

Issue paper:
Towards a future knowledge
agenda and infrastructure
for development

*A discussion on the WRR
report 'Less pretention, more
ambition. Development aid
that makes a difference'*

Colophon

This issue paper, compiled by Kim de Vries (interviews and analysis) and Mirjam Ros (reporting of DPRN workshop at the CERES-EADI Summer School), is part of the process entitled 'Structure follows strategy: the future of Dutch International Development cooperation' (<http://structurefollowsstrategy.dprn.nl/>), organised by the Development Policy Review Network (DPRN). The paper served as input for a workshop during the CERES Summer School on 24 June 2010, and the outcomes of this workshop discussion have been included in the paper. With the aim being to stimulate informed debate and a discussion of issues related to the formulation and implementation of development policies, DPRN creates opportunities to promote an open exchange and dialogue between scientists, policymakers, development practitioners and the business sector in the Netherlands and Flanders. For more information see www.DPRN.nl and www.global-connections.nl.

Contents

	Page
Acronyms	4
Executive summary	5
Introduction	6
Policy versus science	7
Understanding development	9
Development according to the WRR	9
Economics, environment and institutions	10
States, society and stability	11
Scales and generalisability	13
Dutch knowledge for development	14
Knowledge infrastructure	16
Coordination	16
Knowledge from the South	17
Transdisciplinarity	18
Discussion	19
Conclusions	23
Appendix 1 – List of respondents	25
Appendix 2 – Interview scheme (in Dutch)	27
Appendix 3 – Programme of the DPRN workshop at the CERES–EADI Summer School	33
Appendix 4 – List of registered participants in the CERES–EADI Summer School meeting	35
Appendix 5 – Presentation of the interview outcomes at the CERES–EADI Summer School	37
Appendix 6 – Presentation at the CERES–EADI Summer School by Ton Dietz	38

Acronyms

3D	Defence, development and diplomacy
ASC	African Studies Centre, Leiden
CERES	Research School for Resource Studies for Development
CIDIN	Centre for International Development Studies, Radboud University Nijmegen
DPRN	Development Policy Review Network
EADI	European Association of Development and Training Institutes
ISS	Institute of Social Studies, The Hague
MDG	Millenium Development Goal
NUFFIC	Netherlands Universities Foundation for International Cooperation
NWO	Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research
OCW	Ministry of Education, Culture and Science
WOTRO	WOTRO Science for Development (formerly: Foundation for the Advancement of Tropical Research), The Hague
WRR	Scientific Council for Government Policy

‘Towards a future knowledge agenda and infrastructure for development’

Executive summary

This issue paper is part of the ‘Structure follows strategy: the future of Dutch International Development cooperation’ process (<http://structurefollowsstrategy.dprn.nl/>), organised by the Development Policy Review Network (DPRN). It presents the results of 17 interviews with Dutch professors in development studies and related disciplines, held in response to the publication of the WRR report, with a view to hearing their opinions on the knowledge that is available for the development agenda in the coming years and the research infrastructure that would be most appropriate as regards realising this agenda.

The interviews revealed that a discussion on the future knowledge agenda and infrastructure for development is appreciated, but that the scientists also experience a certain dilemma between policy-orientation and scientific autonomy. While most of the respondents were positive about a more strategic and clearly focussed knowledge agenda for development, some of them also stress the need for a certain degree of scientific autonomy in setting research priorities, and warn against an excessive focus on policy-oriented research. Especially, the policy agenda, focused on a few Millennium Development Goals, is generally considered too small to inspire a research agenda.

Whereas most interviewees sympathised with the view expressed in the WRR report that research should support development as a process of accelerated growth guided by a stable and responsive state, there were also some remarks in this respect. Respondents advocated interdisciplinary research on the relationships between economic growth and environmental sustainability, redistribution and institutional processes, state responsiveness and stability, and bottom-up social development. The general view is that a less normative outlook, which takes account of the interlinkages of scales, would lead to an improved understanding of development processes. In the eyes of the respondents, Dutch knowledge in various areas (*e.g.* agriculture and food production, water, law & justice, health & infectious diseases, civil society, and the 3D approach) could certainly contribute to more specialised development policies, but they stress that defining major strategic questions should precede this choice of thematic areas. This might, in turn, result in different thematic and geographic focus areas than those advocated by the WRR.

According to the respondents, the Dutch knowledge infrastructure needed to implement this agenda should be characterised by coordination in the form of strategic funding of networks by NWO/WOTRO and an aligned knowledge agenda at the various ministries involved in international cooperation. Investing in regional networks in the South and long-term partnerships with Southern research institutes are also important factors, although there might be a tension between capacity development and academic excellence. Lastly, transdisciplinary initiatives should be strengthened, so as to increase knowledge of context-specific innovations, with more attention for the ways scientific research can best be communicated to other actors.

Introduction

In its latest and widely debated report entitled ‘Minder pretentie, meer ambitie. Ontwikkelingshulp die verschil maakt’ (‘Less pretention, more ambition. Development aid that makes a difference’), the Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR)¹ advocated an outspoken vision on development and the ways (Dutch) aid should contribute to it. The WRR defines development as an accelerated process of modernisation aimed at the self-sufficiency of countries and people. Using the ‘Western’ model of modernisation as a general basis, the WRR emphasises the need to create a productive economy, a responsive state and an open society.

The WRR makes two strong recommendations for more effective aid policies. In order for Dutch aid strategies to stimulate development they should, first and foremost, be more specific by concentrating on a limited number of countries and specialising in certain thematic sectors. Secondly, development policies should be broadened to take account of global public goods and to promote coherence with other non-classical development policy domains. These recommendations are underlined by the need for a more professional organisation of development aid, which implies greater investments in knowledge. This knowledge should then be used for context-specific analyses to determine the greatest barriers to development and to identify opportunities for intervention (the diagnostic approach).

According to the WRR the knowledge infrastructure for development is organised in the Netherlands in a remarkably poor manner, especially when compared to other countries (such as the United Kingdom) and policy domains (like healthcare and education). Learning would not be sufficiently internalised by organisations that deal with development, and the WRR advocates a more coordinated knowledge agenda. Furthermore, the budget for knowledge development would be too small (EUR 200 million per year, of which EUR 40 million is available for research programmes).

Against the background of these statements, the Development Policy Review Network (DPRN) has decided to launch a debate on the implications of the WRR analysis for the development-related knowledge agenda and infrastructure. This paper, for which 17 Dutch professors in development studies and related disciplines were interviewed (see Appendices 1 and 2), reflects specifically on the ways academic research can contribute to knowledge for development and how this could be organised. A draft version of this paper was discussed during the CERES-EADI² Summer School 2010 of which the outcomes are presented below in a separate section. The debate will be continued in a follow-up conference to be organised

¹ WRR (2010). *Minder pretentie, meer ambitie. Ontwikkelingshulp die verschil maakt*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University press. Available online at: <http://www.wrr.nl/content.jsp?objectid=5213>.

² The CERES Research School for Resource Studies for Development is a network of Dutch development scientists from six universities and thirteen other research institutions. The European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes (EADI) is a professional network of development research and training organisations, think tanks, national bodies and researchers in Europe.

in cooperation with WOTRO Science for Development.³ The debate is part of the DPRN process entitled 'Structure follows strategy: The future of Dutch International Development cooperation' (<http://structurefollowsstrategy.dprn.nl/>) that started two years ago and in which DPRN has held a broad discussion on the strategy and architecture of Dutch international cooperation.

This paper first presents the respondents' general perception of development policy-relevant knowledge. Next, it presents the WRR's definition of development and the research needs that result from it, according to the scientists interviewed. The following section describes the respondents' views on how knowledge can be put to use for Dutch development policies. After that the respondents' views on the knowledge infrastructure required for more effective development policy are presented. Before drawing conclusions, the paper outlines the discussion that was held during the CERES-EADI Summer School 2010 when a draft version of this paper was presented.

Policy versus science

The first issue that was raised in the interviews is to what extent the scientific knowledge agenda is to be guided by the policy-oriented recommendations of the WRR. Should the academic community be regarded as being autonomous when it comes to setting their knowledge priorities, or should they indeed align with a broader knowledge agenda set out by government policy? During the interviews it was clear that there was some disagreement on this point.

On the one hand, most respondents were positive about a more strategic and clearly focussed knowledge agenda and stressed the need for greater investments in knowledge. In this respect the severe budget cuts for knowledge institutions that have recently been proposed to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' International cooperation programmes, were considered to be unwise. The recommendation of the WRR to specialise Dutch aid in certain specialised thematic areas out of enlightened self-interest was generally welcomed. It was believed that (both Dutch and international) research could strongly contribute to better policymaking in this respect. This is in line with the recent advice by the Advisory Council for Science and Technology Policy (AWT)⁴, which emphasises that knowledge development for global challenges can benefit particularly from contributions to those key domains ('*sleutelgebieden*') in which the Netherlands has a comparative advantage.

On the other hand, some respondents were not too happy about taking the WRR report as a starting point for the discussion of a future knowledge agenda and infrastructure. Even though they recognised the importance of the report for deepening the public debate, they stated that it was up to the scientific community itself to set their knowledge priorities. Some

³ WOTRO Science for Development is the division of the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) which supports scientific research on development issues, in particular poverty alleviation and sustainable development.

⁴ AWT (2010). *Kennis zonder grenzen. Kennis en innovatie in mondiaal perspectief*. Rijswijk: Quantes. Available online at: <http://www.awt.nl/uploads/files///Adviezen/a74.pdf>

argued that the WRR would not be sufficiently up-to-date on scientific debates and would stress certain points (like the need for more coordination and the preference for centralised institutes) without much substantiation. Some also feared a narrowing of the knowledge agenda if the recommendations about specialisation (geographical focus and certain thematic areas) were actually adopted.

The somewhat more negative response to the policy recommendations for the knowledge agenda may be attributed to a broader complaint by academia which reflects a trend whereby research (funding) has increasingly been directed towards policy themes, including in other countries (such as the UK or Sweden). Scientists may therefore feel that they are losing ownership as regards setting their agenda. Many of the development-related research programmes place a major emphasis on policy relevancy and, in the Netherlands, are mostly part-financed by WOTRO Science for Development, which follows the Dutch government's focus on Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)⁵. In particular, the focus on MDGs which lack attention for the structural causes of poverty, was found to be too narrow to inspire research questions.

In line with this, several respondents complained that Dutch development research focused too much on studying the effectiveness of development policies and instruments, with scientists focusing excessively on 'describing donor problems in donor terminology'. They emphasised the fact that more attention should be directed towards the investigation of broader development processes, irrespective of donor policies.

Despite this expression of discontentment with policy-oriented research, many respondents identified a considerable need for researchers to develop better impact evaluation studies, an issue that is also stressed by the WRR. Although opinions differed on the extent to which development results can be measured⁶ and attributed to specific interventions, respondents advocated more advanced evaluation methodologies and more structural long-term evaluation studies. They also stated that, in order to assess whether policies have actually resulted in the intended goals, these goals have to be defined more clearly and the variables that may influence the outcomes of development projects have to be described more precisely in advance. They also recommended that the focus of these studies should not be predominantly on economic development indicators, but should include other development indicators of a more political, environmental and social nature as well.⁷

⁵ WOTRO defined four MDG-inspired themes for its thematic framework in the period 2007–2010, namely poverty and hunger, global health and health systems, sustainable environment and global relationships.

⁶ Respondents especially criticised the predominant focus on quantitative results measured in excessively early stages of development projects, something that was also described as a 'fallacy of misplaced concreteness'.

⁷ Someone also mentioned that a good and logical indicator of the impact of development policies would be the reduction in the amount of aid given.

Understanding development

This section describes the various views on how to analyse development. The respondents were asked to reflect on the definition of development as presented in the WRR report, as well as on the research needs that they considered relevant. Before presenting the outcomes of the interviews below, this section first summarises the view on development put forward in the WRR report.

Development according to the WRR

The WRR defines development as an accelerated process of modernisation aimed at the self-sufficiency of countries, which is understood to be a synchronised transition of the four domains of economy, government, political system and society.⁸ The WRR follows the Western capitalistic model of modernisation as occurred from the nineteenth century onwards, but recognises at the same time that each country has its own development path to follow and starts out from a unique position. It therefore criticises universal policy prescriptions and stresses that aid strategies should be country specific.

Despite recognising the context specificity of development processes, the WRR notes that lessons learned from the history of developed countries may also apply to developing countries. The economic and governmental domains are most important in this regard and they should be seen in relation to each other. Indeed, they need each other to function properly. As for the economic domain, an important lesson that needs to be learned is that economic growth can primarily be stimulated by investments in agriculture, which may lead to industrialisation and urbanisation. As for the governmental domain, the WRR argues that development can be stimulated best by so-called developmental states, which consist of a coalition of leaders, elites and interest groups, rooted in the common idea that long-term growth is in the interest of everyone. On the other hand, neo-patrimonial states⁹ would not be able to foster development. The WRR also stresses that states should endorse strategies that enhance growth (instead of the market). Moreover, redistribution is not initially addressed – based on the belief that, without growth, there is little to divide – and only becomes apparent when middle classes are gaining importance.

The WRR's advice to focus Dutch aid strategies primarily on Sub-Saharan African countries is based on the identification of major problems for these countries in the above-mentioned domains. As for the economic domain, investments in agriculture have been delayed because

⁸ Development should lead respectively to the creation of (i) a well-developed and productive economic system embedded in international trade relations; (ii) a government apparatus capable of providing (or facilitating the provision of) essential services such as education, healthcare, shelter and security; (iii) a political system that guarantees collective decision-making processes which allow citizens to feel connected to the outcomes of those processes and to each other; and (iv) a society that is sufficiently open and offers the space to pursue diverse individual and collective development ambitions.

⁹ The WRR report defines a neo-patrimonial state as a state without an effective public sphere and a government structure determined mainly by personal relations and personal gain. As such, the WRR report puts it in contrast to a developmental state.

of difficult and varied natural and climatic conditions, and the absence of strong institutions that invest in the sector. As for the governmental domain, effective state formation is believed to be hindered by neo-patrimonial characteristics, and the fact that it has been largely imposed from the outside during the Colonial Era.

The political and social domains are less clearly defined. As far as the political domain is concerned, the WRR mentions that democracy does not guarantee stability per se, but that it is dependent first and foremost on the capacity of a state to be responsive (which includes the subordination of police and army) and transparent. As far as the social domain is concerned – or ‘social fabric’ as the WRR calls it – the WRR stresses that a certain degree of social bonding is crucial for the proper functioning of institutions. Shared norms and values make it easier to aim for common goals. Lack of social bonding could lead to instability (*e.g.* ethnic conflicts or corruption). The middle classes, that is groups that are able to foster stability because they demand clear rules and facilities from their governments, are of specific importance in the social domain. As the WRR argues, a broad and stable middle class benefits from continuously linking its interests to those of the government,

The definition of economic growth-oriented development has led to the recommendation being made to aim Dutch aid policies more at ‘productive’ sectors (*e.g.* agriculture and infrastructure) rather than at ‘social’ sectors (*e.g.* education, healthcare and sanitation). Moreover, the WRR stresses that more attention is needed for middle classes, rather than for the poorest groups, as they would stimulate employment and economic growth.

Economics, environment and institutions

First of all, the renewed attention in the WRR report for economic growth and productive sectors was met with a positive response, even though respondents were quick to mention that the social sectors were equally important in shaping a conducive business environment.¹⁰ In particular, research on how to stimulate technological innovation was considered necessary and this would require development researchers to become more involved with the business community and to participate in interdisciplinary research involving both social and natural scientists. Specific attention was also requested for the spatial dimensions of economics (particularly in relation to the infrastructure), in order to deepen the understanding of where to invest and how to link productive areas and markets. In this sense, development research could gain more from the knowledge of disciplines of regional economics and business administration, which are generally aimed more at developed countries. Moreover, context specificity is of particular importance when studying economic productivity. Especially in the case of Africa, it was argued that there is a need to investigate the possible drivers of change there in more detail. Should the focus be on agriculture or more on industrialisation or service provision, and what are the main obstacles?

¹⁰ As regards the latter, most respondents also argued that the productive and social sectors were presented too separately and as being opposite towards each other, something that was even more strongly emphasised in the debate that followed the publication of the report.

An inherent element of the discussion of economic growth is the debate about ecological and resource sustainability, a link that is not strongly made by the WRR. Even though the WRR recommends that a link be made between development and environmental policies, as part of its recommendation to broaden the scope of aid strategies, the subject does not figure in its definition of development. Several respondents criticised this standpoint as they believed environmental sustainability to be of utmost importance for development. One of the respondents argued that while increasing economic productivity in developing countries is considered fruitful for development, we should also recognise that this modern development project has clearly reached its ecological limits. This requires development research into how to increase economic productivity in an environmentally-sustainable manner. The trend of increased commoditisation of natural resources also throws up the question of how to make sure that the poor will also benefit from this process. Respondents therefore urged greater cooperation between development and environmental researchers, among other things because the urgency of the poverty agenda has not yet been sufficiently linked to long-term environmental research.

Most respondents stressed the need for research into the relationship between economic growth and (re)distribution, especially when stability is considered a prerequisite for development as stated by the WRR. This requires a greater focus on institutions and, with that, a stronger integration of the economic and social domains in the development analysis. Although wealth is being created and technological innovations provide solutions to poverty-related problems, large groups of poor people do not benefit from it. The key questions are then; (i) Which social structures and institutions then impede social mobility? (ii) How can we ensure that poor people actually move into a different class? (iii) What forms of social security are appropriate in different social contexts? and, (iv) Which are synergetic with respect to economic development?¹¹

A final comment that needs to be made about economic growth and institutions is that the WRR focuses predominantly on the macro level. It emphasises public policymaking by national governments. Respondents identified a need to look closer at the organisation of institutional processes that forego decision-making at national level. How do different types of socio-economic governing institutions (differentiated along territorial, public-private, and formal-informal lines) influence development? Not addressing this 'meso-gap' as the WRR does, was considered to be a methodological mistake (assuming that what works effectively at macro level is automatically translated into results at lower levels), and would not be beneficial for the creation of responsive states.

States, society and stability

Despite the criticism of the predominant focus on macro level, most respondents were happy with what the WRR terms 'the rediscovery of the state'. Especially in a period in which the effects of unregulated markets have been shown to be devastating, strong and responsive states are believed to play a vital role in providing stability. For many respondents the main challenge was therefore how to transform neoliberal policies. Some also identified the need

¹¹ It was also mentioned that research on institutions and economic growth should be gender specific.

for a closer examination of the functioning of states characterised by the Western more state-coordinated European Rijnland model, in contrast to the neo-liberal Anglo-Saxon model.

Even though the WRR recognises that an effective state does not necessarily include a representative democracy and advocates a more modest 'good enough governance' thesis, respondents commented that the WRR still reasoned too much from a normative modernisation perspective. This is also shown in the way the WRR looks at neo-patrimonial states, which it believes could not foster development because their political leaders would act out of short-term self-interest. However, the fact that the social domain is far more integrated with the economic and political domains in many developing countries does not necessarily mean a lack of development orientation. There is a need for less normative development research (by political scientists and public administrators in particular) on state formation processes. Some of the main questions are then: (i) What are the functions of clientelism? (ii) How does this relate to development? and, (iii) What may make neo-patrimonial states turn into a developmental states?¹²

A less normative perspective could also lead to a different outlook on the concept of stability. Respondents identified a need for research which draws more attention to the resilience of people in (ecological, social or economic) shock-prone contexts in which stable states and (formal) economies have not evolved to any great extent. While, from a capitalistic modernisation perspective crises, conflicts and emergencies have largely been viewed as deviations from normality, for the people living in these contexts these situations may be more gradual and adaptable than is often assumed. The suggestion is, therefore, that one should talk of resilient development instead of sustainable development, with research focusing on how people adapt to long-term stressful situations or crises. Longitudinal research results should thereby also generate an answer to the question of whether it may not be more efficient for donors to invest in these areas instead of the economically and governmental more stable areas that the WRR is advocating.

Another important area that has been identified for development research in relation to effective states concerns the interrelated issues of peace, justice and security. The WRR argues that the formal rule of law¹³ is not in itself enough to guarantee development. Respondents agreed with this, however they felt that more attention needs to be paid to the question of how people can gain access to justice as part of development. Development research would therefore benefit from more knowledge on how to create trust in legal

¹² Results from the research programme 'Tracking Development', carried out by the African Studies Centre and the KITLV/Royal Netherlands Institute of Southeast Asian and Caribbean Studies and sponsored by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, highlight the fact that neo-patrimonial states can indeed be development states and that the determining factor would be political pressure from society.

¹³ The United Nations defines the rule of law as a principle of governance in which all persons, institutions and entities, public and private, including the State itself, are accountable to laws that are publicly promulgated, equally enforced and independently adjudicated, and which are consistent with international human rights norms and standards.

institutions and jurisdiction. Moreover, more knowledge is needed on how to apply the law in pursuit of human security. This requires lawyers and scientists in the fields of political sciences and international relations to be more involved in development studies. What is more, respondents advocated research into peace and conflict management, and especially into how trust can be built in post-conflict areas. This would require social scientists to draw more attention to the 'hard' security infrastructure (*e.g.* army forces and police apparatus) and to work with defence experts such as military sociologists. In addition to this, knowledge of trust-building would benefit from research on the experiences of people in conflict situations, for example by (trauma) physiologists.

The last set of comments raised in the interviews refer to the need to develop a research agenda that does not take markets or states as the starting point for development, but which investigates social change from a 'people perspective'. Both development research and policy are believed to be inspired too much by top-down thinking, something which is also reflected in the WRR's confidence in states as the principal actors to foster stability. However, the question of how to develop more responsive states or fair markets also requires more knowledge on how societies organise their countervailing power. Which groups of people are represented by which organisational forms? How legitimate and representative are these organisations, and how are they held accountable? In this sense respondents strongly advocated an open outlook, which could be achieved by not focussing primarily on organisations that are known from a Northern context (such as NGOs or labour unions), but also other organisational forms outside the formal state circuit (such as Muslim brotherhoods or certain forms of youth culture).¹⁴ Some respondents also stressed the need to look more into how social change is influenced by new communication technologies. How do groups organise into interactive platforms and what does it mean when individuals organise themselves outside and without the help of traditional organisations?

Scales and generalisability

Most respondents welcomed the WRR's analysis that development processes are increasingly influenced by global interdependencies. Even though the WRR still primarily speaks about development as the self-sufficiency of countries¹⁵, with global trends providing a mere context, its policy recommendations for more coherence and attention for global public goods, were supported. A strong notion that arose as a result of discussing this issue with the respondents was that knowledge of development processes would benefit from a more in-depth analysis of the interlinkages of scales. Research into how development at the

¹⁴ One respondent also argued that more innovative and relevant research needs to be carried out on new forms of identity in development contexts. For instance, research dedicated to questions such as 'Which new identities and languages are formed in multi-ethnic development cities?' or, 'How can countries strengthen their national identities by building their own archaeological capacity?'

¹⁵ One criticism of taking countries as the unit of analysis is that it is debateable to what extent national borders, especially in Africa, function as such. It was also mentioned that the WRR was too state-centred in its recommendations, something which is to some extent logical given its position of principally advising the Dutch government.

regional, national and local levels is influenced by global trends, for example through value chain analysis, was therefore considered to be worthwhile.

A broader perspective on the interlinkages of scales may also bring more fundamental topics to the fore, most of which are also mentioned in the WRR report. Respondents identified a need for research into the relationship between development and the following topics: (i) climate change, (ii) urbanisation, (iii) migration, (iv) commoditisation of natural resources, and (v) infectious diseases. Related to this is the discussion about global public goods¹⁶, a topic which was not often referred to specifically in the interviews (except in the case of one respondent who mentioned that development itself should be seen as a global public good). However, the WRR, stresses that this is in fact an area which requires more research and it even recommends the creation of a special institute (a Global Issues Centre) for this purpose.

The research needs defined by respondents in response to the WRR's report show that interdisciplinary research must feature more prominently. However, some respondents mentioned from the outset that this would not be easy because knowledge of different disciplines is often not compatible. There is therefore a need for scientists who are capable of linking different disciplines, bridging knowledge divides between social and natural sciences, and integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches methodologies to a greater extent. For social scientists in particular this means that they should generalise their findings more often and think in a more 'model-like' way.

One particular suggestion for ensuring greater generalisation was to take a more systematic look at our own scientific heritage by carrying out meta-analyses which would compare research results from various case studies.¹⁷ Storing research data in digital knowledge banks was therefore also thought to be of great importance.¹⁸ Overall, respondents identified needs for both longitudinal and comparative research, not only to produce more general statements, but also to counteract what are presented as universal models or theories on social processes, which are in fact mostly inspired on a developed context. This would require large-scale research programmes, in terms of both funding and duration.

Dutch knowledge for development

This section shifts the focus from development processes to the policies that may foster it. After having identified the research needs required for a proper understanding of development processes, this section discusses the respondents' opinions with regard to the ways in which Dutch knowledge can contribute to more effective development policies.

¹⁶ Global public goods are defined as goods which are non-rival and non-excludable throughout the world (*i.e.* environment, health, peace and security, knowledge and governance).

¹⁷ This means the methodologies of the underlying studies must be of good quality (*e.g.* clear and replicable).

¹⁸ Organisations such as DANS (<http://www.dans.knaw.nl/>) and SURF (<http://www.surffoundation.nl/nl/Pages/default.aspx>) work on projects to provide free access to digital datasets.

The WRR argues that Dutch development policy is currently insufficiently effective due to a lack of focus. Interventions are spread over too many sectors and countries, thereby impeding substantial knowledge building. In order to intervene more strategically, the WRR therefore recommends a reduction in the number of partner countries (to about ten in Sub Saharan Africa), and to specialise in sectors in which the Netherlands has a comparative advantage. The WRR mentions four sectors in which the Netherlands holds a particular strong knowledge tradition, *i.e.* agriculture, water, law & justice, and HIV/AIDS. Three other sectors, with regard to which the WRR believes that the Netherlands can play an important role, are civil society strengthening, regional cooperation and integration, and coordination mechanisms for global public goods.¹⁹ Specialisation in certain sectors is believed to be beneficial because it would create more political leverage and can contribute to a division of labour between bilateral donors. An additional advantage of connecting more strongly to Dutch knowledge and traditions which has been identified by the WRR, is that it may lead the Dutch population to associate more with development policies.

Although some tension is felt in the way policy-oriented recommendations may be guiding academic research priorities, most respondents underlined the need of a more coordinated knowledge agenda. However, instead of listing Dutch expertise sectors – referred to by some as mere name dropping – as a starting point, most respondents referred to the fact that the initial focus of this agenda must be the definition of a number of strategic questions. The task of formulating these questions should be carried out by transdisciplinary working groups consisting of scientists, policymakers, and practitioners from both the Dutch and the Southern development context (also called ‘innovation circles’), who from there on analyse the areas in which the Netherlands could play a leading role.²⁰

If fundamental strategic questions (such as: (i) How to develop environmentally sustainable economies? (ii) How to create resilient cities in times of rapid urbanisation? (iii) How to provide food security when natural resources are increasingly commoditised? or (iv) How to foster peace and development in post-conflict areas?) are taken as a starting point for international cooperation, instead of predefined sectors and countries, the thematic and geographic focus areas may well be quite different to those which the WRR advocates. This is largely related to the above discussion on the interlinkages of scales and the recommendation to deepen the integration of a global perspective in the analyses of development. For instance, an international focus on environmental problems and development may lead to a focus on emerging economies (such as the BRIC²¹ countries), instead of the poorest MDG countries on which the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is currently focussing. Dutch technological expertise on waste water treatment, renewable energy

¹⁹ Respectively because the Netherlands (i) traditionally values civil society and subsidises NGOs to a great extent, (ii) has experience with regional integration in the European Union, and (iii) may fill an international knowledge gap on the issue of global public goods.

²⁰ With regard to this, some respondents regretted the fact that sectoral councils, such as the Netherlands Development Assistance Research Council (RAWOO) or the National Council for Agricultural Research (NRLO), have been abolished. One respondent mentioned that this exercise could be carried out by the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency.

²¹ The term ‘BRIC’ refers to the countries of Brazil, Russia, India and China.

sources or air pollution control, could then be used for the implementation of a policy in this area.

Even though respondents emphasised that setting knowledge priorities should follow the exercise of defining strategic questions, they generally agreed with the WRR's analysis of available expertise in the sectors of agriculture and food production, water, law & justice, and HIV/AIDS (which was often broadened to infectious diseases in general, including malaria and tuberculosis). The area of civil society strengthening in relation to the state was also mentioned as a possible focus area. Dutch knowledge of social security systems, and the experience in organising civil society–state relations in the Rijnland model, could hereby be connected more to development policies. Another area which was identified as being suitable for the Dutch development policies is that of peace and security, with more in–depth knowledge of the 3D (Defence, Development and Diplomacy) approach.

Knowledge infrastructure

This section elaborates on the respondents' views with regard to the ways in which development–related knowledge activities from scientists and other actors can be organised both in the Netherlands and in the South in order to create more effective development policies. It discusses the three main recommendations made by the WRR concerning a future knowledge infrastructure, namely the recommendation for greater coordination of knowledge activities, the strengthening of knowledge relations with Southern institutes, and the need to invest in transdisciplinary knowledge activities.²²

Coordination

The WRR recommends greater coordination of knowledge activities in the Netherlands because it considers the Dutch knowledge landscape for development to be currently too fragmented. The WRR believes that a strategically focused development policy could therefore benefit from coordinating knowledge in the form of a centralised research institute connecting policy and science (such as ODI in the United Kingdom) or in the form of more effectively organised knowledge networks.

Respondents opted for the second option. Instead of concentrating knowledge in newly to be created institutes and centres of excellence, they preferred coordination by means of centralised research funding of well–organised networks in which existing institutes

²² The other main recommendation of the WRR for improving the quality of Dutch development research, namely to make greater investments, (up to about EUR 300 million), was very warmly welcomed by respondents. However, less welcome was the WRR's related statement to the effect that the Netherlands currently lacks prominent knowledge centres for development issues. Some respondents were even quite offended by this statement. Nonetheless, there were others who felt that the quality of Dutch development research should be improved by either imposing stricter publication requirements, or by demanding more 'visibility' through promoting research on conferences, websites and in open access journals. It was claimed that these two options would also help Dutch researchers to position themselves more effectively vis-à-vis Anglo-Saxon researchers, who are more prominent in development research, as the WRR also argues.

collaborate. NWO and WOTRO could play a key role in coordinating these networks, with respondents emphasising the need to have an international outlook and hence not to restrict research funding to Dutch institutes. WOTRO should continue to draw attention to research on issues related to poverty alleviation and sustainable development, but could cooperate even more with other NWO divisions in research programmes. The recommendation of respondents to design larger-scaled research programmes (of at least EUR 1 million per programme over a period of at least five years and preferably more) should thereby be taken to heart.²³

Opinions on the possibilities for CERES to coordinate development research differed, especially because of the recent trend whereby universities participating in CERES have established their own graduate schools in PhD training and Research Masters. Respondents found that CERES had an important networking function and could stimulate interdisciplinary research collaborations.²⁴ However, it was felt to be not strong enough to coordinate a knowledge agenda for development research. One respondent therefore even argued in favour of the incorporation of CERES into WOTRO.

As far as the government is concerned, respondents stated that the research agenda should ideally be aligned between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (OCW) and other ministries involved in international affairs. Only then will the broader approach and a more coherent research knowledge agenda that the WRR report advocates be possible. As far as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is concerned, respondents particularly advocated a greater commitment to knowledge, a greater openness to learn from others and the management of more structured knowledge flows throughout the organisation.

Knowledge from the South

The WRR argues that investing in Southern research institutes is of great importance for two specific reasons. Firstly, knowledge of development would benefit from 'alternative' or 'dissonant' visions as most of the thinking is currently dominated by the knowledge produced in Anglo-Saxon institutions (the World bank in particular). To compete with this knowledge, the WRR recommends investing in new regional knowledge banks (at least one in Africa and one in Asia). The second reason is that development is a context-specific process whereby innovative solutions benefit from specific local knowledge. Knowledge building would therefore benefit from cooperation with Southern research institutes. One way of doing this is to establish partnerships between Dutch and Southern universities.

With regard to the first recommendation of the WRR, respondents felt that there was indeed a need for more diverse and context-specific perspectives on development. However, they

²³ However respondents also stressed the fact that considerable funds for innovative research outside these policy oriented domains should be retained.

²⁴ CERES was valued especially for organising PHD trainings (although some respondents argued that the quality had to be increased) and Summer Schools. Furthermore, the CERES valuation system for rating social science journals, which is more inclusive than the general ISI rating system, was found to be very relevant. This is also demonstrated by the fact that the EADI adopted the system in 2005.

warned against labelling knowledge from the South as ‘alternative’ or even representing a ‘Southern’ vision, as this would be denigrating. Instead of investing in newly created knowledge banks, respondents recommended that existing regional networks and institutions be strengthened.²⁵ Some respondents also argued against the idea of investing in banks specifically, because this would mean a bias to financially economic knowledge and applied (instead of fundamental) research.

As far as the second recommendation is concerned, respondents agreed with the need for closer and long-term cooperation with Southern research institutes.²⁶ Programmes such as IDPAD en SANPAD, in particular, were positively rewarded because of the long-term research programmes and the frequent exchange opportunities between Dutch and Southern researchers. Most respondents stressed that, in cooperating with Southern research institutes, the aim should also be to strengthen the research capacity, especially to ensure that research questions are defined and inspired from the Southern context. This would currently be prevented to some extent because there would be too many criteria imposed by Dutch institutions involved in capacity building activities, especially those of the Netherlands Universities Foundation for International Cooperation (NUFFIC).²⁷ On the other hand, some respondents mentioned that capacity building contradicts the aim to achieve academic excellence because high-quality research would require the skills of highly-qualified researchers, irrespective of their place of origin.

Transdisciplinarity

The WRR argues that knowledge building for development requires knowledge from a variety of sources other than academic science. Practitioners, policymakers, businesses and end-users should also be involved, especially because this would increase the knowledge of context-specific innovations.²⁸

²⁵ Respondents mentioned the following institutions: African Union (AU), African Development Bank Group (AfDB), Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLASCO), the Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA), the African Economic Research Consortium (AERC), and the Institute for Security of Studies (ISS).

²⁶ As regards the suggestion of partnerships with universities, one respondent suggested the reinstallation of a programme similar to that of the PUO (‘Programma voor Universitaire Ontwikkelingsprojecten’) of the 1970s. This programme of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs allowed Dutch Universities to enter into partnerships with Southern universities according to their own preferences.

²⁷ In addition to NUFFIC, WOTRO also aims to strengthen research capacity, although it focuses more on individual researchers than NUFFIC, which is also involved in institutional capacity building. Even though the two organisations have a different focus, most respondents felt that they should align their activities more effectively and some even suggested that the two organisations be merged. In this respect respondents also mentioned that NUFFIC in particular, should put more emphasis on academic excellence.

²⁸ In this light respondents thought it was useful that WOTRO evaluates research applications through a Societal panel on development relevance, in addition to a Scientific Advisory Committee that evaluates on academic excellence.

As far as practitioners are concerned, the respondents appreciated the recent trend whereby NGOs in the Netherlands invest more in research, especially through cooperative programmes with universities. As regards policymakers from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, respondents felt they could be more committed to knowledge, in particular with respect to ways of organising knowledge management within their organisation. Having said this, some respondents also saw a positive trend towards the Ministry becoming more interested in strategic research again. Interviewees did not say much about the cooperation between scientists and the business community, other than that the business sector could play a major role in stimulating technological innovation. This can be seen as illustrative of the institutional landscape on development issues in which the private sector is not particularly engaged. Lastly, with regard to acquiring knowledge in cooperation with end-users, some respondents strongly advocated a greater involvement on the part of the poorest groups. As they are would be hardly involved at the moment, organisations dealing with development lack proper insights into the dynamics of poverty.

In the Netherlands several specific transdisciplinary initiatives have been designed to make research contribute more to policy formulation and the development practice. One such initiative is the IS-academy²⁹, about which respondents mentioned that it generally produced relevant research results, although the outcomes varied depending on the interests of the Ministry's departments in charge of the programmes. For the IS-academy specifically, some respondents advised to align the individual programmes more, and in the light of a broadened approach, it was also proposed to extend the programmes to other ministries.

Other transdisciplinary networking initiatives, like DPRN, were generally rewarded for fostering cooperation between different actors. However, respondents also said that they could relate more to Southern networks. One respondent also worried that a too dominant focus on knowledge exchange within these networks would lead to a mere recycling of knowledge instead of stimulating new research.

Overall, respondents stressed the fact that communicating scientific research results more strategically to other actors would be greatly needed in order to stimulate the uptake of knowledge. A journal like *The Broker* was therefore appreciated. Furthermore, and in relation to the request to use scientific research more systematically, respondents identified a need to summarise the outcomes of related studies in 'policy and practice friendly' language.

Discussion

After having presented a draft version of this paper at the CERES-EADI Summer School on 24 June 2010 (see Appendix 3 for the programme, Appendix 4 for the registered participants and Appendix 5 for the presentation of this paper), four DPRN Task Force members reacted on the findings on behalf of the scientific, policy, NGO and business community respectively.

²⁹ The IS academy consists of several cooperative knowledge programmes between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and academic and knowledge institutes in the Netherlands, in which students and researchers carry out assignments for the Ministry and policymakers have the opportunity to pursue doctoral studies and publish articles.

Ton Dietz, Director of the African Studies Centre and professor in environmental political geography at the University of Amsterdam argued in favour of a leading role for WOTRO Science for Development in both channelling research funds from ministries and NGOs and defining core areas for development-oriented research. His main statements were:

1. WOTRO should be in the lead.
2. There should be as much funding as possible from our Ministry of Education, our Ministry of Foreign Affairs and other ministries, NGOs and businesses geared to global issues throughout the WOTRO structure.
3. A solid long-term foundation for maintaining and strengthening institutes for general knowledge on areas and issues.
4. Specific funding for a selected number of core areas of interest and knowledge sharing, making use of the best elements offered by the fragmented Dutch knowledge landscape, both in terms of excellence and in terms of relevance for development, including anything of relevance to capacity building in the South. This means supporting excellence in the South, but also involving Dutch knowledge workers, for linking and co-learning purposes.
5. For WOTRO this would mean combining its function as a funding agent, with a function as knowledge broker.

The complete version of Dietz' presentation can be found in Appendix 6.

Henk Molenaar, Executive Director of NWO/WOTRO Science for Development (and formerly staff member of the Cultural Cooperation, Education and Research Department (DCO) of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) disagreed with the notion that that development research would 'too much focus on policy themes'. Half of WOTRO's funds are reserved for research on 'out-of-the-box' ideas but, remarkably, the number of research proposals submitted for these ideas remains limited. He also stressed that research for development means more than development studies alone, and includes technological sciences, medical sciences, etc. He argued in favour of taking strategic questions (rather than alleged Dutch academic expertise) as a starting point for development-relevant research, combined with interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary approaches. He also underlined the importance of a focus on interlinkages between scales. Finally, he highlighted the fact that WOTRO will indeed strengthen investments in institutional capacity development through networks of scientific communities that link scattered excellence in various fields, with a view to enhancing policy-oriented development research. He argued that it is in this field that WOTRO has a role to play.

Dieneke de Groot, Coordinator Research and Evaluation at the Interchurch Organisation for Development Cooperation (ICCO), mentioned two reasons why it is important for practitioners to collaborate with scientists on the knowledge agenda. First, collaboration allows NGOs to systematise experiences and to determine whether they are on the right track or whether theories on social change should be adapted. Second, research gives substance to innovation. She mentioned the ICCO, Woord & Daad and the University of Amsterdam's impact study designed from a beneficiaries' point of view, in which a study is made of the beneficiaries' perspective of the long-term impact of development interventions through a participatory evaluation methodology. She argued that scientists and knowledge institutes help practitioners to look beyond the obvious paths and discover new avenues

beyond the borders that they set themselves. Finally, she remarked that being policy relevant is not, nor should be, synonymous with being policy-directed.

Pieter van Stuijvenberg, Director Euroconsult/BMB Mott MacDonald, wondered why the business sector is so marginally involved in discussions about international cooperation. In the end, a recent study by Sustainalytics³⁰ revealed that activities by multinational corporations often have positive impacts on the Millennium Development Goals through e.g. job creation and different supply chain effects that contribute to economic development. There can be no doubt that the business sector plays a relevant and often positive role, and this raises the question of whether there is some truth after all in the 'trickle-down theory' that so many of us rejected in the early 1980s. Van Stuijvenberg also noted that the business community is very diverse, ranging from local entrepreneurs to multinationals, and including consultants as well. Within this diversity, a lot of applied research is being carried out which may well be transferred after having been properly tested. However, this would require local R&D capacity in the recipient countries. He also advocated more research on 'what works' in particular regions, countries and sectors. In his view, evaluations focus too much on what does *not* work. Based on such research findings, tool boxes might well be developed that could subsequently be used elsewhere. Finally, he argued that a research policy should not be formulated by governments nor that the knowledge agenda should be supervised by the ministries, as there may be a lack of relevant knowledge and, moreover, ministries themselves must remain the subject of research. In that sense, he is in favour of NWO/WOTRO having a greater coordinating role.

After these presentations, **Jan Donner** (President of the Royal Tropical Institute and Chairman of the DPRN Task Force), challenged the audience to make statements that could help define the research agenda and infrastructure.

Bert Helmsing (Institute of Social Studies) argued that discussions on the role of the private sector in development and the debate among scientists of what research architecture is most conducive to development is illustrative of the difficulty of defining strategic questions. He argued that these strategic questions should be formulated in multi-stakeholder processes, which include non-academic actors.

Elly Rijniere (Cordaid) advocated a demand-driven research agenda based on an analysis of worldwide demand. According to Rijniere, the current discussion on a new 'architecture' of development research in the Netherlands seems to start from the Dutch perspective, rather than from a Southern and context-specific one. This suggests a supply-driven agenda that 'generates our own business'. She also observed that, despite all kinds of efforts, bridging the gap between the research and development agenda is still a major problem that can only be solved if scientists take a different, more facilitating role geared towards generating 'knowledge for change' (rather than 'knowledge for science').

³⁰ Sustainalytics (2010). *Business Impact Report 2010*. Amsterdam: NCDO. Available online at: <http://www.ncdo.nl/docs/uploads/Business%20Impact%20Report%202010.pdf>.

Bram Büscher (Institute of Social Studies) raised two issues from a political science perspective. First, the question of 'what works' should be reformulated as 'what works for *whom* and *why*?' Second, he argued that we should not view knowledge as something technical that can simply be 'exchanged', but that we should instead regard knowledge as a process that depends on intellectual debate and intellectual capacity.

Bernike Pasveer (ECDPM/University of Maastricht) would like to add the following questions: 'why does an intervention work and under what conditions?' to enable people to learn and re-use lessons in context-sensitive ways.

Josine Stremmelaar (Hivos) wondered whether we know enough about how effectively research in transdisciplinary initiatives is currently organised in the Netherlands. Perhaps we should first find out more about this before we continue our discussion on a new research infrastructure.

Ruerd Ruben (CIDIN) stated that greater focus of research carried out by universities, is in line with a recent recommendation of the Commission Veerman³¹ that advised the Ministry of OCW on the future of Dutch higher education. The commission recommended that Dutch universities make thematic choices and mutually profile themselves more strongly. Ruben also wondered whether the focus areas referred to in which the Netherlands would have a comparative advantage, especially agriculture, are indeed the areas in which the Netherlands should specialise. He reminded the audience of the fact that most agricultural programmes in development cooperation had been the subject of negative evaluations, and that knowledge of agriculture would be primarily related to a Northern instead of a Southern context. He further questioned whether WOTRO should be being the lead agency as regards redefining the research agenda based on several strategic questions. The fact that researchers who may be involved in defining these questions are also WOTRO clients means this can easily lead to conflicts of interest. He is of the opinion that we currently do not have a structure nor the critical mass to define strategic questions and proposed that DPRN takes the lead in this effort as a next step in this process (and to have 10 such questions ready before the new government is formed). He also thinks that a truly interdisciplinary approach requires people to be brought together, including those from the South, because virtual networks do not actually work.

For **Jan Donner** (KIT, DPRN) the key question is "to *whom* is the knowledge relevant?"

Antonie Otieno On'gayo (Utrecht University) proposes linking the formulation of strategic questions with capacity building by creating knowledge communities that allow researchers from the South to influence agenda setting. Currently research questions would be excessively inspired by a Northern context.

³¹ Commissie Toekomstbestendig Hoger Onderwijs Stelsel (2010). *Differentiëren in drievoud. Omwille van kwaliteit en verscheidenheid in het hoger onderwijs*. Den Haag: Ministerie van OCW. Available online at: <http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/bestanden/documenten-en-publicaties/rapporten/2010/04/13/advies-van-de-commissie-toekomstbestendig-hoger-onderwi/adv-cie-toekomstbestendig-ho.pdf>

Arjan Schuthof (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) argued that the WRR report has shown that today's problems are becoming increasingly complex and interrelated (agriculture is related to health, etc.). He advocates a combined agenda setting driven by local institutions from the South and the global agenda. As regards the latter he stated that new insights are needed as far as global public goods are concerned, specifically with regard to how global public goods can be linked to local development problems. Schuthof agreed with the WRR that the Netherlands can play a leading role on the issue of global public goods.

Rob van Poelje (PSO) stressed the importance of knowledge being linked to learning processes in the North and in the South. Therefore, research must be client-oriented and policymakers and practitioners must continuously take part in participatory agenda setting processes.

Finally, workshop convener and chair **Jan Donner** gave the floor to the co-referees again, for a final statement or reflection.

Ton Dietz said that 90% of research funding comes from the government and that this money should no longer be used freely by academics. We should decide how to organise development-oriented research and create a panel with intervening capabilities consisting of policymakers and practitioners, from both the North and the South.

Dieneke de Groot confirmed the urgency of bringing together prestigious people to define strategic questions and reminded the audience of the role that co-financing organisations can play in creating accountability through their partner organisations.

Henk Molenaar responded to the remark about research on 'what works'. He considered the remark to be somehow naïve and abstract because the answer to the question 'what works?' is context-specific. Moreover, the notion of 'what works' is relative because people have different views on the matter.

Pieter van Stuijvenberg agreed that questions such as 'for whom' and 'how come' are relevant. However, sharing stories on what works is a good start precisely because knowledge is currently very fragmented.

Kim de Vries confirmed the urgency of defining the strategic questions and the need to agree on the configuration of the groups who are going to formulate these questions.

Jan Donner concluded that (i) the Netherlands has sufficient but fragmented research capacity, (ii) that the proper agenda is to make that capacity work; and that (iii) we should make sure that it serves a purpose, i.e. generating policy relevant and innovative research. The real overall challenge is to define the constituencies for research on poverty alleviation and sustainable development and the architecture that works for what kind of research questions.

Conclusions

This paper has shown that a discussion of the future knowledge agenda and infrastructure for development is appreciated. While the respondents stress the need for a certain degree

of autonomy in setting research priorities, and warn against an excessive focus on policy-oriented research, most of them were positive about a more strategic and clearly focussed knowledge agenda for development.

The research needs identified in response to the WRR report relate primarily to interdisciplinary questions about the relationships between economic growth and environmental sustainability, redistribution and institutional processes, state responsiveness and stability, and bottom-up social development. The general view is that a less normative outlook, which takes account of the interlinkages of scales, would lead to an improved understanding of development processes. In the eyes of the respondents, Dutch knowledge in various areas (*e.g.* agriculture and food production, water, law & justice, health & infectious diseases, civil society, and the 3D approach) could certainly contribute to more specialised development policies. However, they stress that defining major strategic questions should precede this choice of thematic areas. This might, in turn, result in different thematic and geographic focus areas than those advocated by the WRR.

According to the respondents, the Dutch knowledge infrastructure needed to implement this agenda should be characterised by coordination in the form of strategic funding of networks by NWO/WOTRO and an aligned knowledge agenda at the various ministries involved in international cooperation. Investing in regional networks in the South and long-term partnerships with Southern research institutes are also important factors. Lastly, transdisciplinary initiatives should be strengthened, so as to increase knowledge of context-specific innovations, with more attention for the ways scientific research can best be communicated to other actors.

The discussion following the presentation of these outcomes revealed the need to:

- Align research with development needs;
- Formulate strategic questions for development-relevant research, taking sustainability and linkages between multiple levels of scale into account;
- Focus research on what works, for whom, and in what regional contexts;
- Link up with Southern perspectives on what is development-relevant research in order to create a demand-driven agenda;
- Combine policy-oriented research with out-of-the box thinking;
- Mobilise the Dutch research community in order to tackle fragmentation of knowledge, preferably through WOTRO Science for Development.

Appendix 1 – List of respondents

1. Prof. Dr L. (Louk) de la Rive Box, formerly Professor of International Cooperation and Rector at the Institute of Social Studies (ISS), The Hague.
2. Prof. Dr J.W. (Jan Willem) Gunning, Professor of Development Economics at VU University Amsterdam, and co-Director of the Amsterdam Institute for International Development (AIID).
3. Prof. Dr J.B. (Hans) Opschoor, Professor of Economics of Sustainable Development at the ISS, The Hague, and Professor of Environmental Economics at VU University Amsterdam.
4. Prof. Dr ir D.J.M. (Thea) Hilhorst, Professor of Humanitarian Aid and Reconstruction at Wageningen University.
5. Prof. Dr A.H.J. (Bert) Helmsing, Professor of Local and Regional Development at the ISS, The Hague, and Professor of Regional and Local Planning at Utrecht University.
6. Prof. Dr A.P.R. (Rob) Visser, associate researcher at the Centre for International Development Studies (CIDIN), Radboud University Nijmegen, and formerly Visiting Professor of Development Studies at University Utrecht.
7. Prof. Dr ir. R. (Rudy) Rabbinge, Professor of Sustainable Development and Systems Innovation at Wageningen University.
8. Prof. Dr E.B. (Annelies) Zoomers, Professor of International Development Studies at Utrecht University, and Professor of International Migration at Radboud University Nijmegen.
9. Prof. mr Dr W.J.M. (Willem) van Genugten, Professor of International Law at Tilburg University and Chair of the WOTRO Board.
10. Prof. Dr D.A.N.M. (Dirk) Kruijt, Honorary Professor of Development Studies at Utrecht University.
11. Prof. Dr P.J.R. (Paul) Hoebink, Extraordinary Professor in Development Cooperation at CIDIN, Radboud University Nijmegen.
12. Prof. Dr R. (Ruerd) Ruben, Professor of Development Studies and Director of CIDIN, Radboud University Nijmegen.
13. Prof. Dr I.S.A. (Isa) Baud, Professor in International Development Studies, University of Amsterdam, and Chair of the CERES Board.
14. Prof. Dr L.J. (Leo) de Haan, Professor of Development Studies and Rector at the ISS, The Hague, formerly Director of the African Studies Centre (ASC), Leiden.
15. Prof. Dr P.R. (Paul) Klatser, Director Biomedical Research at the Royal Tropical Institute Amsterdam, and Extraordinary Professor in Biomedical Research for Development at VU University Amsterdam.

16. Prof. Dr J.W.M. (Han) van Dijk, Professor of Law and Governance in Africa at the ASC Leiden/Wageningen University, and Scientific Director of CERES.
17. Prof. Dr A.J. (Ton) Dietz, Director of the ASC Leiden, and Professor in Human Geography at the University of Amsterdam.

Appendix 2 – Interview scheme (in Dutch)

Dit schema is opgesteld voor het DPRN traject over de toekomstige kennisagenda (deel 1) en kennisinfrastructuur (deel 2) van de Nederlandse internationale samenwerking, als onderdeel van het DPRN proces ‘Structure follows strategy: the future of Dutch international development cooperation’ (<http://structurefollowsstrategy.dprn.nl/>). Het schema bestaat uit 10 vragen die volgen uit de analyse en aanbevelingen van het WRR rapport ‘Minder pretentie, meer ambitie. Ontwikkelingshulp die verschil maakt’ (<http://www.wrr.nl/content.jsp?objectid=5213>) en worden ingeleid met telkens een korte samenvatting van de standpunten van het rapport.

1. Kennisagenda

1.1 Ontwikkeling definiëren

Ontwikkeling wordt door de WRR gedefinieerd als “*een bewuste versnelling van modernisering, opgevat als een gesynchroniseerde vierdubbele transitie van de economie, de overheid, het politieke systeem en de samenleving*”.³² De WRR sluit zich daarmee aan bij het Westerse model van modernisering (ook omdat er weinig alternatieven zouden zijn), maar onderkent daarbij wel dat elk land een eigen ontwikkelingspad te volgen heeft en bovendien een eigen startsituatie heeft. In de verklaring van ontwikkeling zouden er vervolgens geen alomvattende theorieën zijn die voor elk land gelden. De WRR hekelt in dit opzicht dan ook de ‘verleiding van de maakbaarheid’: het blijvende zoeken naar universele beleidsrecepten voor ontwikkeling.

Ondanks de contextspecificiteit van ontwikkelingsprocessen, zouden er wel lessen kunnen worden getrokken uit het verleden (van vooral Westerse landen) die voor ontwikkelingslanden van toepassing zijn. De dimensies economie en overheid zijn daarbij leidend en moeten vooral niet worden gezien als terreinen die tegenover elkaar zouden staan: ze hebben elkaar nodig om goed te kunnen functioneren. Qua economie wordt gesteld dat investeren in landbouw via verstedelijking en industrialisering tot ontwikkeling leidt. Qua overheid geldt dat groei/industrialisering vooral tot stand komt dankzij zogenaamde ‘effectieve overheden’: zij die kunnen ‘leveren’ op verschillende terreinen (met name de harde en softe infrastructuur). Herverdeling is daarbij overigens in eerste instantie

³² De WRR vervolgt: “*Modernisering is een aanduiding van wat in het Westen is gerealiseerd vanaf de negentiende eeuw: het tot stand brengen van een goed ontwikkeld en productief economisch systeem dat ingebed is in internationale handelsrelaties, een overheidssysteem dat in staat is om essentiële diensten op het terrein van onderwijs, gezondheidszorg, huisvesting en veiligheid te (helpen) realiseren, een politiek systeem dat zorgt voor collectieve besluitvormingsprocessen die ertoe leiden dat burgers zich verbonden voelen met de uitkomst en met elkaar, en een samenleving die voldoende open is en ruimte biedt aan de verschillende individuele en collectieve ontplooiingswensen*” (p. 61). Algemeen gaat het er bij het nastreven van ontwikkeling volgens de WRR om dat de vier dimensies in een productieve verhouding ten opzichte van elkaar komen te staan.

niet aan de orde – zonder groei zou er immers nog weinig te verdelen zijn – en krijgt pas zin als de middenklasse ‘serieuze vormen begint aan te nemen’.³³

De politieke en sociale dimensies zijn minder duidelijk uitgewerkt. Qua politiek wordt gesteld dat stabiliteit noodzakelijk is (wederom afhankelijk van een sterke overheid – die politie en leger ondergeschikt heeft kunnen maken) en dat democratie geen ideaal is; het kan zelf leiden tot ‘democracy’. Qua samenleving (‘sociaal weefsel’) wordt gesteld dat sociaal kapitaal (binding) van cruciaal belang is voor het goed functioneren van instituties – door gedeelde normen en waarden zou er gemakkelijker naar een gezamenlijk doel toegewerkt kunnen worden. Een gebrek aan sociale binding zou kunnen leiden tot o.a. etnische conflicten, corruptie en gesloten samenlevingen.

Vraag 1: De WRR maakt een vierdimensionale indeling van het ontwikkelingsproces en stelt daarbij de dimensies economie en overheid voorop.

a) Wat betekent deze indeling voor de toekomstige kennisagenda van ontwikkelingsgerelateerd onderzoek?

b) Tot welk type onderzoek zou dit moeten leiden en welke vragen staan daarin centraal?

Vraag 2: Ontwikkeling speelt zich in de analyse van de WRR vooral op nationaal niveau (binnen de staatsgrenzen) af.

- Wat voor onderzoek is nodig om de mondiale en lokale schaalniveaus te integreren in de analyse van ontwikkeling?

1.2: Ontwikkeling meten

De WRR stelt dat er een aantal succesvolle meetbare ontwikkelingen zijn (bijvoorbeeld de levensverwachting, onderwijsdeelname en landbouwproductie), maar dat het meetbaar maken van ontwikkeling als totaalbeeld echter nog steeds zeer moeilijk, dan wel onmogelijk, is. Economische indicatoren (BBP, armoedegrens 1,25\$/dag) zijn daarvoor ook niet toereikend.

Nog moeilijker is het vervolgens om het effect van de hulp op ontwikkeling te meten, vooral op macro niveau.³⁴ Hierbij spelen zes factoren een rol. Allereerst kan hulp niet als een homogene categorie worden beschouwd; het wordt met verschillende – vaak onduidelijk omschreven – doelstellingen, gegeven. Ten tweede komt hulp terecht in complexe situaties, waardoor het moeilijk is causaal vast te stellen wat het precieze effect is geweest. Ten derde is hulp vaak maar een van de vele geldstromen die ontwikkelingslanden vanuit het

³³ De WRR stelt dat vooral Afrika op beide dimensies grote problemen heeft en pleit er daarom voor juist in dit continent te investeren. Economie: Landbouw bedrijven is moeilijk door de natuurlijke en klimatologische omstandigheden, en er ontbreken sterke instituties die hierin grootschalig investeren. Overheden: zijn veelal ineffectief (gekenmerkt door neo-patrimoniale verhoudingen), onder meer als gevolg van de koloniale tijd.

buitenland ontvangen (anderen – vaak nog veel groter in omvang – zijn bijv. FDI en remittances). Ten vierde geldt voor hulp – en eigenlijk alle vormen van beleid – dat het vaak lang duurt voordat effecten zichtbaar worden. Ten vijfde is er sprake van de zogenaamde ‘micro–macro paradox’: een project kan succesvol zijn, maar dit is vaak niet zichtbaar in landelijke cijfers. Als laatste is ook de vergelijkbaarheid tussen landen problematisch, omdat deze verschillende uitgangssituaties hebben.

Op micro niveau is het effect van hulp iets beter aan te tonen, maar de meetbaarheid is nog steeds problematisch (bijvoorbeeld omdat case studies moeilijk vergelijkbaar zijn en omdat er weinig herhaalde metingen worden gedaan). De WRR stelt echter dat het feit dat het effect van ontwikkelingshulp moeilijk meetbaar is, geen voldoende reden is om niet aan ontwikkelingshulp te doen.

Vraag 3: Wat kan er vanuit de wetenschap gedaan worden aan de problematische meetbaarheid van de effecten van ontwikkelingshulp?

Vraag 4: De WRR gaat vooral in op de meetbaarheid van ontwikkeling en hulp op het macro (nationale) en micro niveau.

- Wat voor onderzoek is nodig om ontwikkeling vanuit een mondiaal perspectief meetbaar te maken?

1.3: Ontwikkelingshulp inzetten

De WRR maakt een onderscheid tussen drie doelstellingen van ontwikkelingshulp:

- 1) Het verbeteren van de directe levensomstandigheden (directe armoedebestrijding);
- 2) Het ‘gericht’ (structureel) bevorderen van de (economische) ontwikkeling (‘zelfredzaamheid’);
- 3) Het veiligstellen van mondiale publieke goederen.

Daarnaast worden twee (of liever misschien drie³⁵) hoofdmotieven genoemd, die beide een rol spelen in de huidige ontwikkelingshulp:

- 1) Morele opdracht: ‘Het streven naar het helpen van medemensen’ veelal uit levensbeschouwelijke posities door (i) ontplooiing van individuele mogelijkheden, (ii) recht op ontwikkeling, of (iii) een categorie van benaderingen die niet langer de superioriteit van de Westerse samenleving als uitgangspunt voor ontwikkeling neemt.
- 2) Eigen belang: waarbij hulp wordt ingezet om ook de Nederlandse belangen te dienen, waarbij het WRR rapport onderscheid maakt tussen puur eigenbelang (geld en invloed), verlicht eigenbelang (bevorderen stabiliteit) en collectief eigenbelang (hulp als bijdrage aan mondiale overleving).

De WRR verbindt de bovenstaande doelstellingen en motieven in haar betoog voor een effectievere inzet van ontwikkelingshulp. Ontwikkelingshulp zou namelijk vanuit een dominant ‘moreel opdracht motief’ te lang en eenzijdig zijn gericht op de eerste doelstelling (armoedebestrijding), waardoor de tweede doelstelling (zelfredzaamheid) – waarbij

³⁵ Het motief van collectief eigen belang wordt door sommigen als apart motief gezien.

verlicht/collectief eigen belang een grotere rol spelen – uit het zicht is verdwenen. Directe armoedebestrijding wordt door de WRR vervolgens grotendeels gelijkgesteld met investeringen in ‘sociale sectoren’ (genoemd worden onderwijs, gezondheidszorg/sanitatie en civil society). Ten behoeve van het behalen van de tweede doelstelling zou er meer moeten worden geïnvesteerd in productieve sectoren (met name landbouw en infrastructuur). Bovendien zou er meer aandacht moeten komen voor middenklassen (in plaats van de allerarmsten), want het is deze categorie die werkgelegenheid en economische groei zou brengen. De twee belangrijkste randvoorwaarden voor succesvolle investeringen gericht op zelfredzaamheid zijn volgens de WRR (i) een effectieve overheid die een faciliterende rol kan spelen en (ii) een voldoende stabiel maatschappelijk klimaat.

De derde doelstelling is redelijk nieuw, maar vraagt – in tijden van globalisering – dringend om een goede invulling (met name vanuit het motief van collectief eigen belang). Iets wat dit in de weg staat is het door de WRR als ‘hardnekkig’ bestempelde probleem van ‘verkokering’: ontwikkelingshulp wordt nog teveel los gezien van bredere mondiale vraagstukken (genoemd worden: migratie, handel, financiële stabiliteit, fiscale coördinatie, voedsel en klimaat), terwijl ontwikkeling daar wel steeds meer door wordt beïnvloed. Dit laat zich ook zien in de ministeriële organisatie waarin de verbindingen met niet-klasseke beleidsterreinen op het gebied van internationale samenwerking moeizaam van de grond komen. Ook op Europees en mondiaal niveau is het organiseren van meer coherente organisatiestructuren problematisch. De WRR vraagt vanuit ontwikkelingsoogpunt serieuze aandacht voor de derde doelstelling, om zodoende de tweede – zelfredzaamheid – te kunnen bewerkstelligen.

De WRR geeft wel aan dat de huidige ontwikkelingshulp zich in een toenemende spagaat zou bevinden: er wordt geïntervenieerd op uitersten van schaalniveaus (lokaal en mondiaal) en vanuit verschillende motieven (van morele opdracht tot gedeeld/eigen belang) en doelstellingen (van armoedebestrijding tot het veiligstellen van mondiale publieke goederen). Dit brengt een legitimatieprobleem met zich mee. Om het draagvlak voor ontwikkelingssamenwerking te behouden en ‘groot en klein’ te kunnen combineren, wordt daarom voorgesteld om primair op doelstelling twee en drie in te zetten en het motief van verlicht/collectief eigen belang centraal te stellen.

Vraag 5: De WRR maakt allereerst een onderscheid tussen de doelstellingen armoedebestrijding en ontwikkeling als zelfredzaamheid.

- a. Wat betekent dit onderscheid voor de toekomstige onderzoeksagenda? Wat voor type onderzoek is nodig om na te gaan in hoeverre deze doelstellingen inderdaad bepalend zijn voor de effectiviteit van ontwikkelingshulp?*
- b. Is het vanuit wetenschappelijk oogpunt zinvol om deze doelstellingen aan motieven te verbinden (armoedebestrijding aan een morele opdracht en bevorderen van zelfredzaamheid als verlicht eigen belang)?*

Vraag 6: Met het definiëren van een derde doelstelling – het veiligstellen van mondiale publieke goederen – pleit de WRR voor een verbreding van ontwikkelingshulp. Ontwikkelingshulp moet zich meer verbinden met mondiale kwesties en daarmee ‘ontkokeren’.

- Hoe kan de onderzoeksagenda hierop aansluiten?*

Vraag 7: De WRR noemt twee belangrijke randvoorwaarden voor ontwikkeling: stabiliteit en een effectieve overheid, al is het nog erg onduidelijk hoe dit tot stand komt.

- *Hoe kan wetenschappelijk onderzoek bijdragen aan het verkrijgen van inzicht in deze kwesties (en zijn er volgens u nog andere belangrijke randvoorwaarden)?*

2. Kennisinstructuur

Kennisontwikkeling over ontwikkelingshulp is volgens de WRR in Nederland 'opvallend' slecht georganiseerd: het ontbreekt aan institutioneel geheugen. Grotere investeringen in kennis zijn volgens de WRR dan ook noodzakelijk om te komen tot een professionele organisatie van de ontwikkelingshulp. Dit omdat ontwikkelingshulp bij uitstek een 'zoekende' activiteit zou zijn, waarbij experimenteren en de openheid om daarvan te leren voorop moeten staan. Bovendien vergt het maken van gedegen keuzes (diagnostiek) een goede kennis van de (landen-)context waarin men intervenueert. Nederland zou zich daarbij kunnen specialiseren in bepaalde onderwerpen (bijvoorbeeld landbouw, water of civil society) om het aanbod van de hulp kwalitatief te verbeteren en zichzelf duidelijker te profileren. Kennisontwikkeling op deze gebieden zou dan ook effectiever kunnen worden georganiseerd.

Drie belangrijke oorzaken die een rem op de kennisontwikkeling zetten zijn:

- Er is te weinig geld beschikbaar voor kennisontwikkeling. Er zou minimaal 300 mln EUR (6% van het ontwikkelingsbudget) moeten worden geïnvesteerd, terwijl er nu maar 40 mln EUR gaat naar onderzoek.
- Er is te weinig coördinatie.
- Er is te weinig ruimte voor alternatieve ontwikkelingsparadigma's (bias naar kennis van de Wereldbank en Angelsaksische auteurs).

Verder doet de WRR aanbevelingen om te investeren in:

- Een interdisciplinaire kennisinstructuur;
- Samenwerkingsverbanden met Zuidelijke universiteiten;
- En het betrekken van andere partijen in kennisontwikkeling (praktijk, beleid, internationale organisaties, bedrijfsleven etc.).

Vraag 8: De WRR pleit voor meer coördinatie van de kennisontwikkeling op het gebied van ontwikkeling in Nederland. Dit zou kunnen via een gecentraliseerd kenniscentrum of een coördinerend instituut in Nederland. In het geval van kennis op het gebied van mondiale publieke goederen doet de WRR het voorstel om deze te bundelen in een Global issues centrum.

- a) Wat is volgens u de ideale manier om deze kennisontwikkeling binnen Nederland te coördineren?*
- b) Welke rol dienen Zuidelijke onderzoeksinstituten te krijgen in deze kennisontwikkeling?*
- c) Hoe waarborg je interdisciplinariteit?*
- d) Hoe waarborg je transdisciplinariteit, of het uitwisselen van kennis tussen wetenschappers en andere partijen (praktijk, bedrijfsleven, beleid, diaspora)? Ziet u daarbij een rol weggelegd voor bestaande intersectorale kennisinitiatieven zoals de IS-academie, DPRN en The Broker?*

e) Wat is voor u de ideale manier om kennis over mondiale publieke goederen een prominente plaats te geven binnen het ontwikkelingsgerichte onderzoek?

Vraag 9: De WRR pleit voor meer ruimte voor alternatieve ontwikkelingsvisies. We zouden voor deze kennis te afhankelijk zijn van met name De Wereldbank. De WRR doet daarbij het voorstel om te investeren in meerdere regionale kennisbanken (in Azië, Latijns-Amerika, Afrika).

a) Is het oprichten van meerdere kennisbanken volgens u de oplossing voor het creëren van meer ruimte voor alternatieve ontwikkelingsvisies?

b) Hoe zou de Nederlandse kenniswereld moeten bijdragen aan het creëren van meer ruimte voor alternatieve ontwikkelingsvisies?

Vraag 10: De WRR doet de aanbeveling om als Nederland te specialiseren in bepaalde in bepaalde sectoren (bijvoorbeeld water, landbouw, civil society).

a) Hoe organiseer je de wetenschappelijke kennis op deze terreinen?

b) En welke inbreng zou de Nederlandse wetenschap moeten hebben bij het analyseren van de context van ontwikkelingslanden en de diagnostiek die wordt toegepast bij het analyseren van de knelpunten in ontwikkeling?

Appendix 3 – Programme of the DPRN workshop at the CERES–EADI Summer School

Changing roles and meaning of International Cooperation – Implications for the Research agenda and Infrastructure

Convenor: Dr Jan Donner (President KIT, Chairman DPRN Task Force)

Date: Thursday 24 June, 2:30 – 4:00 p.m.

Venue: Institute of Social Studies, Kortenaerskade 12, The Hague

The much-debated report of the Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR in Dutch) advocates more investment in development-oriented research. Knowledge of development processes is indispensable in order to be able to make choices, set the right diagnoses and be specific. However, the Netherlands is lagging behind as far as investments in the development-oriented knowledge infrastructure are concerned. These amount to a mere EUR 200 million per year, of which only EUR 40 million is available for research programmes. The question to be debated in this workshop, organised by the Development Policy Review Network (DPRN) is what form the research agenda and infrastructure should take if more money were to be made available. How can interdisciplinarity and transdisciplinarity be promoted and locally-specific development strategies be designed? Is there a need for a coordinating institute like the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) in the UK or the Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) in Germany, or will knowledge networks meet the need for stronger and more coherent research? How can independent research support Monitoring and Evaluation? These and other questions will be addressed in this workshop, which aims to bring together scientists and knowledge workers in policy, NGOs and the corporate sector.

Programme:

- 3:00 – 3:05 p.m. Introduction
- Jan Donner**, President of the Royal Tropical Institute (KIT) and Chairman of the DPRN Task Force.
- 3:05 – 3:25 p.m. Towards a policy relevant research agenda and architecture: opinions of academic key players in Dutch development research.
- Kim de Vries**, Development Policy Review Network (DPRN)
- 3:25 – 3:45 p.m. Reactions by:
- Ton Dietz**, Director African Studies Centre and Professor in Human Geography at the University of Amsterdam: the academic perspective.
- Henk Molenaar**, Executive Director WOTRO Science for Development: the policy-oriented perspective.

Dieneke de Groot, Coordinator Research and Evaluation at the Interchurch Organisation for Development Cooperation (ICCO): the NGO perspective.

Pieter van Stuijvenberg, Director Euroconsult/BMB Mott MacDonald: the business perspective.

3:45 – 4:30 p.m. Debate

4:30 – 5:00 p.m. Drinks

Appendix 4 – List of registered participants in the CERES–EADI Summer School meeting³⁶

	First name	Last name	E-mail	Organisation	Professional category
1.	Alexander	Monica	m.alexander@quicknet.nl	Jeugdwerk	Practice
2.	Bosch	Alinda	alinda.bosch@cordaid.nl	Cordaid	Practice
3.	Buscher	Bram	buscher@iss.nl	Insitute of Social Studies (ISS)	Science
4.	Companjen	Francoise	fj.companjen@fsw.vu.nl	VU University Amsterdam	Science
5.	Depassé	Natasja	n.depasse@nwo.nl	SANPAD	Science
6.	Dijk	Han van	h.vandijk2@uu.nl	CERES and Wageningen University	Science
7.	Heilbron	Miguel	miguelheilbron@gmail.com	OnMyWorld.org	Practice
8.	Helmsing	Bert	helmsing@iss.nl	Insitute of Social Studies (ISS)	Science
9.	Hernandez Espino	Fernando	fernandohe@gmail.com		Other
10.	Ho	Wenny	howws@wxs.nl	Independent consultant	Practice
11.	Kerkhoven	Russell	kerkhoven@irc.nl	IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre	Practice
12.	Kooijman	Margo	kooijman@pso.nl	PSO Capacity Building in Developing Countries	Practice
13.	Lake	Gloria	gp.lake@hotmail.com	VU University Amsterdam	Science
14.	Lamain	Corinne	c.lamain@nwo.nl	NWO/WOTRO	Science
15.	Leeuwenburg	Johannis	jleeuwenburg@hetnet.nl	Senior lecturer, Tropical Institutes Antwerpen & Amsterdam	Science

³⁶ Not all participants are listed as some did not specifically register for this workshop, but attended impulsively due to their participation in the CERES–EADI Summer School as a whole.

16.	Mariet	Mulders	mariet.mulders@cordaid.nl	Cordaid	Practice
17.	Melis	Tineke	t.melis@cis.vu.nl	Centre for International Development, VU	Science
18.	Mesters	Manoe	m.mesters@nwo.nl	NWO/WOTRO	Science
19.	Otieno	Antonie	a.ongayo@geo.uu.nl	Utrecht University	Science
20.	Pasveer	Bernike	bernikepasveer@gmail.com	Knowledgegetravel.nl	Practice
21.	Poelje	Rob van	poelje@pso.nl	PSO Capacity Building in Developing Countries	Practice
22.	Rijnierse	Elly	elly.rijnierse@cordaid.nl	Cordaid	Practice
23.	Ruben	Ruerd	r.ruben@maw.ru.nl	Centre for International Development Issues	Science
24.	Ruigrok	Inge	ingeruigrok@gmail.com		Other
25.	Schuthof	Arjan	arjan.schuthof@minbuza.nl	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Policy
26.	Severs	Marije	m.severs@nwo.nl	NWO/WOTRO	Science
27.	Stremmelaar	Josine	j.stremmelaar@hivos.nl	Hivos	Practice
DPRN:					
28.	Dietz	Ton	dietzaj@ascleiden.nl	African Studies Centre / University of Amsterdam	Science
29.	Donner	Jan	j.donner@kit.nl	Royal Tropical Insitute	Practice
30.	Groot	Dieneke de	dieneke.de.Groot@icco.nl	Interchurch Organisation for Development	Practice
31.	Molenaar	Henk	h.molenaar@nwo.nl	NWO/WOTRO	Science
32.	Ros	Mirjam	mirjam.ros@dprn.nl	University of Amsterdam	Science
33.	Stuijvenberg	Pieter van	pieter.stuijvenberg@mottmac.nl	Euroconsult/BMB Mott MacDonald	Business
34.	Vries	Kim de	kim.devries@dprn.nl	University of Amsterdam	Science

Appendix 5 – Presentation of the interview outcomes at the CERES–EADI Summer School

By Kim de Vries, on 24 June 2010

Development Policy  Review Network

Towards a future knowledge agenda and infrastructure for development



*A reflection on the WRR report
'Less pretention, more ambition.
Development aid that makes a difference'*

Development Policy  Review Network

Content

- Objective of the study
- Policy-science dilemma
- Identified research needs
- Dutch knowledge for development
- Knowledge infrastructure

Development Policy  Review Network

Objective of the study

- Learn the views of Dutch scientists on the knowledge agenda & infrastructure proposals in het WRR report
- Providing input for a WOTRO/DPRN debate on the issue later this year

Development Policy  Review Network

Policy versus science

- An aligned knowledge agenda (AWT)
- Warning for too dominant policy focus (MDGs)
- Need for impact evaluations

Development Policy  Review Network

Research needs

- *Economic growth*: yes, but what about environmental sustainability and redistribution?
 - *State stability*: yes, but what about shock-prone areas and bottom-up development?
- (less normative) interdisciplinary research, linking scales, and generalise findings.

Development Policy  Review Network

Dutch knowledge for development

- Defining strategic questions
- Focus areas: agriculture and food production, water, law & justice, health & infectious diseases, civil society, 3D approach.

Development Policy  Review Network

Knowledge infrastructure

- Funding of networks by NWO/WOTRO
- Coherent knowledge agenda by different ministries
- Knowledge from the South: regional networks and long-term partnerships
- Strengthen transdisciplinary initiatives

Appendix 6 – Presentation at the CERES–EADI Summer School by Ton Dietz

Changing roles and meaning of International cooperation: implications for the research agenda and infrastructure – The academic perspective

Let me take you back to the year 2003. I had just taken over as director of CERES and of the WOTRO Board. It was not difficult to see major flaws in the Dutch research and knowledge landscape as regards dealing with global issues like development, climate change, peace and security, human rights, migration, global health care and globalisation.

The first observation was that the Dutch academic landscape was very fragmented, with no institute leading. In each of our 13 universities a few, rather marginal, research groups were struggling against a growing parochial immediate context in their own faculties and universities and were often rather myopic in their research focus. Of course, we had spent ten years building up CERES and that was a considerable achievement. However there were still some stubborn research centres outside the CERES structure, namely the Amsterdam School for Social Science Research (ASSR), Leiden and Erasmus Rotterdam universities almost as a whole, and many economists, including prominent ones at the VU University, and Wageningen University. In addition, the architecture of research schools had created some new building blocks for mutual exclusion in that there were, for instance, hardly any research contacts with the research school SENSE, which dealt with international environmental issues. Moreover, a lot of development-oriented research work in health sciences, in technical sciences and in natural sciences was not part of the CERES framework. Attempts to organise cross-overs were beset with difficulties.

The second observation was that there were very few remaining contacts between academia and the broad Dutch landscape of agencies dealing with development and related global issues. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs stood with its back to the knowledge sector as a whole and many Dutch academics had simply given up liaising. A small unit in the ministry dealing with research and knowledge zealously ignored Dutch academics. In addition, NUFFIC's approach based on the capacity building of Southern institutes had alienated most Dutch academics. Moreover the many Dutch development-oriented NGOs had no knowledge policy.

When I joined WOTRO's Board in 2003 my first discussion with people at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs made it very clear that they did not think WOTRO had any value. The attitude was that there was enough knowledge and that it only needed to be applied. The people I spoke to were also irritated by the fact that those treasured MDGs that were all the rage at the ministry at the time were not enthusiastically embraced by those academics. They were regarded as useless. When I first encountered the Board of NWO, the mother agency of WOTRO, I was told in no uncertain terms that WOTRO would cease to exist without continued partial funding from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

It was clear that action was badly needed. At WOTRO we decided to reformulate our mission in ways that opened more avenues for communication with the ministry. We succeeded by often using the word MDG. In fact, we now even have MDG Profs. The result was a doubling of our budget and support for the idea that there should also be so-called 'surprising research' to which we, as the WOTRO Board, were pleased to find out, half of the budget was

allocated as long as it was development-relevant and as long as attempts were made to create trans-disciplinary research designs. At CERES we decided to support the building of bridges with the world of policy and practice. First via DPRN, then the Worldconnectors and finally via The Broker. This now forms part of the WOTRO architecture. The frosty relationship with the ministry and the NGO sector was also starting to thaw. The ministry first initiated the IS Academies, of which there are now ten, and the Knowledge Networks, of which there are four. Many NGOs started genuine knowledge units which offered employment to quite a few PhD holders.

Now, in 2010, we have to do something about the following issues:

1. There is still a very fragmented academic research environment for the study of global issues.
2. CERES and the research school architecture is weakened due to the tendency to start university and faculty specific graduate schools;
3. WOTRO must become strong and prestigious, covering all the relevant fields;
4. The transdisciplinary knowledge landscape must become much better integrated, with a much more knowledge-oriented Ministry of Foreign Affairs and NGO sector.

To me it is obvious that there should not be one new research institute for global issues. Moreover it would be foolish to select one of the existing institutes for a role of *primus inter pares*. However, we do have a structure in place that can function as the hub for everything that is currently needed and that is WOTRO. As a funding agency and knowledge network WOTRO can link academia, policy and practice, and it can link it both with the best researchers in the world, and with researchers and knowledge hubs in Africa, Asia and Latin America. The various practices in its current funding architecture show that this can be done on the basis of win-win options for all those who participate.

The answer to the question of whether we need to specialise is yes and no. A network architecture should be in place for basic knowledge about the various areas in the world and about all relevant issues. The Netherlands is an open society, with links around virtually the whole world. There will always be a need for Dutch anchor points for links with the whole world, as long as it is also linked to European and Global networks of knowledge sharing. We have quite a thriving architecture of Area Institutes in the guise of the African Studies Centre, CEDLA, KITLV, IIAS and this architecture should be used to good effect!

On top of that there should be focal points for major and financially massive Dutch specialisation. Of course that specialisation should be in fields where, on the one hand, there is a lot of accumulated strength and, on the other hand, where the outer world expects the Dutch to excel. As the WRR suggests, we need to make sure that the following five domains get long-term and massive support, as trans-disciplinary ventures:

- agriculture for global development and food security;
- global water management, and water-related adaptation to climate change;
- international law and human rights;
- global health systems, with a focus on infectious diseases;
- civil society and its relationships with government and business, at various levels of scale.

Again, the answer to the question of whether we need to specialise in a few countries, as was suggested by the WRR, is yes and no. We should maintain a solid basic infrastructure for area knowledge about the whole world. However, there are, of course, focal areas for long-term Dutch involvement and it would be beneficial to link the various knowledge agencies in the Netherlands that are involved in any of those focal areas, and with their network in the country or region concerned. If we do this, we should eventually be able to build a long-term longitudinal research infrastructure on the basis of trends and impacts in selected areas in these focal countries, while fully involving local centres of excellence in these Southern areas, and linking them effectively to partners in the Netherlands and abroad.

I think that now is very much the time to make a few decisions:

1. WOTRO in the lead.
2. As much funding as possible from our Ministry of Education, our Ministry of Foreign Affairs and other ministries, NGOs and businesses geared to global issues all going through the WOTRO structure.
3. A solid long-term foundation for maintaining and strengthening institutes for general knowledge on areas and issues.
4. Specific funding for a selected number of core areas of interest and knowledge sharing, making use of the best elements the scattered Dutch knowledge landscape has to offer, both in terms of excellence, and in terms of relevance for development, and that includes relevance for capacity building in the South. This means supporting excellence in the South, but also involving Dutch knowledge workers, for linking and co-learning purposes.
5. For WOTRO this would mean combining its function as funding agent with a function as a knowledge broker.

