

1 **Long title: The cost of sponsored research at institutions of higher learning**  
2 **in low- and middle-income countries: a cross-sectional study**

3  
4 **Short title: Cost of sponsored research**

5  
6 **Authors: Ahaz T. Kulanga<sup>1</sup>, Gibson E. Kapanda<sup>1</sup>, John A. Bartlett<sup>2</sup>, Charles Muiruri<sup>2,3</sup>,**  
7 **Stef de Jong<sup>4</sup>**

8 <sup>1</sup>Department of Public Health and Administration, Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University  
9 College, Moshi, Tanzania

10 <sup>2</sup> Department of Medicine and Nursing, Duke Global Health Institute- Duke University,  
11 Durham, North Carolina, United States of America.

12 <sup>3</sup> Department Population Health Science, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, United  
13 States of America.

14 <sup>4</sup>Department of Behavioral Science, Marketing, Human Resource, Communication,  
15 Entrepreneurship, European University - Business School – Geneva, Switzerland

38 **Abstract**

39 **Introduction:** Research in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) is challenged with  
40 poor investment by both in-country governments and philanthropies. Although research  
41 grants cover costs directly associated with specific research projects, they do not fully cover  
42 costs that are indirectly attributable to specific projects. The relationship between grant  
43 funding and actual cost of paying for such projects at institutions of higher learning (IHL) in  
44 LMICs is poorly understood. Our purpose was to evaluate unaccounted costs associated with  
45 grants and explore the system level factors that support or hinder the goal of “breaking even”.

46 **Materials and methods:** We used a descriptive retrospective cross-sectional design to  
47 evaluate unaccounted costs and qualitative interviews with stakeholders at three prominent  
48 medical universities in Tanzania. Data were obtained from annual audited Final Reports and  
49 Final Financial Reports for biomedical and social and behavioral sciences (non-biomedical)  
50 sponsored projects funded from 2007 through 2017.

51 **Findings:** A total of 17 projects were included in the study, of which 6 (35.3%) were  
52 biomedical and 11 (64.7%) non-biomedical. The median total amount of project funding for  
53 all biomedical research projects was US\$ 544,084; interquartile range (IQR) [89,268-  
54 1,226,570]. These projects had median unaccounted costs of US\$ 186,403 (IQR) [30,583-  
55 420,223]. The median funding for non-biomedical sponsored research projects was US\$  
56 902,999 (IQR) [468,259-1,951,212] and unaccounted costs were US\$ 112,875 (IQR)  
57 [58,532-243,902]. 27 faculty and staff at study sites participated in interviews. Three themes  
58 emerged- costing practices, unaccounted-for costs, and budget negotiating power.

59 **Conclusion:** The study demonstrated that there was a substantial amount of unaccounted-for  
60 costs for sponsored projects. Costing and financial practices associated with sponsored  
61 research projects were weak, coupled with lopsided negotiating power with funding agencies.  
62 Funding agencies and institutions in this study should work to reduce the inequity in research  
63 costs.

64 **Key words:** Cost of research, costing practices, unaccounted-for costs, institutions of higher  
65 learning, low- and middle-income countries, indirect costs, sponsored research, negotiating  
66 power.

67

## 68 **Introduction**

69 To compete successfully for external support, institutions of higher learning (IHLs) must  
70 invest in the research environment including competent investigators, laboratories, and data  
71 systems among others and demonstrate their proficiencies. With these investments, IHLs  
72 reap economic and academic prestige benefits demonstrated by academic rankings which are  
73 closely associated with institutions' research capabilities<sup>1</sup>.

74 In high-income countries (HIC), governments and philanthropies are key external funders of  
75 research in IHLs. With continual growth of economies in low- and middle-income countries  
76 (LMICs) such as African countries, there has been an impetus to recognize the value of  
77 research for sustainable development. As a result, in 2007 African leaders pledged to  
78 intensify government funding of research infrastructure<sup>2</sup>. Regrettably, this pledge has not  
79 been realized—most research in LMICs is funded by international organizations.

80 Governments commit minimal or no portion of their budgets to research. For example,  
81 Franzen et al.<sup>3</sup> observed that research in LMICs is challenged with poor investment by both  
82 governments and in-country philanthropies. It is estimated that almost 80% of research  
83 funding in LMICs comes from donors<sup>4</sup> who invest resources, largely on the basis of the  
84 funders' goals and objectives. The paucity of local funding and underfunding of sponsored  
85 research from external funders challenges sustainability of the research enterprise in  
86 institutions/universities in LMICs<sup>4,5</sup>.

87 Most sponsored research at IHLs is comprised of two main budgetary components; (1) direct  
88 costs and (2) indirect or overhead costs, also referred to as facilities and administrative  
89 (F&A) costs. Direct costs are costs that are directly linked to the research activities. These  
90 may include support of faculty time, graduate research assistants, post-doctoral fellows,

91 laboratory technicians, computers and other durable equipment, and expendable commodities  
92 such as reagents, travel, communication, and clerical assistance<sup>6</sup>.

93 In HIC, F&A costs cover a portion of the IHL's infrastructure and operational costs necessary  
94 to conduct the research, not directly linked to the research project itself. These negotiated  
95 rates are meant to cover a portion of operating, maintaining, and renovating research  
96 facilities<sup>7</sup>. Additionally, the indirect cost recovery supports the research enterprise by  
97 funding major research initiatives, and research and shared facilities<sup>8</sup>.

98 Although research grants cover costs directly associated with specific research projects, they  
99 do not fully cover costs that cannot be directly attributed to one project<sup>7</sup>. Institutions  
100 conducting sponsored research may end up spending considerable unaccounted-for amounts  
101 of funds and resources to ensure success of a project<sup>9</sup>. According to Dr. Kelvin K.  
102 Drogemeier, University of Oklahoma Vice President for Research, while performing  
103 sponsored research, IHLs incur a variety of other significant costs, both direct and indirect,  
104 leading up to and during a specific research project that they would otherwise not incur. Watt  
105 and Higerd<sup>10</sup> and Wimsatt et al.<sup>11</sup> also report that the recovered F&A costs from a grant  
106 award rarely cover the actual costs required for a research project of 24-28%<sup>12</sup>, and at least an  
107 additional 40% institutional costs (F&A) to cover external research funding<sup>7</sup>. Additionally,  
108 Association of American Universities and Colleges (AAUC)<sup>13</sup> demonstrates that colleges and  
109 universities in the United States are the second-leading sponsors of research, providing about  
110 20% of total institutional research expenditures.

111 According to Fonn et al.<sup>9</sup> there is also the aspect of in-kind contributions (approximately  
112 42%), that includes unremunerated labor time by faculty, use of physical and infrastructure  
113 resources, and unremunerated indirect costs in research project implementation. These  
114 contributions are provided by individual faculty who devote unremunerated time that is not  
115 counted as part of the institution's responsibilities apart from their teaching, supervisory, and

116 administrative roles. Without these in-kind contributions, the realization of set goals and  
117 impact of such sponsored research projects would be difficult, if not possible.

118 Most of the institutions in LMICs do not have policies on research costing and thus, in most  
119 instances, the F&A rates are based on funder discretion<sup>14</sup>. Due to this fact, there is a wide  
120 variation of indirect cost rates at IHLs in LMICs, with rates varying from 0% to 15% of  
121 direct costs<sup>14</sup>.

122 Despite an increase in funding for sponsored research in LMICs in the past decade, a  
123 quantifiable relationship between the funds requested from funding agencies and the actual  
124 cost of paying for such projects at IHLs in LMICs is poorly understood. To our knowledge,  
125 there has not been a comprehensive evaluation of adequacy of indirect costs at IHLs in  
126 LMICs to inform institutional policies on equitable distribution of research funding.  
127 Furthermore, the perceptions of stakeholders on research costing of sponsored projects at  
128 IHLs in LMICs are not well described in the current literature in order to provide direction  
129 for the initiatives to be undertaken to reduce the disparities. It is within this premise that we  
130 conducted this study to provide IHLs in LMICs the ability to quantify the actual costs of  
131 conducting sponsored research and to understand the system level factors that support or  
132 hinder the goal of “breaking even”.

### 133 **Materials and methods**

134 This descriptive mixed methods cross-sectional study was conducted at Muhimbili University  
135 of Health and Allied Sciences (MUHAS), Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College  
136 (KCMUCo) and Catholic University of Health and Allied Sciences (CUHAS) in Tanzania.  
137 These institutions have witnessed increased externally funded research and development  
138 project activities over the past two decades.

139 For the quantitative component, Audited Final Financial Reports (FFR) for externally funded  
140 research projects from January 1, 2007 and closed by December 31, 2017, were obtained  
141 from the MUHAS Office of Sponsored Projects (OSP), and the Offices of Research  
142 Management and Innovation (ORMIs) at KCMUCo and CUHAS. The FFRs contained  
143 details of specific expenditures for each project and amounts used during a specific period of  
144 funding as well as cumulative amounts for each category listed in the FFR. These categories  
145 include salaries and wages, consultancies, travel, laboratory fees, equipment, supplies and  
146 materials, training-related expenses, and regulatory fees, among others. Using the specific  
147 categories, we identified the activities undertaken to arrive at a specific expense as mandated  
148 by the institutional finance, human resources, procurement, and other departmental rules and  
149 regulations. For example, if a specific project needed to hire staff to work on the project, we  
150 worked with the human resources department and identified the cost of advertising for the  
151 position and costs associated with interviewing process hiring, Social Security contributions,  
152 payroll/wage bills, relocation/subsistence allowances and orientation/induction. These costs  
153 are expected to be paid by the IHL and not the projects because they are considered  
154 unallowable. After developing the associated costs matrix for each category, the author then  
155 applied it to both the biomedical and non-biomedical sponsored projects funded during the  
156 period previously described. For credibility, we worked closely with the respective heads of  
157 departments that perform these activities to develop the assigned associated costs from their  
158 previous experience and current costs of the activities. For biomedical projects, both  
159 equipment (depreciation, maintenance/service, clearing, insurance, bidding and disposal) and  
160 human resource components (advertising, interviewing, induction/orientation, training,  
161 relocation/subsistence, Social Security/welfare, and payroll/wage bill costs) were considered  
162 in estimating the unaccounted-for indirect costs while for non-biomedical projects the main  
163 component was human resource.

164 To gain insights on research costing from key stakeholders, we interviewed faculty members  
165 who had active sponsored projects or had received past sponsored project awards, senior and  
166 junior administrators and research administrators, and other junior administrators such as  
167 human resource, procurement, legal, finance, and accounting officers.

168 To evaluate the appropriateness of questions in the interview guide and length of the  
169 interview, six pilot in-depth interviews were conducted, and a revised interview guide was  
170 developed. The data from this pilot stage were not included in the final analysis. With  
171 purposively selected participants, face-to-face in-depth interviews were conducted by AK  
172 between March and May 2021. After providing consent, demographic information was  
173 collected and participants were asked about costing practices of sponsored projects at their  
174 institution including budgeting and F&A costs.

175 Statistical analysis was performed using Stata Version 15 (StataCorp LP, Texas). Descriptive  
176 statistics (median/mean and standard deviation/interquartile range) and charts were used to  
177 summarize the collected numerical data. Comparisons between biomedical and non-  
178 biomedical externally-funded research funds for unaccounted-for costs and indirect cost rates  
179 were summarized using charts.

180 For the qualitative component, demographic data of the in-depth interview (IDI) participants  
181 was summarized using frequency distributions. All in-depth interviews were first transcribed  
182 verbatim. Applied thematic analysis was employed to analyze segments of IDI data following  
183 a multi-stage deductive and inductive analysis approach (Kiger and Varpio 2020). Two  
184 analysts independently applied structural codes (based on the specific interview topics) to the  
185 data using Dedoose. The analysts checked for consistency by applying the code list and  
186 definitions to the transcribed interviews through discussion and reconciliation. Discrepancies  
187 in code application were resolved through discussion, and edits were subsequently made to  
188 the structural codebook, with transcripts recoded as needed. AK reviewed discrepancies

189 between coders and acted as the tie breaker. Lastly, the analysts wrote memos to summarize  
190 the most frequently mentioned findings for each code.

191 Ethical clearance was obtained from the KCMUCo Ethical Review Board vide Certificate  
192 No. 2497. Permission to carry out the study was given by each respective institution's  
193 Review Boards. Respondents were briefed about the purpose of the study and assured of  
194 strict confidentiality of the information provided and non-effect to their institutional  
195 positions.

## 196 **Results**

197  
198 A total of 17 projects were investigated, of which 6 (35.3%) were biomedical and 11 (64.7%)  
199 non-biomedical. Of the six biomedical donor-funded research projects, three were conducted  
200 at KCMUCo, two at MUHAS, and one at CUHAS. Of the 11 non-biomedical research  
201 projects, 2 were conducted at KCMUCo, 4 at MUHAS, and 5 at CUHAS.

202 The median total amount of project funding for all biomedical donor-funded research projects  
203 was United States Dollars (USD) 544,084; interquartile range (IQR) 89,268-1,226,570. The  
204 median (IQR) amount of direct costs being USD 480,600 (76,851-1,190,008) while the  
205 median (IQR) for indirect costs was USD 63,484 (12,417-117,562). The average  
206 unaccounted-for cost rate on total project cost for biomedical donor-funded research projects  
207 was 34.3% and the median (IQR) of unaccounted-for costs was USD 186,403 (30,583–  
208 420,223). The results are shown in Table 1.

209

210

211

212

213



214 Table 1. Biomedical Project Costs

Project ID	Direct costs (USD)	Indirect costs (USD)	Total project costs (USD)	Unaccounted costs (USD) (personnel + equipment)
KB-1	50,876	3,617	54,493	18,669
KB-2	1,205,055	118,887	1,323,943	453,583
MB-1	3,068,685	414,402	3,483,087	1,193,306
KB-3	820,867	113,586	934,453	320,144
MB-2	140,333	13,381	153,714	52,662
CB-1	55,690	12,096	67,786	23,223
Median (IQR)	480,600 (76,851-1,190,008)	63,484 (12,417-117,562)	544,084 (89,268-1,226,570)	186,403 (30,583-420,223)

215 *Note:* ID = Identity; USD = United States Dollar; IQR = Interquartile Range

216

217 The median (IQR) total amount of project funding for non-biomedical donor-funded research  
 218 projects was USD 902,999 (468,259–1,951,212). The median (IQR) amount of direct costs  
 219 was USD 790,959 (425,699–1,543,345) while the median (IQR) for indirect costs was USD  
 220 24,144 (0–137,301). In contrast to biomedical research, the median (IQR) for unaccounted-  
 221 for costs (unfunded by the funder) was USD 112,875 (58,532–243,902) with the average rate  
 222 on total project cost of 12.5% (Table 2).

223 Table 2. Non-Biomedical Project Costs

Project ID	Direct costs (USD)	Indirect costs (USD)	Total project costs (USD)	Unaccounted for costs (USD) (pers)
MNB-1	527,777	0	527,777	65,972
KNB-1	8,837,056	574,015	9,411,071	1,176,384
MNB-2	212,205	1,484	213,689	26,711
KNB-2	1,813,911	137,301	1,951,212	243,902
MNB-3	1,543,345	0	1,543,345	192,918
MNB-4	36,859	24,144	61,003	7,625
CNB-1	790,959	112,040	902,999	112,875
CNB-2	746,511	0	746,511	93,314
CNB-3	425,699	42,560	468,259	58,532
CNB-4	1,310,563	0	1,310,563	163,820
CNB-5	1,313,630	898,590	2,212,220	276,528
Median (IQR)	790,959 (476,738-1,428,488)	24,144 (0-124,671)	902,999 (498,018-1,747,279)	112,875 (62,252-218,410)


224 Note: ID = Identity; USD = United States Dollar; IQR = Interquartile Range

225

226 In summary, we note that (i) the larger the sponsored research fund size, the higher the  
227 unaccounted-for cost amount; and (ii) though the median total costs for non-biomedical  
228 donor-funded projects were more than 1.4 times higher than those for non-biomedical  
229 projects, the median of unaccounted-for costs for biomedical donor-funded projects was 1.7  
230 times higher than the median of non-biomedical projects (USD 186,403 vs. 112,875,34.3 vs.  
231 12.5% of total budgets respectively).

232 Figure 1 shows the comparison of the proportion of hidden/unaccounted-for costs to total  
233 direct costs for biomedical and non-biomedical sponsored research projects. It can be  
234 observed that the proportion of unaccounted-for costs for biomedical research is considerably  
235 higher than for non-biomedical sponsored research.

236



237 KCMUCo = Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College; MUHAS = Muhimbili University of Health and  
238 Allied Sciences; CUHAS = Catholic University of Health and Allied Sciences


240 **Figure 1: Comparison of proportion of unaccounted-for costs to total direct costs by**  
241 **type of project according to study institution.**

242

243 Figure 2 shows the proportion of indirect costs to total direct costs, that is indirect cost rate  
244 (ICR) according to study institution by type of sponsored research (biomedical vs. non-

245 biomedical). It can be observed that the indirect cost rates for biomedical research are  
 246 relatively higher than for non-biomedical. The average indirect cost rate for biomedical  
 247 research for the three study institutions is 30.9 percent (range = 13.3-57.7%) compared to  
 248 non-biomedical with average ICR of 9.9 percent (range = 1.1-15.4%). In general, the average  
 249 indirect cost rates for both biomedical and non-biomedical sponsored research are small.

250  
 251  
 252  
 253  
 254  
 255  
 256  
 257  
 258  
 259  
 260  
 261  
 262  
 263  
 264  
 265  
 266



267 KCMUCo = Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College; MUHAS = Muhimbili University of Health and  
 268 Allied Sciences; CUHAS = Catholic University of Health and Allied Sciences

269 **Figure 2: Proportion of indirect costs to total amount of direct costs by type of project**  
 270 **according to study institution**

271 A total of 27 individuals participated in interviews. The majority were male, and seven held  
 272 senior administrative leadership positions. Most of the participants had been with their  
 273 institutions for more than 10 years. The demographic characteristics of the participants are  
 274 summarized in Table 3.

275 **Table 3. In-depth interview participants' demographic characteristics**

Variable	Frequency	%
<b>Name of institution:</b>		
KCMUCo	10	37
MUHAS	7	26
CUHAS	10	37
<b>Gender of participant:</b>		
Female	6	22.2

Male	21	77.8
<b>Age of participant (years):</b>		
Mean (SD)	52.3 (12.7)	
< 45	10	37
45 – 60	9	33.3
>60	8	29.6
<b>Highest academic qualification:</b>		
Masters' degree	10	37
Doctorate degree	17	63
<b>Primary field of work:</b>		
Senior Administrator	7	25.9
Investigator/Scientist	13	48.2
Junior Administrator	4	14.8
Research Administrator	3	11.1
<b>Duration at the institution (years):</b>		
Mean (SD)	15.1 (9.1)	
<10	9	33.3
10 - 19	12	44.4
>20	6	22.2

276 KCMUCo = Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College; MUHAS = Muhimbili Health and Allied  
277 Sciences; CUHAS Catholic University of Health and Allied Sciences; SD = Standard deviation  
278

279 Three major themes emerged from interviews with key stakeholders of sponsored research;  
280 costing practices, unaccounted-for costs, and budget negotiating power of sponsored  
281 research.

282

### 283 **Costing and Financial Practices Associated with Sponsored Projects**

284 In exploring participants' perceptions of the financial policies and procedures related to  
285 budget preparations, overwhelmingly there were issues such as determination of costs for the  
286 sponsored projects including indirect costs and their perceptions of indirect cost adequacy.

### 287 **Budgeting for Sponsored Projects**

288 Universally, participants stated that budget development is an important step in ensuring  
289 efficient costing for research. Most participants mentioned there were no set standards used  
290 for budget development. Participants described a lack of skills in budgeting as being a  
291 limitation. Most of them highlighted the importance of training and developing the budgeting  
292 skills of researchers and administrators.

293 *I think what guides budgeting is really the donor regulations on budgeting.. Some people eventually budgeted*  
294 *for things which are not allowable. Again, that is lack of know how in writing proposals and research*  
295 *administration because research administrators should be able to guide researchers. [Senior Administrator,*  
296 *>10, Male]*

297

298 Despite the lack of sponsored research budgeting skills, researchers were therefore expected  
299 to develop their budgets. This was not ideal, and participants recommended developing  
300 capacity in research administration.

301 *Researchers cannot be experts in budgeting. You need to create that capacity for individuals, actually, even*  
302 *accountants who are trained in preparing budgets for research grants. Because then, they will have no conflict*  
303 *of interest, but they will also have a broader view of the institution to look at the visible and invisible costs.*  
304 *[Senior Scientist, >10, Male]*

305 When asked about financial policies related to sponsored projects, participants did not know  
306 of their existence at their institution. Participants reported that even though institutions had  
307 policies on research costing, there are limitations and the policies could not account for all  
308 budget and cost elements.

309 *But we have policies that are guiding two things. One policy is guiding institutional overhead. Another policy is*  
310 *guiding the level of effort. Those are the only two things that we are worried and caring for. The rest of the*  
311 *things really depend on the grant. [Junior Scientist, <10, Male]*

312

### 313 **Indirect/Overhead and Unaccounted-for Costs**

314 A majority of participants said that not all costs associated with a sponsored project were  
315 covered by the funding agencies. The indirect/overhead cost funds allocated by projects were  
316 not adequate to cover for unaccounted project costs. Some commented that some funding  
317 agencies had a fixed percentage for the overhead costs.

318 *.....from NIH funded projects is fixed. This is supposed to cater for so many things including research*  
319 *administration and utilities, but they had a whole hall full of very heavy-duty freezers, you see, so you're*

320 *actually not recovering anything from the project to pay for the utilities because that overhead charge is fixed at*  
321 *8%. So it was peanuts. [Senior Administrator, >10, Male]*

322

323 *... don't think so, because some of these are invisible. Are invisible costs. It's not easy to cost them. One might*  
324 *argue that whatever is being provided is institution overheads, would cover some of these elements are difficult*  
325 *to justify in a research project. [Senior Scientist, >10, Male]*

326

327 Some participants described these standards as being ideal for local research and focused on  
328 overheads, but none existed for donor-funded research or they were not formalized.

329 *We don't have a standard, MUHAS standard, for grants. We have our institutional standards for IRB. So when*  
330 *you're applying for IRB, there is a number of items that we need to hear from you, how we're paying the staff,*  
331 *what will be the cost of fieldwork? What will be the cost of materials? Et cetera. Quite close to that. But we don't*  
332 *have a standard or format for grants for sponsored projects, because each sponsored project, each organization*  
333 *has their own kind of templates, budget templates and standards. [Junior Scientist, <10, Male]*

334

335 Some of the participants lamented the lack of data and wished for a national forum to provide  
336 guidance on negotiation of overhead costs.

337 *We don't have facts and figures for negotiation. We don't have a high policy body in the country that is speaking*  
338 *for all scientists in the country, that is speaking for the conduct of research in the country. You know now for*  
339 *example, when it comes to ethics issues, we have more voices, because in health research, it is the national*  
340 *health research ethics committee at NIMR which is the pillar. And our collaborators know, they require this and*  
341 *this and this, no squabbles. So we needed something of that nature in order to kind of come up with a formula*  
342 *system, and facts and figures about institutional overhead cost. Not leaving for the institutions to negotiate.*  
343 *[Senior Scientist, >10, Male]*

344

345 Participants also described some unaccounted costs including insurance, tax, electricity,  
346 space, water and others that were not allowable by sponsors or whose justification would  
347 require expert negotiation.

348 *The other issue is insurance. It's very uncommon to see medical equipment insured. But I think this is something*  
349 *that needs to move in that direction. Because people will just say, "Okay, I budget for in terms of a breakdown,*  
350 *I'll do this and that." But what about insurance?. So obviously those are things that are often overlooked in the*  
351 *budget, but unfortunately also often not allowed. [Junior Scientist, <10, Male]*

352

353 *And it was not enough even to maintain the freezers. So that is another gray area that the imposing of a fixed*  
354 *overhead cost to the institutions sometimes force the institutions to pay from other sources for their utilities like*  
355 *water, electricity, especially electricity et cetera. Of course, there is the other thing which is not put in the*  
356 *equation, the people who are supporting research on a daily basis. So if your charge is only 8%, and electricity*  
357 *is taking more than 8%, you cannot even support the conduct of research or support research assistants who*  
358 *are not part of the research. [Senior Administrator, >10, Male]*

359

360 Another participant said his institution had to squeeze other operations to cover for research  
361 due to low funding.

362 *You have to recast, cast down your numbers to ensure that you live within your budget. And in doing that, you*  
363 *find that, in most cases, you have to squeeze yourself or squeeze some operations so that you can live within*  
364 *your budget. That's how we do it [Junior Administrator, <10, Male]*

365

### 366 **Budget Negotiating Power**

367 A majority of the participants described the lack of negotiation power as being a big  
368 limitation in budgeting and costing for sponsored research projects. Almost all noted their  
369 institutions had a low negotiation power when deciding on rates used for budgeting.

370 *Well, the budgets are developed, guided by the donor regulations that you have.... I think what guides budgeting*  
371 *is really the donor regulations on budgeting. Again, that is lack of know how in writing proposals and research*  
372 *administration because research administrators should be able to guide staff. [Senior Administrator, >10,*  
373 *Male]*

374

375 Some noted that some donor funding agencies had some room for negotiation for overheads.

376 *For example, in Europe, some funding agencies were ready to negotiate, and by the time you got to negotiation,*  
377 *you've already calculated the amount of utilities' costs and you factor that in your negotiations to make sure*  
378 *you're not going to lose in terms of overhead, to make sure you're not going to pay from your other sources to*  
379 *supplement utilities for research. So I very much support the idea of negotiation for overheads. [Senior*  
380 *Administrator, >10, Male]*

381

## 382 **Discussion**

383 This study aimed to describe the costing practices of sponsored research practices in IHLs in  
384 LMICs and their implications for the unaccounted-for costs that are borne by these IHLs. Our  
385 study demonstrated that the higher the amount of the sponsored project, the higher are the  
386 unaccounted-for costs. Also, we established that despite the median total amount of non-  
387 biomedical sponsored projects being about one-and-a-half times that of biomedical projects,  
388 the median amount of unaccounted-for costs for biomedical projects was more than twice that  
389 of non-biomedical projects, which implies that unaccounted costs for biomedical sponsored  
390 research are considerably higher than those for non-biomedical sponsored research projects.

391 Through interviews with key stakeholders of research at three large IHLs in Tanzania,  
392 costing and financial practices associated with sponsored projects were weak, especially in  
393 budget preparation, and overhead cost estimations were inadequate. Negotiating power  
394 between funders and IHLs was also found to be lopsided, leading to unaccounted-for costs  
395 associated with sponsored projects.

396 The fact that the higher the total amount of the sponsored research, the higher the  
397 unaccounted-for costs could be attributed to higher indirect costs of the human resource  
398 component (for non-biomedical), including the high-tech equipment component (for  
399 biomedical projects) that are included in such projects. As expected, such projects may  
400 involve a large and diversified group of human resources for non-biomedical, and high-tech



401 equipment for biomedical research projects, leading to increased amount of unaccounted  
402 costs.

403 Ehrenberg and Mykula<sup>6</sup> assert that there is a perception among principal investigators that by  
404 excluding some of the indirect costs, the chance of getting funds for sponsored research  
405 increases. This propensity may be directly related to the size of the amount to be funded to  
406 the sponsored research. Furthermore, applicants may exclude some indirect costs such as  
407 salaries of administrative staff, rental of facilities, and infrastructure upgrades with the  
408 assumption that they are unallowable by the funder<sup>14</sup>. A US National Science Foundation  
409 report in 1991 enumerated deficiencies in calculation and application of indirect costs of  
410 federally sponsored research in educational and other institutions, including underestimating  
411 indirect costs to make an applicant's grant more competitive and assigning responsibility for  
412 reviewing indirect costs to staff who have inadequate experience or training to accomplish  
413 the assignment effectively<sup>15</sup>. Also, in most instances, the indirect cost rates in LMIC are  
414 based on what the funder allows or are an estimated rate<sup>14</sup>. Due to this fact, there is a wide  
415 variation of indirect cost rates in LMICs, with rates varying from 0% to 15% of direct costs<sup>14</sup>  
416 (ESSENCE, 2012a). As a result of these factors, the recovered indirect costs from a grant  
417 award rarely cover the actual indirect costs required for a research project<sup>10, 11</sup>.

418 This study also found that although the median amount for non-biomedical sponsored  
419 projects was higher than that of biomedical, the reverse was the case for the median amount  
420 of unaccounted costs, implying that unaccounted costs for biomedical research projects are  
421 generally higher than for non-biomedical. This could be attributed to the differences in the  
422 inherent nature of biomedical vs. non-biomedical sponsored research projects. Most  
423 biomedical research involves clinical trials, which are studies using volunteers designed to  
424 answer safety and efficacy questions about interventions<sup>15</sup> and are thus characterized by  
425 longer durations, high-tech equipment, varied supplies, and larger number and more

426 diversified human resources. Non-biomedical research in medical schools is most commonly  
427 geared toward enhancing medical education and therefore is mostly cross-sectional research  
428 primarily involving the human resource component.

429 Participants described weak fiscal policy pertaining to sponsored research efforts at their  
430 IHL. Given that funding agencies provide guidance or suggestions on allowable costs,  
431 budgeting policies to fully account for associated costs for sponsored research projects are  
432 important in determining the feasibility of executing a sponsored program. Negotiating power  
433 for budgeting and costing for sponsored research projects was deemed to be lopsided and  
434 favoring the funding agencies. Awards for sponsored research had a stipulated budget amount  
435 and overhead cost rate that were not negotiable. Overhead cost rates were deemed inadequate  
436 by study participants, and mostly have a fixed rate overhead rate. For example, the US NIH  
437 funds facilities and administrative costs at a fixed rate of 8 percent of modified total direct  
438 costs<sup>16</sup> With this stipulation, there is need for the IHL to cover unaccounted costs as  
439 described by the participants. The continued burden of covering unaccounted-for costs at  
440 IHLs in LMICs threatens the research enterprise sustainability. It is therefore important for  
441 IHLs and funding agencies to work together to develop fair overhead rates for IHLs.

442 Initiatives to establish offices of research and sponsored programs (ORSPs) or enhance the  
443 services of existing ORSPs that were supported by the NIH are critically needed<sup>17</sup>.

444 Results from this study should be interpreted with caution. This was an exploratory attempt to  
445 highlight costs that IHLs incur by undertaking sponsored research. First, the findings may  
446 contain inherent weaknesses pertinent to its retrospective nature such as confounding and  
447 selection bias, as well as potential unreliability of secondary data. Second, it was not possible  
448 to examine the external validity of the study for purposes of determining the generalizability  
449 of findings to other LMIC IHLs. Also, participants were recruited from three large IHLs and  
450 results may not be generalizable to all IHLs in Tanzania and other LMICs. Moreover, despite

451 participants being reassured of anonymity of their responses with no impact on their roles at  
452 their IHL to limit social desirability bias, they may still have been inclined to respond in a  
453 positive manner. Despite the fact that the findings from this study are specific to three IHLs  
454 in Tanzania, their implications could be relevant to other medical schools and IHLs in  
455 Tanzania, sub-Saharan Africa, and LMICs worldwide. To our knowledge this is the first  
456 study that has explored the views on sponsored research of different cadres of personnel at  
457 IHLs in Tanzania.

#### 458 **Conclusion**

459 The study demonstrated that there were unaccounted-for costs for sponsored projects. We  
460 found that the larger the amount of the sponsored project budget, the higher the amount of  
461 unaccounted-for costs. This is consequential to LMIC institutions because it may be difficult  
462 to recover the full cost of a specific sponsored project, regardless of whether the project is  
463 biomedical or non-biomedical. Given this deficit in cost recovery from sponsored projects,  
464 there is a direct negative impact on their ability to sustain the research enterprise and  
465 sponsored projects may drain meager institutional resources.

466 Costing and financial practices associated with sponsored research projects were weak,  
467 especially in the budget preparation, and overhead cost estimation. Negotiating power for  
468 budgeting and costing for sponsored research projects was lopsided and favored the funding  
469 agencies. Awards for sponsored research had a stipulated budget amount and overhead cost  
470 rate that were not negotiable, and indirect cost rates were deemed inadequate.

471 It is imperative for IHLs and funding agencies to cooperate in developing equitable and fair  
472 indirect cost rates. This effort is especially important when the decolonization movement in  
473 global health is highly visible and active. In summary, there is a gap of understanding and  
474 practice of indirect cost recovery and reimbursement policies and practices within the context  
475 of sponsored research projects and the research funding model at IHLs in LMICs. IHLs and

476 funding agencies should intentionally work to reduce the inequity in research that is currently  
477 experienced.

478 **Author contributions:** ATK - Conceptualization, investigation, project administration,  
479 writing the manuscript; GEK- Formal Analysis, methodology and visualization; JAB -  
480 Validation, supervision, review and editing the manuscript; CM - Methodology, data  
481 curation and original draft preparation; and SdeJ – Supervision


482 Acknowledgements: The authors thank all the stakeholders including study participants,  
483 Leadership at MUHAS, KCMUCo, CUHAS who participated to provide inputs to develop  
484 this piece of work that advocates resources' equity across the globe.

#### 485 **References**

- 1 World University rankings [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2019 June 30]. Available from: <http://roundranking.com/ranking/world-university-rankings.html#world-2019>.
- 2 African Union. *Assembly of the African Union Eight Ordinary Session – Decisions and declarations* [Internet]. Available from: [https://au.int/sites/default/files/decisions/9556-assembly\\_en\\_29\\_30\\_January\\_2007\\_auc\\_the\\_african\\_union\\_eighth\\_ordinary\\_session.pdf](https://au.int/sites/default/files/decisions/9556-assembly_en_29_30_January_2007_auc_the_african_union_eighth_ordinary_session.pdf). Retrieved May 30, 2019
- 3 Franzen, SR, Chandler, C, & Lang, T. 'Health research capacity development in low- and middle-income countries: reality or rhetoric? A systematic meta-narrative review of the qualitative literature,' *BMJ Open*. 2017; 7, p.e012332
- 4 Musiige, G., Maassen, P. 'Faculty perceptions of the factors that influence research productivity at Makerere University' in N. Cloete, P. Maassen, and T. Bailey (eds), *Knowledge Production and Contradictory Functions in African Higher Education*. Cape Town: African Minds; 2015.
- 5 ESSENCE on Health Research (2020) *The Five Keys To Improving Research Costing and Pricing in Low-and Middle-Income Countries* [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Nov 12]. Available at <https://www.who.int/tdr/partnerships/essence/en/>
- 6 Ehrenberg, RG, & Mykula, JK. Merit pay for school superintendents? (NBER Working Paper Series No. 6976) [Electronic version]. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research; 1999.
- 7 Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. "Funding the Institutional Costs of Research: An International Perspective" [Internet]. 2009 [cited 2020 Sept 01]. Available from: <https://www.uoguelph.ca/research/document/funding-institutional-costs-researchinternational-perspective>

- 8 Office of Sponsored Programs, Southern Illinois University (2019). *Guidelines* [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2019 June 30]. Available from: [https://ospa.siu.edu/\\_common/documents/IDC%20Guidelines.pdf](https://ospa.siu.edu/_common/documents/IDC%20Guidelines.pdf).
- 9 Fonn S, Hu J, Igumbor JO, et al. Quantifying the cost of in-kind contributions to a multi-donor-funded health research capacity building programme: the case of the Consortium for Advanced Research Training in Africa. *BMJ Global Health* 2020;5:e002286. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2020-002286
- 10 Watt, C, & Higerd, T. Indirect costs and other uses of facilities data at institutions. *New Directions for Institutions*. 2007;135: 47–61. doi:10.1002/ir.222.
- 11 Wimsatt, L, Trice, A, & Langley, D. ‘Faculty perspectives on academic work and administrative burden: Implications for the design of effective support services.’ *Free Library*. September 22, 2009 [cited 2010 Nov 17]. Available from: [http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Faculty Perspectives on Academic Work and Administrative Burden...a0213601797](http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Faculty+Perspectives+on+Academic+Work+and+Administrative+Burden...a0213601797).
- 12 Goldman CA, Williams T, Adamson DM, Rosenblatt K. Paying for University Research Facilities and Administration. 2000. Available from: [https://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\\_reports/MR1135.html](https://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR1135.html)
- 13 Association of American Universities (AAU) and the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities (APLU). *Understanding the costs of federally sponsored research at universities*. October 2013. Available from: <https://www.ucop.edu/research-policy-analysis-coordination/policies-guidance/indirect-cost-recovery/Understanding-the-Costs-of-Federally-Sponsored-Research-at-Universities.pdf>
- 14 ESSENCE. *Five keys to improving research costing in low- and middle-income countries*. Geneva: ESSENCE, TDR/WHO. 2012a. Available from: [http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2012/TDR\\_ESSENCE\\_1.12\\_eng.pdf](http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2012/TDR_ESSENCE_1.12_eng.pdf)
- 15 Office for the Protection of Human Subjects - University of Illinois. *Types of research* [Internet]. n.d. [cited 2021 June 22]. Available from: <https://oprs.research.illinois.edu>.
- 15 Office of the Inspector General, National Science Foundation Report. *Federally sponsored research: How indirect costs are charged by educational and other research institutions*. 1991 [cited 2021 Sept 22]. Available from: <https://www.nsf.gov/pubs/1997/oig912/oig912.pdf>.
- 16 NIH. (2021). *Reimbursement of facilities and administrative costs* [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Oct. 01]. Available from: [https://grants.nih.gov/grants/policy/nihgps/html5/section\\_7/7.4\\_reimbursement\\_of\\_facilities\\_and\\_administrative\\_costs.htm](https://grants.nih.gov/grants/policy/nihgps/html5/section_7/7.4_reimbursement_of_facilities_and_administrative_costs.htm).
- 17 DHHS. *Biomedical/Biobehavioral Research Administration Development (BRAD) Award (G11)* [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Oct. 1]. Available from: <https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PAR-14-333.html>.

**Figure 1: Comparison of proportion of unaccounted-for costs to total direct costs by type of project according to study institution.**




KCMUCo = Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College;

MUHAS = Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences;

CUHAS = Catholic University of Health and Allied Sciences

**Figure 2: Proportion of indirect costs to total amount of direct costs by type of project according to study institution**



KCMUCo = Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College;

MUHAS = Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences;

CUHAS = Catholic University of Health and Allied Sciences