selected and assessed on merit, before approval. While DFID had no intention of micromanaging projects supported by the Challenge Fund, it expected timely reports that reviewed project implementation and progress in relation to the MDGs. The Consultant expressed confidence that a final grant agreement would be signed in January 2007, and funds for first year activities made available for utilisation before the end of March 2007.

22. DFID support for the RCMI consists of a £3.5 million grant to the AAU, covering the period 2006/2010 with annual budget allocation limits fixed as follows:
- 2006/2007: £200,000
 - 2007/2008: £800,000
 - 2008/2009: £1 million
 - 2009/2010: £1.5 million.
23. The grant was limited to a maximum of £3.5million. While there is no provision for equipment, there is support for scholarships and programmes, including those related to, or promoting gender empowerment. DFID was also strongly in favour of links and networks.
24. Out of the total grant, £50,000 was for the initial RCMI design, including the current planning meeting; £450,000 was earmarked for events like consultative fora; and the bulk, £3million, was for the Challenge Fund activities.
25. The discussion that followed this presentation focused mainly on the need to develop clear project selection guidelines, with the AAU providing technical leadership. One of the purposes of the planning meeting was for the AAU to solicit inputs from its various partner sub-regional and national organisations in the formulation of the guidelines. As the objective of the Initiative was to assist with the attainment of the MDGs throughout Africa, it was agreed that project funds from the Challenge Fund should be open to universities and higher education institutions throughout the continent, even those that were not members of the AAU.
26. Among the key challenges in operationalising the Fund would be how to reconcile its competitive nature with the need for balance and fair coverage. After extended discussion, the AAU was requested to draw up the necessary modalities so as to ensure the achievement of the objectives and goals of RCMI, encouraging both competitiveness and fairness. The modalities are to include
- a. a transparent selection process,
 - b. criteria that favour projects with a multi-country focus,
 - c. proper consideration for peculiar situations like that of the PALOPs,
 - d. the need to use the Challenge Fund to leverage other resources to sustain projects beyond the four-year duration
 - e. other categories of organisations, such as professional and thematic associations, that could benefit from the Initiative, were to be identified and eligibility criteria applicable to them drawn up.
27. The AAU was further tasked to work out modalities for collaborating with sub-regional and national groups.

OPERATIONALIZATION OF THE RCMI

28. Following the discussion of the Challenge Fund, attention turned to modalities for operationalising the RCMI and the Challenge Fund. This required clearly defined goals, purposes and expected outcomes, understood by all.

29. Goal of RCMI and the Challenge Fund:

To strengthen African Higher Education institutions to act as catalysts for poverty eradication and sustainable development.

30. Purpose of RCMI and the Challenge Fund

Renewal and strengthening of African higher education institutions

31. Expected Outcomes of RCMI and the Challenge Fund:

- a. Enhanced capacity of higher education institutions for information sharing, innovation and reform.*
- b. Policy-oriented research leading to policy briefs on innovative ways for higher education institutions to contribute to national development programmes and the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals.*
- c. Development of policy frameworks that addressed key issues such as schemes for enhancing enrolment of under-represented groups and quality of teaching and learning, among others.*

32. Criteria for eligibility to participate in Challenge Fund projects:

- a. In line with the goal of leveraging sub-regional and national capacity for higher education revitalisation and attainment of the MDG, proposals for funding must promote interchange, contact and co-operation among sub-regional and national higher education organizations.*
- b. To meet the goal of a continent-wide policy framework for key aspects of higher education development, project proposals must seek to generate and facilitate appropriate frameworks, inputs and forms of support for policy development.*
- c. To enhance networks for information exchange on higher education renewal needs, proposals must seek to collect, research and disseminate information relevant to African higher education revitalisation*
- d. To achieve the intended harmonisation of the different traditions in African higher education, proposals may focus on governance and leadership strengthening, promotion of equity and quality assurance, and indicate approaches for addressing these issues.*

33. Categories of eligible organisations and institutions:

- a. Regional and sub-regional higher education groups*
- b. Other appropriate networks of institutions*

34. Principles of project selection:

- a. Competitiveness*
- b. Openness and transparency*
- c. Selection by an expert and representative panel*

35. **Basic guidelines for the vetting and selection procedure:**
- a. Two-stage process
 - o Concept paper (2 - 4 pages)
 - o Full proposal
 - b. Project budget to be within a range of £20,000 -£50,000
 - c. All projects to be completed within a maximum of two years.
36. The AAU was requested to develop a *Programme Work Plan* covering the proposed four-year period (2006 – 2010), an appropriate *RCMI Governance Structure*, including a *Steering Committee*. Eligibility to the committee membership was to take to the following factors into consideration:
- a. Knowledge and experience of higher education and innovation
 - b. Regional balance
 - c. Representation of the African Union Commission (AUC) and the AAU
 - d. Seven committee members made up of:
 - o 5 Representatives drawn from 5 sub-regions
 - o AUC
 - o AAU
37. The Committee is to be chaired by the AAU, which is also to propose membership through consultation. It is to conduct business online, as far as possible, and to work out modalities for fund disbursement
38. The AAU was tasked to draft the *Terms of Reference* for the Steering Committee and circulate them as part of the draft report of the consultation.

CAPACITATION AND PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT

39. Building the relevant capacity at the AAU Secretariat for efficient and effective management of the project was considered critical to the success of the RCMI. To that end, it was recommended that the following should form the core activities of the first year of operations:
- a. Appointment of RCMI Coordinator at the AAU Secretariat
 - b. Analysis of relevant plans and programmes of sub-regional and national organizations
 - c. Consultations aimed at developing shared understandings
 - d. Exploratory discussions with and between identified partners
 - e. Reports to DFID, leading to formal launch of the Initiative
 - f. Presentation on the RCMI to the COMEDAF and other relevant structures of the African Union.
40. The AAU was requested to undertake urgent consultations and set up the necessary structures for early advertising of the Challenge Fund, to allow for receipt of the initial applications and their processing by mid 2007.
41. On/ with regard to the *Work Plan for 2007/10*, the general consensus was that the following should constitute the project focus areas in the-roll out phase:

- a. Information and Communication Technology (ICT)
 - b. Leadership development
 - c. Quality promotion and quality assurance
 - d. HIV/AIDS
 - e. Advocacy and consensus building
 - f. Pedagogy and curriculum development
 - g. Gender and culture in various aspects of higher education
 - h. Brain drain and internationalisation
 - i. Knowledge generation and development linkages
 - j. Public, private and community partnerships
42. On programme *monitoring and evaluation*, emphasis was placed on the need to conceptualise at an early stage general indicators for monitoring and evaluation of the programme, possibly before the launch of the Challenge Fund in 2007. The RCMI Coordinator was to develop the overall RCMI *programme performance indicators*, as well as *project-specific indicators*.

RISK ANALYSIS

43. In anticipation of the *logical framework* to be developed, an exercise was undertaken to identify potential risks to programme implementation. Following are the risks identified using a rough sampling procedure:
- Weak responses and or commitment from regions
 - Poor accountability for funds
 - Weak coordination and management
 - Slow fund disbursement
 - Insufficient good projects
 - Political instability / conflicts
 - Inadequate dissemination of information
 - Marginalisation of weaker institutions
 - Slow identification and mobilization of regions /sub regions
 - Different expectations
 - DFID policy change
44. The likelihood of each of the listed risks and the probable the impact on the RCMI programme were analysed and scored in a matrix (see [Annex 3](#)). The analysis revealed a low risk rating.

CLOSING

45. In the closing session, the following were itemised as matters requiring immediate action:
- a. announcement of the Initiative through a news brief/press release
 - b. Circulation of outcome of the planning meeting to all participants
 - c. A draft report to be written and forwarded to participants within 21days
 - d. AAU to initiate immediate consultation on the membership of the Steering Committee and forward proposals to the participants
 - e. The definition of the role of current “planning group” in communicating the RCMI and Challenge Fund to their constituents
 - f. The creation of a listserv for participants by the AAU.

Final Remarks

46. In his final remarks Terry Allsop expressed satisfaction that the meeting had made good progress and provided material for further work. While the initiative had become better conceptualised through the discussion, the challenge of ensuring a good start still remained.

47. Beatrice Njenga reported that she intended to present a brief on the RCMI and the Accra Consultation at a meeting of the African Union Commission, scheduled for December 18, 2006. She again emphasised the importance of continent-wide harmonisation of academic diplomas and degrees to facilitate credit transfer across the continent. She also reiterated the need to ensure that higher education in Africa was adequately resourced so that, the system could perform at optimal level. She finally underlined the importance of meaningful and productive collaboration amongst all stakeholders.

48. In concluding remarks, the Secretary General of the AAU expressed appreciation to all participants for their contribution to the success of the Consultation. A lot of ground had been covered and the quality of the contributions had more than justified the invitation to partner organisations to join in the initial formulation of the Initiative. He acknowledged that many challenges still lay ahead, and called for more dedication and hard work for the Initiative to achieve its goal.

49. He extended special appreciation to DFID for setting up the Challenge Fund and for its open-ended nature, which provided the AAU and its partners sufficient latitude to shape and manage it. He further observed that DFID's initiative had opened up other possibilities from which AAU member institutions and others stood to benefit. He congratulated the African Union for according higher education its due recognition and for undertaking to collaborate with the AAU, thereby opening up for the AAU, greater access to high level policy-makers and increased possibilities of direct dialogue with African governments.

50. He thanked AAU staff, who had worked tirelessly to make the Consultation possible and so problem-free, and wished all a safe journey back home.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

1. Dr. Terry ALLSOP
Consultant
UK
2. Prof. Jophus ANAMUAH-MENSAH
Chairman, Vice Chancellor's Ghana (VCG)
VC, University of Education
Winneba, GHANA
jam@uew.edu.gh / pucew@africaonline.gh
3. Prof. Arlindo CHILUNDO
Higher Education Coordinator
Ministry of Education
P. O. Box 34
Maputo, MOZAMBIQUE
Arlindo@zebra.uem.mz
chilundo@mec.gov.mz
4. Dr. Bakary DIALLO
African Virtual University
Nairobi
KENYA
"Dr. Bakary Diallo" <bdiallo@avu.org>
5. Mr. Paul EFFAH
Executive Secretary
National Council for Tertiary Education
(NCTE)
Accra, GHANA
ncte@ug.edu.gh
6. Prof. Faisal ELHAG
Deputy Secretary General
Association of Arab Universities (AArU)
P.O. Box 401, Jubeyha
Amman, JORDAN
faisal@aaruu.edu.jo
faisalael@yahoo.com
cc: "MAY" may@aaruu.edu.jo
7. Dr. Piyushi KOTTECHA
SARUA
SOUTH AFRICA
"PK" pk@sarua.org
8. Dr. Benedict MTASIWA
Programs and Projects Officer
Inter-University Council for Eastern Africa (IUCEA)
Kampala, UGANDA
bnmtasiwa@hotmail.com
cc: "Alice Mulondo" intersity@africaonline.co.ug
9. Dr. Beatrice NJENGA
African Union
Addis Ababa
ETHIOPIA
10. SHAJE TSHILUILA Josette
Directrice BAO
Agence Universitaire de la Francophonie (AUF)
Ottawa, CANADA
Tél: 221 8242927
Fax: 221 8253448
josette.shaje-tshiluil@auf.org
11. Prof. Everett STANDA
Commission Secretary
Commission for Higher Education (CHE)
P.O. Box Nairobi
KENYA
<che@wananchi.com>
12. Prof. Akilagpa Sawyerr
Secretary General
secgen@aau.org
13. Prof. John Ssebuwufu
Director, Research and Programmes
pjmsseb@aau.org
14. Dr. Pascal Hoba
Head
15. Prof. Olusola Oyewole
Project Officer

Communications and Services
phoba@aau.org

16. Mrs. Araba Botchway
Project Officer
Ford Foundation IFP
botchway@aau.org

19. Mrs. Adeline Addy
Assistant Project Officer
Research and Programmes
research@aau.org

Research and Programmes
oyewole@aau.org

17. Mrs. Victoria Duah
Assistant Information Officer
Communications and Services
vduah@aau.org

20. Mrs. Alida Baeta
Executive Assistant
Secretary General's Office
abaeta@aau.org

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES TO THE RCMI AND CHALLENGE FUND

Professor Jophus Anamuah-Mensah, Vice Chancellor, University of Education, Winneba, Ghana and current Chair of Vice Chancellors Ghana chaired the session on institutional responses.

African Virtual University

On behalf the AVU, Dr. Diallo made a presentation on the purpose, activities and scope of the institution. Highlights of the presentation included the following:

- The AVU works in Francophone, Anglophone and Lusophone areas and therefore understands the complexities of networks.
- Emphasis on the role of networks in the higher education revitalisation process.
- Bandwidth Initiative supporting 10 universities
- Open Distance and Electronic Learning curriculum development and delivery
- Digital libraries accessible by network members
- Collaborations and agreements with AU, NEPAD, AAU, AUF and ADEA means well placed to contribute to RMCI Initiative

Association of Arab Universities (AArU)

Professor El Hag noted the large membership of AArU (over 173 with 70 of its members in Africa) and the organisation's primary aim of fostering cooperation among its members as well as helping preserve the Arab culture.

Initiatives taken by AArU for promoting higher education include:

- Scholarship schemes
- A depository for theses
- Financial support for Palestinian universities
- The organisation of 18 professional/thematic bodies which meet annually and publish a journal
- Instituting benchmarks for quality assurance
- An Arab Council for Quality Assurance
- The establishing of Community colleges in Sudan with focus on women empowerment
- The linking up of all AArU members by internet

DRAFT

South African Universities Association (SARUA)

In her presentation, Dr. Kotecha noted that a medium to long-term dynamic relation between higher education, governments and the private sector was necessary to move the RCMI initiative forward. She, however, cautioned participants about the seemingly “distributed” or piecemeal methodology proposed for operationalising RCMI given the peculiarities of the individual organisations. In her view this could affect accountability, and present challenges for managing delivery and coordination. She however noted that the proposed methodology has its strengths in the inclusive nature. She also noted that with regard to facilitating the RCMI, advocacy is key and raised questions about who to lead the lobbying in the African higher education milieu as well as the point and timing of interventions. She further noted that certain regions, such as the SADC had existing communication channels and other interactions on socio-economic fronts and therefore have a natural link for advocacy and an existing audience. She raised questions on what action could be taken in areas without such structures. Finally she observed that proper communication with stakeholders on the RCMI initiated by the AAU would be necessary if the project is to succeed.

Inter -University Council for East Africa (IUCEA),

On behalf of the Inter-University Council for East Africa (IUCEA), Dr. Benedict Mtasiwa noted the importance of developing guidelines for identifying RCMI partners as well as modalities for selecting projects. He urged that emphasis be placed on programmes and projects aimed at poverty reduction. He cited some initiatives undertaken by IUCEA in response to revitalising higher education. Among them were the Lake Victoria Project, a Biotech Initiative, the organisation of meetings of experts from common thematic areas (12 thematic clusters on environment, industry, socio-economy, gender/equity, HIV/AIDS etc.) with focus on research, teaching and outreach. He also indicated that currently, the East African Community Secretariat is working on mechanisms for inputting research findings into health policies. He indicated that based on its initiatives the IUCEA is well placed to contribute to RCMI.

Agence Universitaire de la Francophonie (AUF)

Dr. SHAJE TSHILUILA Josette, on her part indicated that the AUF, although a multilateral body supporting francophone universities in area of research and teaching, is also open to other universities. talking about the AUF's thematic programmes on French language, human rights, environment and sustainability, centres of excellence, and ICT among others, she explained that these programmes are based on institutional and research networks. She also mentioned that the AUF had had to cancel its North-South scholarship programme due to the non-return of students. Currently the AUF runs a South-South student mobility and staff exchange programmes. With reference to the RCMI project, she noted that it is important to consider the autonomy of universities during the operationalisation phase.

DRAFT

Commission for Higher Education (CHE), Kenya

Prof. Everett STANDA of the Commission for Higher Education (CHE) – Kenya, indicated that whereas his organisation is mainly responsible for accrediting universities in Kenya, an act is soon to be promulgated to revise the mandate of CHE, granting it more powers. He mentioned some initiatives of CHE including instituting standards and benchmarks for Quality Assurance. He also indicated that a formal collaboration was soon be initiated between Higher Education bodies of Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania to work on modalities for credit transfers among the institutions.

Risk Analysis Matrix

IMPACT	LEVEL OF RISK			
		3	2	1
	3		1, 2, 4	7
	2		10, 11	3, 5
	1		8	6, 9

Potential Risks

1. Weak responses and or commitment from regions
2. Poor accountability for funds
3. Weak coordination and management
4. Slow fund disbursement
5. Insufficient good projects
6. Political instability / conflicts
7. Inadequate dissemination of information
8. Marginalisation of weaker institutions
9. Slow identification and mobilization of regions /sub regions
10. Different expectations
11. DFID policy change