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The year began with a sense of optimism about the strength of the international commitment to international development, but has ended on a more sombre note. The momentum imparted by Monterrey and by Rio, by the new round of trade talks, and by NEPAD, is threatened by dissension over Iraq and the possibility that large, rich countries will become more assertively self-interested. Those of us who are committed internationalists have work to do, on two fronts.

First, we need to make the case for a world which is more equal and more socially cohesive. Poverty reduction, human security and environmental sustainability are not philanthropic extras: they are central to the well-being of rich countries as well as poor ones. If the Doha Round fails, rich countries will be among the greatest losers. If poverty continues to worsen in Africa, and conflict to spread, rich countries will inevitably be affected. If disease spreads because health infrastructure is poor, then both the health of the rich and their economic infrastructure will be at risk. Working to reduce poverty is the right thing to do because poverty is a moral and social wrong. But it also benefits us.

Second, we need to do what we can to strengthen - rebuild - international institutions. Some of this needs to be global, in particular with respect to the political and economic work of the United Nations. Some of it is more local, especially in the context of the European Union. We are entering a period in which a series of decisions will be taken about the future of Europe’s relations with developing countries, and we need to get those right. For example, will the combined impact of enlargement, economic slow-down and new security concerns mean that Europe becomes increasingly inward-looking, or focused on its ‘ring of friends’ in Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean? I hope not.

ODI’s work remains highly relevant to the evolving agenda. There are now close to fifty researchers at ODI, working with dozens of collaborators and Research Associates overseas. As this year’s report shows, our programme is wide-ranging, research-rich and policy-focused. Outreach is fundamental. I have been especially pleased this year by the reach and impact of our public affairs programme - for example, the series of meetings we helped to organise on NEPAD, and our various briefings at the time of the crisis in Iraq. We need to take on more projects like these.

We completed a strategic review of ODI’s work this year, with an unusual level of involvement by the Council of ODI. We reaffirmed our Mission Statement, as Britain’s leading independent think-tank on international development and humanitarian issues. A British base does not imply a solely British remit, of course, as Simon Maxwell emphasises in his contribution overleaf. ODI is, and needs to continue being, an institute with international ambitions. We drew the strong conclusion in our strategic review that ODI’s key task must be to work with partners around the world on the main policy issues facing the developing world. That means taking on the kind of global issue referred to earlier. It also means pooling our resources at ODI, and working much more in problem-focused and cross-cutting teams. There will be challenges, we think, to the traditional way of working – and we are confident that ODI can meet them.

I’m pleased to be associated with ODI, and grateful to its staff and Council for their support. The Council has been very helpful to me in my first year. I would like especially to thank Dominic Bruynseels, who chairs our Finance and General Purposes Committee and is now the Deputy Chair of the Institute. Avinash Persaud has also been especially helpful, as Chair of our new Council Working Group on funding. A number of Council members stood down this year, and we should express our thanks to them: Robin Coope, Professor Amartya Sen, and Jonathan Taylor. I would also like to welcome new members Tony Baldry MP, Hugh Bayley MP, Andrew Bennett, and Lord Stone.

Margaret Jay
At ODI, we often work on particular problems in particular places: but we also hope that our solutions will resonate more widely. Certainly, the urgent questions of our day, for example about how to rebuild international institutions, or create a successfully inclusive world, are transnational in character.

Achieving change is more complex when more than one country is involved. For example, how can coalitions be constructed across borders, across cultures, and across the boundary between developed and developing societies? How can genuine partnerships be fostered between those with greater resources and more access to power, and those with less? And how can the legitimacy of dialogue be strengthened at international level?

Our growing programme of work on how to bridge research and policy, led by John Young, emphasises the importance of policy networks and policy communities – groups of people from different domains who share ideas and work together. My own work this year, on the future of European Development Cooperation, has led me to the idea of ‘policy code-sharing,’ where groups of institutions collaborate in much the same way as airlines do, with shared agendas and cross-guarantees of quality.

Fostering networks
This kind of collaboration obviously involves much more than dissemination or communication, important though those are to an Institute which places great importance on the transformative potential of ideas. Take some examples.

First, all of us are involved in personal networks of various kinds, formal and informal, academic and otherwise. I myself am currently President of the Development Studies Association of the UK and Ireland, the main professional body for academics and practitioners engaged in international development. Until September, Sheila Page was President of the European counterpart of the DSA, the European Association of Development Institutes (EADI). We all need these kinds of professional associations. They introduce us to new ideas and new people. They help us with dissemination. And they help to represent our sector to the outside world.

"Policy code-sharing": shared agendas and cross-guarantees of quality.’

"ODI networks: a guided, but essentially open conversation.’

Closer to home, the main ODI networks, Humanitarian Practice (HPN), Agricultural Research and Extension (AGREN), and Rural Development Forestry (RDFN) have for many years provided a framework for communication between specialists within their communities – a guided, but essentially open conversation. They have also provided structure, putting together mailings or newsletters concentrating on particular themes. For example, the HPN newsletter, Humanitarian Exchange, contains a themed section: recent topics have included loud versus silent emergencies, the protection of people affected by conflict, and the food crisis in Southern Africa. HPN is very much focused on practitioners, so the conversations it fosters link quickly to change in agencies and in the field.

A further step has been to encourage and moderate very focused discussions, usually electronically. The Agricultural Research and Extension Network, AGREN, has set up electronic discussions, on globalisation and on the privatisation of extension services. Participants from 30 countries contributed to the discussion on globalisation, which focused on access to export markets and the threat to farmers of competition from imports. The food crisis in Southern Africa is currently the subject of an electronic discussion, moderated by Elizabeth Cromwell in the ODI Rural Policy and Environment Group.

The activities are intended to be open and participatory, though they remain ODI-led. This provides a degree of quality assurance, though it also raises questions about ownership and governance. Some of our activities tackle those questions head on. For example, six years ago we set up the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP) as an ODI Project. ALNAP has now developed into a mature network with 51 Full Member organisations, over 300 Observer members, and funding by 22 donor agencies. The ALNAP Steering Committee is representative of the membership, and acts as an Executive Body.

Other opportunities for ODI are to work with international networks which are themselves Southern-owned or part-owned. For example, we have collaborated with the African Economics Research Consortium, and more recently with the Global Development Network, now established as an independent foundation and soon to move to New Delhi. Our research-policy programme, RAPID, has been helping the GDN with its own programme on research and policy, involving a website and a collection of more than 50 case studies of how researchers can work more effectively with policy-makers.
Working with partners *in North*...

It is possible to have partnerships without networks, and this is another way ODI work crosses boundaries. For example, the Humanitarian Policy Group has a joint programme with Tufts University in the US, and has outposted one of its Research Fellows, Kate Longley, to work on humanitarian issues in Nairobi. Kate’s special area of expertise is on livelihood and livelihood rehabilitation in conflict areas, particularly from an agricultural perspective. It is appropriate that she should be based in the Nairobi office of ICRISAT, the International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics.

Many similar partnerships can be found. On European development policy, we collaborate very closely with the European Centre for Development Policy Research, based in Maastricht, in the Netherlands: we no longer have a joint post with ECDPM, as we have had in the past, but certainly regard it as our partner of choice in this important area. ECDPM, in turn, brings a strong set of partnerships with other institutions in Europe and in ACP countries.

Partnerships can be at project level. This year, for example, we have completed an important review of results-based management, as a key tool of public expenditure reform. The work was led by John Roberts, who until March led our Centre on Aid and Public Expenditure, and is now Head of an outposted DFID unit at ODI (another partnership) called the Economics and Statistics Analysis Unit. The review involved research in seven countries on three continents (plus a further review of OECD countries) and involved 19 researchers.

...and South

Are some of our partners Southern-based? Of course. We have project or programme relationships with many Southern institutions, often over a long period of time and over a series of projects. For example, the Chronic Poverty Research Centre, which ODI leads, jointly with the Institute of Development Policy Management in Manchester, builds on long-established collaborations with partner institutions in South Africa, Bangladesh, India, and Uganda. Our work on capacity-building for trade, the African Trade and Poverty Programme, similarly builds on partnerships with collaborators from the South, in this case in South Africa.

We do need to recognise, however, that institutional partnerships, beyond the project level, take time to build and cost money, for both partners. It is not easy to find donors who will underwrite the long-term commitment that full partnership-building requires.

 Some of our best Southern partnerships are with Governments, and find expression in the ODI Fellowship Scheme. The FS is forty years old this year, and is celebrating winning the DTI Award for Capacity-Building at the 2003 Worldaware Awards for Business. As the judges observed in their citation, ‘By helping to grow indigenous capacity in the form of well-trained and experienced development economists, the ODI Fellowship Scheme provides an essential ingredient to many developing country governments.’ Quite so. There are currently 55 Fellows posted to 20 countries.

Influencing policy

ODI is not and cannot be disengaged. We describe ourselves as Britain’s leading independent think-tank on international development and humanitarian issues, and so we are. That should never mean, however, that our focus is entirely on UK policy. If the problems are international, then so are the solutions, and so are the partnerships and alliances needed to find and promulgate them. Our commitment needs to be to knowledge networks and communities of practice around the world.

’Our commitment needs to be to knowledge networks and communities of practice around the world.’

I hope that is evident in our work, reported in more detail – and in a new format – in the following pages. We are able to report an extraordinary range of work this year. The Institute owes a great deal – and so do I as Director – to the commitment and inspiration of all our staff. Thanks to them all. As usual, some researchers left this year and some joined. We say goodbye as Research Fellows to San Bilal, Roger Blench, Karim Hussein, Peter Newborne, Andy Norton, and Gill Shepherd; and as Research Officers to Craig Johnson, Felix Naschold, and Dan Start. We welcome new RFs – Ian Gillson, Paul Harvey, John Mitchell (as Coordinator of ALNAP), and Steve Wiggins; and new ROs – Ed Andersen, Dirk Bezemer, Julius Court, Zaza Curran, Sonia Fagernas, Adele Harmer, NamBusi Kyegombe, Cokro Leksmono, Cecilia Luttrel, Dorothya Meyer, Rachel Slater, and Tim Williamson.

Finally, a special thank-you to the Council, under its new Chair, Baroness Margaret Jay. She has helped us complete a strategic review this year.

Simon Maxwell
Humanitarian Policy

The Humanitarian Policy Group is one of the world’s largest teams of policy researchers and information professionals working on humanitarian policy issues. It combines a capacity for independent and critical research with a valued ability to act as a neutral forum for debate and information exchange around key issues of concern to humanitarian policy makers and practitioners. The work of the Humanitarian Policy Group centres around three key themes:

- The evolving architecture of humanitarian action
- Maximising the impact of humanitarian response in chronic crises
- Laws, Principles and the Responsibility to Protect

These themes are reflected in the Group’s research and commissioned work, and in the material published by the Humanitarian Practice Network.

---

**The evolving architecture of humanitarian response**

**Bilateralisation of humanitarian aid**

- Official donors are becoming increasingly involved in humanitarian decision-making and operations. ODI has been working with the governments of the Netherlands and Sweden to convene an international working meeting between donors and their key operational partners to agree and codify the principles that should inform official donor policy and practice in the humanitarian arena, and to establish mechanisms by which donor performance might be monitored (see Policy Brief, page 6). HPG contributed to the UK’s National Audit Office’s investigation into the UK responses to international emergencies and to evaluations of DFID’s Institutional Strategy Papers.

**Monitoring Trends**

- The interface between humanitarian and political responses to complex political emergencies was examined in HPG’s first report on key trends in humanitarian policy. Integrated approaches to humanitarian response are now being widely adopted, and HPG has worked with the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue to evaluate their significance.

**Maximising the impact of humanitarian response in chronic crises**

**Understanding the political economy of war: a livelihoods approach**

- How have communities adapted their ways of life and means of securing an adequate income under the combined pressures of violence and structural changes in economic, social and political relations? In studies from Afghanistan, Senegal, Sierra Leone and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, HPG researchers have adapted established development methodologies to provide insights into these complex environments, with implications for ways in which international actors might adapt their responses to enhance effectiveness.

- Review of the evidence of links between transnational corporations and conflict, and mechanisms for regulating their conduct (Philippe Le Billion, a Research Associate).

---

**Humanitarian Policy Group**

- Joanna Macrae: Group Coordinator
- James Darcy: Research Fellow
- Paul Harvey: Research Fellow
- Catherine Longley: Research Fellow
- Frances Stevenson: HPN Coordinator
- Adele Harmer: Research Officer
- Charles-Antoine Hofmann: Research Officer
- Lin Cotterrell: HPG Publications Coordinator
- Matthew Foley: HPG Group Administrator
- Julie Bygraves: HPG Project Administrator
- Alison Prescott: Project Administrator, HPN and Disasters
- Siobhan Thomas*: HPG Website Development Officer

* Left during the year

---

Fifty-eight-year-old Namukolo Siyuni heads a household of 10 orphan children

© Marko Kokic/International Federation of the Red Cross
Iraqi Kurdistan, April 1991: in a few days, 55,000 Kurds headed for Turkey.
© Médecins sans Frontières

Humanitarian Practice Network (HPN)

HPN provides a unique platform for policy-makers, practitioners at headquarters, management and field levels and others working in or on the humanitarian sector to share and disseminate information, analysis and experience. HPN produces a range of specialist information resources which include a newsletter, longer papers and state of the art reviews, targeted at relief practitioners and programme managers. It also maintains a comprehensive website (with an average of 45,000 hits per month) and hosts a seminar series.

HPN has a membership of over 2,000 people, working for over 400 organisations and located in about 80 countries. Over the past year, the network has continued to keep its members informed of the wide range of issues confronting the sector, ranging from civil-military relations, to supporting livelihoods in chronic emergencies, to issues of international humanitarian law and trends in official donor policy. It has also contributed to real-time discussions with special features and meetings on the Southern Africa drought and humanitarian policy in Iraq.

HPN’s range of products, and its ability to target practitioners and programme managers make it a unique and highly valued resource within the sector. In 2002/03, HPN received a special grant to review best practice in the field of post-conflict housing reconstruction, which will be published in mid-2003.

www.odihpn.org
Redefining the official humanitarian aid agenda

Joanna Macrae, Adele Harmer, James Darcy and Charles-Antoine Hofmann

Every year, approximately $6 billion is spent by OECD countries on emergency relief (see graph below). This money is a vital support to some of the poorest people in the world – but the way it is spent is changing and there are growing concerns about politicisation of official humanitarian aid (OHG). ODI research has tracked those changes. We propose a new ‘deal’ and a new set of principles to protect the essential purpose of humanitarian aid.

Humanitarian aid needs to be impartial and neutral (see Box). Humanitarian donors need to be accountable. But while there has been much talk of an ‘accountability revolution’ in the sphere of international humanitarian action over the last decade, the behaviour of official donors in the humanitarian arena has attracted little scrutiny.

As it happens, donors have become more involved in humanitarian decision-making and operations. They have become much less willing to delegate full responsibility to UN, Red Cross and NGOs actors for defining need and planning responses. This phenomenon of ‘bilateralisation’ of humanitarian response includes a number of elements:

• Increased earmarking of contributions
• An increasing role for donors in the coordination of humanitarian action
• Tougher contractual and managerial regimes to manage donor-agency partnerships
• Increased donor presence at field level
• Increased use of non-conventional humanitarian organisations to deliver assistance, including the military and private contractors.

These changes reflect donors’ legitimate demands to enhance the performance and accountability of their operational partners. But these moves have also coincided with a period when many donor governments have been developing much more interventionist approaches to the management of conflict, and seeking ways of linking their assistance programmes with a wider effort to enhance international peace and security. Humanitarian principles may be at risk.

Some commentators have begun to question donor motives. Is this simply, as most donors argue, a means of enhancing the effectiveness of humanitarian action? Or does it mark a gradual encroachment on the political independence of humanitarian action, with operational agencies becoming little more than the executing wings of donor governments?

Research by the Humanitarian Policy Group at ODI concludes that while donors have a legitimate and important role to play in managing international humanitarian assistance, there are important problems in the way that they are currently doing so.

First, the trend towards bilateral decision-making militates against ensuring that humanitarian aid resources are distributed in proportion to need. Current allocations of humanitarian aid tend not to be allocated impartially, but rather to be highly concentrated on the visible emergencies in which Western donors are playing a prominent military and political role. So, for example, between 1996 and 1999, the top five recipients of bilateral humanitarian aid were all political hotspots: Bosnia, Serbia and Montenegro, the former Yugoslavia (unspecified), Iraq and Israel, which together accounted for £2,725 million. The next five, Rwanda, Sudan, Afghanistan, Angola and Indonesia – received $1,388 million combined. These allocations cannot be explained in terms of the relative need of the populations.

Second, the way in which humanitarian aid spending is reported remains very opaque, and it is extremely difficult to track where funds are being disbursed, and the different channels for disbursement (UN, NGO etc). It is also very difficult to measure quickly and accurately the precise size of the emergency aid pot, since many donors continue to report spending on refugees living in their own countries as part of their official development assistance.

More generally, the mechanisms by which donors are held to account...
There are important and real opportunities for realising this agenda. In particular, in parallel with its work on 'bilateralisation', HPG has been undertaking a study commissioned by an international group of donors and agencies called the Humanitarian Financing Work Programme. As part of this initiative, HPG has led an international team that has sought to investigate the process by which needs are defined and measured, and the role of needs assessment in informing donor decisions regarding resource allocations.

The findings of the study coincide with that in the bilateralisation study, in that both highlight the fact that donor behaviour cannot be understood in isolation. Rather, what needs to be understood are the relationships between donors and their operational partners. Specifically, the study finds that agencies themselves often fail to undertake robust assessment of needs, but tend instead to tailor their assessments to the process of raising funds for their programmes. There need to be more consistent approaches to the definition of need, in terms of key indicators, health, well-being and security, and these need to serve as more systematic triggers for response by donors and operational agencies alike. More broadly, HPG's work suggests that these agencies need to develop a more critical and open relationship with their donors, not simply to comply passively with what they think donors want. In other words, to build a relationship based on trust and genuine partnership.

The agenda is both simplest and significant. It is modest in that it is concerned with a relatively tiny proportion of global wealth, which is seeking to counter the effects of much more powerful military, political and economic interests in disaster-affected countries. It is significant in that defining the purpose of such funds, the way in which they are managed, and the basis on which they are allocated says much about the relationship between the most powerful nations and some of the most marginalised people on the planet.
The challenges of development and poverty reduction span ‘upstream’ issues (what are the factors that weaken states and reduce the impact of aid?) and ‘downstream’ issues of market failure and social exclusion – those that strike directly at the lives and livelihoods of poor people. Increasingly, the work of PPPG spans both poles of this continuum. We continue to have a big investment in the politics of pro-poor change at country level, PRSP processes, public management reforms and new modalities of development assistance. But we are also concerned with problems of conflict, injustice and extreme or chronic poverty that are liable to be bypassed by too narrow a focus on improving national policy processes and aid. A big challenge is to arrive at policy formulas and ways of working that are capable of reconciling these concerns under different country conditions.

Pro-poor politics?

- Donors increasingly recognise that pro-poor policy change is highly political. Yet understanding of the fundamental values and interests of national policymakers is often limited. An ODI-led team of researchers has examined pro-poor reforms in Cambodia and Vietnam, concentrating upon policy change in the land, forestry and health sectors, and how donors might be able to apply these insights in practice (Tim Conway and Cecilia Luttrell, FPEG).

- Under what conditions can states be made more responsive to the needs of the poor? Studies in Uganda and Ghana emphasise the significance of strategic political decisions at various stages; the importance of sequencing in democratic decentralisation; and different ways of linking local and sector planning (Joy Moncrieffe and David Booth).

- When donors recognise the role of politics in pro-poor change, questions arise about whether and how positive changes can be supported. An evaluation of DFID’s Political Empowerment Programme in Kenya concluded that where donors set up a basket fund to support civic education nation-wide, major difficulties can be avoided (Laure-Hélène Piron).

- Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) are inherently political – intended to focus policy-making and budgets on the needs of the poor, and to make governments primarily accountable to citizens for the effective use of aid. But the explicitly political aspect of this new aid modality has been largely hidden. An ODI team has been researching how national political systems and political cultures have shaped poverty reduction strategy papers, and how devising and then implementing a PRSP has in turn influenced political change. Studies in Bolivia, Georgia, Uganda and Vietnam suggest that the effects, while subtle and often precarious, may nonetheless be significant (Alison Evans, Laure-Hélène Piron, Erin Coyle, David Booth and Tim Conway).

Supporting PRSP processes in Africa and Asia

PSIA

- Policy reforms supported by IMF and World Bank loans have frequently been criticised for neglecting social impacts. Changed thinking in Washington has led to the routine adoption of Poverty and Social Impact Analysis (PSIA), and DFID has been funding ‘demonstration’ PSIAs in 7 countries. The Uganda exercise was led by ODI (David Booth), and the PRSP Monitoring and Synthesis Project organised a seminar series at DFID to draw together lessons. Using existing data, the impact of specific policy changes on the poor can rapidly be assessed and necessary compensatory measures identified. Governments are seeing the relevance of PSIA, and engagement with other stakeholders yields extra insights (Alison Evans, Erin Coyle, Karin Christiansen and Zaza Curran).

Monitoring implementation

- As Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) become central to the poverty-focused conditionality of the World Bank and IMF, there is an urgent need for national monitoring of their implementation and impact. PPPG staff have worked on this in Pakistan, Ghana,
Kenya and Rwanda, and facilitated a regional workshop for DFID social development and statistics advisers.

- An ODI team worked with government officials to draw up a monitoring and evaluation framework for the Pakistan PRSP, integrating existing and proposed information systems (Andy McKay, Felix Naschold and Tim Conway). Another group provided technical support to the final stages of Pakistan’s national Participatory Poverty Assessment (David Booth and Karin Christiansen).

- In Africa, ODI staff contributed to the monitoring and evaluation sections of the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy, worked on a framework for Kenya, and facilitated strategic poverty planning in Rwanda (Andrew Shepherd, Kate Bird, Nambusi Kyegombe, Andy McKay, David Booth, Karin Christiansen, Alison Evans and Erin Coyle).

Policy brief

Budgets not projects: a new way of doing business for aid donors

David Booth

Development assistance is changing fast. Around half of all aid to some countries now takes the form of un-earmarked contributions to the national budget. Both projects and sector programmes are becoming less important in terms of funding flows, and the total number of projects is far less than in the past. The change reflects a strong trend in thinking about the costs and benefits of different forms of aid.

As well as displacing projects and sector support, the current wave of general budget support (GBS) is different in purpose from previous forms of ‘programme aid’. In the forms of food aid, balance-of-payments support and direct budgetary assistance, programme aid has been important at various times in the past. But it was generally used to bridge specific financial gaps or to bolster governments’ commitments to policy reforms agreed with the IMF or World Bank. Today, in contrast, GBS is meant to rebuild countries’ capacities to decide and implement policies for themselves. This follows a long period in which this capacity has been weakened by a combination of bad political leadership, intrusive yet ineffective conditionality, and the building of parallel structures by project funders.

GBS is the aid counterpart of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, the initiative of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund designed to nudge borrowing countries into setting their own development agendas. Its purpose is to support countries in implementing their PRSPs, and to do so in the framework of a medium or long-term partnership. Although there are other ways donor country programmes can be aligned with PRSPs, supporters of GBS maintain that it is the best choice whenever circumstances permit.

A team from ODI and Oxford Policy Management has been examining GBS in Uganda, Mozambique and Andhra Pradesh, India.

At a first level of change, GBS is supposed to empower government in relation to donors, while reducing transaction costs and improving the predictability of funding flows. At a second level, GBS is believed to improve the capabilities of the state (by using and focusing remedial attention on national systems) and to strengthen processes of democratic accountability (e.g. by enabling more effective parliamentary scrutiny). A further hypothesis is that these changes will lead in due course to improved government performance and hence economic growth and better outcomes for poor people.

Initial testing suggested that, while plausible, the critical linkages are not automatic but call for supporting changes that are only likely to arise from national political processes. Greater predictability of donors emerged as important but problematic under current conditions.

The most important findings, however, were about the limited degree to which stakeholders have internalised the rationale of ‘new’ GBS. Among donors other than DFID, there was a tendency to alternate between an old-fashioned faith in conditionality and a rather rootless rhetoric about partnership. There is an urgent need to clarify the ‘rules of the game’ governing the new GBS agreements.

GBS in Uganda

- 55% of aid takes this form, with some residual earmarking.
- GBS donors participate actively in sector working groups and other fora.
- Health planners claim big increases in efficiency and outputs as a result of the redirection of project funds into the budget.
- Political issues are still interfering with the reliability of funding.

A search for applicable analytical models found these not in the theory of contracts (as in the cases of conditionality and partnership) but in the theory of firms or clubs. In the terminology of Albert Hirschman, GBS agreements should be conceptualised as a multi-stakeholder ‘club’, where membership entails interconnected rights and obligations governing ‘exit’, ‘voice’ and ‘loyalty’.

There are practical implications. There need to be arrangements for consultation that allow donors influence (voice) commensurate with their commitment to a relatively open-ended policy agenda. In return for voice, some limitations on exit – on the speed or timing of any withdrawal of funding – must be in place. Not least important, participants should make a good prior assessment of the costs, benefits and risks of the arrangement, including all the relevant political factors.
Public management reforms

• Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEFs) are critical parts of the new ‘comprehensive’ approach to international development, to help countries implement effective poverty reduction strategies. ODI studies in eight African countries and Albania have found that while weaknesses in public expenditure management can still be an obstacle to achieving poverty reduction, channelling aid through MTEF-based budgets does appear to have positive results (Alison Evans).

• Results-based management (RBM) underpins current conventional wisdom on poverty reduction. But, if poorly implemented, RBM can cause serious distortions, create perverse incentives, and undermine trust. Effective RBM draws on models of learning organisations and ‘double-loop learning’, which involves local adaptation and ownership, incorporates a qualitative dimension, rewards genuine value-added, avoids rewarding success at the expense of genuine need, and institutes new forms of accountability (Simon Maxwell).

Towards a new architecture of aid?

• Africa’s development crisis has been high on the international development agenda for at least twenty years. In 2002/3, it was also high on the international political agenda – thanks to the NEPAD initiative taken by African leaders, and the strong support for NEPAD from the G8 at the Kananaskis Summit. The new Africa ‘project’ has many constituent elements – trade, debt relief, conflict resolution, aid – bound together by a new commitment to partnership. But there are risks. G8 countries need to stay engaged, even with the difficult countries; and need to beware of ‘picking winners’. Further, they need to strengthen the mechanisms which make them accountable to African partners, perhaps by means of jointly-owned peer review (Simon Maxwell and Karin Christianse).

• The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) provide an internationally-agreed set of long-term targets to focus the policies of poor governments and donors. Amongst bilateral donors, DFID has been notable in explicitly making the MDGs the basis of their strategic objectives and management systems. The International Development Select Committee, which provides Parliamentary oversight of DFID’s work, commissioned ODI to provide a succinct summary of how the MDGs came into existence, progress made to date, and the potential strengths and weaknesses of DFID’s use of the MDGs (Tim Conway and Karin Christiansen).

• Understanding changes in donor policy helps national stakeholders and other agencies to engage more effectively in international debates. ODI has written an analytical account of how UK development cooperation policy has changed since 1997, addressing not only the intellectual rationale but also the political influences shaping it (Tim Conway and Karin Christiansen).

• Donors are increasingly recognising the country level as crucial in the formation of partnership-based development policy. ODI contributed to a review of Sida country strategy development in Laos and Vietnam, concluding that medium-term steering documents have often exercised only limited influence on Swedish development cooperation activities (Tim Conway).

• As donor agencies adopt a ‘rights-based’ approach to development, there is still a lack of consensus about what the approach consists of. ODI work also suggests a gap between human rights and development actors, and scepticism on the part of Southern governments (Laure-Hélène Piron).

Conflict and injustice

• Countries in Africa affected by conflict can develop sound poverty strategies. But they face major challenges – the lack of credible political authority; a minimal functioning government; and a political climate making public participation impossible. Donors should ensure that strategies for peace and emergency relief are coordinated with poverty reduction strategies (Alison Evans and Erin Coyle).

• The Rwandan government is trying to develop genocide suspects through a participatory process (’gacacas’) while also planning to reform the administration of justice to strengthen its professionalism and independence. Donors could help the government to prioritise, cost and sequence long-term reforms and improve key relationships by moving towards a ‘sector-wide’ approach (Laure-Hélène Piron).

Exclusion and inclusion

• Global factors, including trade liberalisation and foreign direct investment, are seen as drivers of increased inequality within countries.
Ongoing work suggests that greater exposure to external influences does not necessarily increase inequality but often does, with important implications for policy (Ed Anderson and Andy McKay).

- Reducing rural poverty is no easy task – especially in Central America, where most of the poor still live in rural areas, and depend significantly on agriculture. As traditional commodity prices have fallen, not least for coffee, agriculture is no longer an engine of growth. Emigration has been one response – though remittances to the region have caused currencies to appreciate and put more pressure on productive sectors. While better-connected areas are recovering, poorly connected areas may need more social protection (Simon Maxwell and Michael Richards, research associate).

- In Cambodia, user fees have encouraged the poor to use inexpensive clinic services, rather than more expensive hospital services. Hospital staff need a system for identifying the poor for fee exemptions, which need to be financed. ODI reviewed findings from pilot schemes and made proposals for future developments in pro-poor health financing (Tim Conway).

The chronically poor

- There are between 389 and 727 million chronically poor people in 32 developing countries. Many are structurally excluded from economic growth. Reasons for exclusion can be socio-cultural, political or related to the nature of economic growth and a country’s insertion into the global economy (Andrew Shepherd).

- Both nationally and internationally, redistributive policies and effective social protection are required to address chronic poverty. Very low asset ownership is as important an indicator as low income. Measuring and redistributing key poverty-reducing assets are becoming increasingly critical focuses of poverty reduction policies, and the existing opportunity-based post-Washington consensus needs to be reappraised. Social protection measures are powerful instruments for interrupting chronic poverty as well as preventing transient poverty, but are generally neglected (Andrew Shepherd).

- In Uganda HIV/AIDS has had a major impact on socio-economic mobility. Through economic growth, a proportion of households severely affected by HIV/AIDS in the late 1980s and early 1990s have ‘progressed’. Household structure and intra-household relations, and the capabilities and freedoms derived from these, have been more important in susceptibility to long term poverty than structural socio-economic factors (Andrew Shepherd).

- In rural Uganda, access to health services by the chronically poor is constrained by distance and cost. Despite the country’s good record in responding to HIV/AIDS, AIDS-affected households in low-infection rate (rural) areas are given little or no counselling, palliative care or other support. Psycho-social problems, including alcohol abuse, are both a cause and a consequence of chronic poverty in rural Uganda, but fall outside development programming (Kate Bird).

- Village level government officials in some parts of tribal Madhya Pradesh, India, divert the bulk of disability and pension payments for their own use, using the balance to reinforce patron-client relationships with local communities. Despite ‘better’ gender equity than mainstream Hindu society in Northern India, domestic violence is used against young wives in tribal communities in SW Madhya Pradesh to encourage hard(er) work and conformity (Kate Bird).

- Quantitative evidence from Uganda during the 1990s shows that though total poverty has fallen sharply, many have remained in persistent poverty and others have fallen into poverty. Inadequate levels of assets are key factors behind this. Similar results are obtained in urban Ethiopia which has experienced high levels of chronic poverty in recent years (Andy McKay).
Policy brief

Michael Warner

How can the corporate sector play a more effective part in tackling poverty? Can we assume that encouraging the corporate sector to invest in low-income regions results in greater access to employment for the poor and greater tax revenues directed towards social programmes? Is it practicable to position the corporate sector as an agent in the delivery of the international Millennium Development Goals and the poverty reduction strategies of national governments? Conversely, are we right to believe that progress towards poverty reduction reinforces economic and political stability, helps markets to grow, and provides a platform for private sector development?

The new business frontier

In many of the poorest countries and regions of the world there remain persistent challenges to realising the true value of corporate sector investment. The main challenges are listed in the box ‘Partnerships for development’. There is also a wide range of adverse environmental and social impacts that companies often fail fully to mitigate, such as the loss of renewable natural resources, livelihood insecurity following resettlement, impacts on cultural integrity, and the management of long-term environmental risks, such as groundwater pollution.

And yet the business units and activities of corporations operating in developing countries have substantial potential to do good across whole districts and regions. New approaches need to be ‘smart’. They must avoid disincentivising further investment or undermining current business performance. They must optimise the returns for both business and development.

The building blocks are beginning to be put in place, through a new action research programme at ODI – Optimising the Development Performance of Corporate Investment. The main focus is on the way in which the business units of multi-national corporations discharge their social responsibilities and contribute to economic development in the poor societies in which they market products and services, manage field operations or source supplies. The new approach (see Figure) recognises that:

- business units with a local presence are a source of assets, resources, capabilities and competencies that may be substantially underutilised; and
- though these core business competencies may sometimes be effectively deployed alone, significant leverage can be obtained by pooling these in partnership with the competencies of other organisations (government authorities, international development agencies and civil society organisations), and in this way more closely align strategic business objectives (such as short-term reputation assurance and long-term growth) with the strategic development objectives of society (such as the Millennium Development Goals, national poverty reduction strategies, regional development plans and community livelihood priorities).

Development performance in the absence of regulation

Business opportunities often lie in societies facing significant social problems, from mass poverty, disease and corruption, to conflict and human rights violations. To manage these problems, companies have largely looked to regulatory frameworks, corporate policies and principles, and international codes and standards. However, this ‘compliance-centred’ approach is ill-suited to the poorer parts of the world, where the most critical corporate responsibility issues are often social and economic, not safety or the environment.

In the absence of regulatory frameworks requiring companies to contribute to social needs and economic objectives, companies and institutional investors alike have turned to international frameworks and instruments, such as the Global Reporting Initiative, Global Compact, and Dow Jones Sustainability Index. But these are seriously lacking in consideration of development issues beyond the usual ‘safeguard measures’ of labour standards, human rights, corruption and stakeholder dialogue.

International standards are needed to help businesses contribute to the reduction of poverty and, more generally, optimise the value added by the business to society’s social and economic developmental objectives.

There is a further reason for companies to begin to think about their ‘development’ performance both in financial terms and in terms of core business competencies. This is the increasing evidence of the business opportunities associated with such behaviour. Examples include: 25% capital expenditure savings by aligning operational infrastructure with government sector plans; 1 400% resource leverage from governments and NGOs in providing combined employee and community health care; 2 improvements in supplier reliability by providing working capital and management support to local businesses; and long-term business growth based in part on ensuring a positive economic and social legacy in the region of operations. 3 One reason that financial benefits such as these are possible, is the cost saving and leverage gains to be had from deploying ‘existing’ company assets, resources and staff, as against introducing new fixed costs such as those required to improve safety and environmental performance in line with regulatory requirements.

Avinash Persaud sums up...

“...the biggest mismatch between what SRI (socially responsible investment) trustees say they are concerned about, and what they actually screen for in their [ethical] investments, is in the area of international development.” 4

---

A core competencies approach to optimising the development performance of corporate investment

**Company’s Core Competences**
- Cash
- Borrowing capacity
- Physical assets, e.g. land, production technology, office equipment, vehicles
- Financial and accounting skills
- Project and contract management skills
- Training skills
- Procurement management
- Quality control
- Management of employee health facilities and other employee benefits
- Development and management of operational infrastructure (power, water, sanitation, telecommunications, transportation, waste)
- Distribution networks
- Market research and marketing expertise
- Administration and legal expertise
- Environmental management
- Product R&D

**Partners’ Core Competences**
**Government**
- Strategic co-ordination
- Regulatory powers
- Expenditure budgets
- Broker
**Civil Society**
- Local knowledge
- Pro-poor focus
- Independence
- Longevity of local presence
**International donators**
- Budget support
- Grants
- PPP expertise
- Risk finance

**Partnerships for development**
Partnerships for sustainable development between business, government and civil society are a relatively new phenomenon. Unlike out-sourcing arrangements, or public-private partnerships, these new social partnerships seek not to **shift** responsibility and risk from one party to another, but to **share** risks, pool resources and talents and deliver **mutual benefits** for each party. ODI is currently working on adapting the partnership model to social performance in Extractive, Construction and Telecommunications sectors.

In recognition of the complexity of brokering such multi-sectoral partnerships, ODI and the International Business Leaders Forum have launched what is believed to be the first ever professional Partnership Brokers Accreditation Scheme (PBAS). A pilot year for the scheme will run from September to December 2003 (by invitation). Accreditation will be granted to those who successfully complete a 7-day intensive residential skills training course and three months of mentored professional practice.

**Strategic Business Objectives**
- New business investment opportunities
- New products and services
- Access to risk finance
- Effective distribution of tax and royalty revenues
- Effective social and environmental risk management
- Higher worker productivity and staff retention
- Procurement reliability and lower supplier costs
- Efficient capital expenditure on operational infrastructure

**Strategic Development Objectives**
**International**
- Millennium Development Goals
- International treaties and protocols
- Conflict prevention
**National**
- Investment stimulation
- Good governance and efficient fiscal management
- Enhanced environmental and social compliance standards
**Provincial**
- Decentralisation and institutional reform
- Long-term regional economic planning
- Enterprise development
- Access to essential infrastructure
**Local**
- Enhanced local income earning opportunities
- Access to health care and education
- Food security and humanitarian assistance
- Dispute prevention
IEDG’s activities extend beyond economic analysis to include policy advice to developing countries and to the UK Department for International Development, the European Commission and Parliament, the World Trade Organization and the Development Banks. We work closely with other economists in Europe and in developing countries. Our projects range from multi-year multi-country comparative analysis to short studies to answer immediate policy questions.

Trade negotiations
- Zambia, like other southern and eastern African countries, finds itself in a number of negotiations, more than one at regional level, with the US and EU, and multilateral. And at the same time, it is rethinking its own trade advantages. This requires clear national priorities and an awareness of the different negotiations and their interaction in achieving these (Sheila Page).
- In helping to set the EU policy in the Doha trade round, the UK government needs to consider how to promote both its own interests and development interests. Examination of the detail of what the negotiating countries want combined with understanding of the poverty impact of different trade policies can assist this (Sheila Page).

The impact of the WTO
- A study of the potential impacts of tariff reductions under the WTO, in textiles and clothing, pharmaceuticals and non-ferrous metals, reinforced the point that, while trade liberalisation offers potential benefits to developing countries as a whole, some countries and some groups within every country will suffer adjustment costs. The research identified, for each sector, the types of measures required to mitigate costs and to enhance potential benefits (Oliver Morrissey and Dirk Willem te Velde).
- The WTO is intended to be a rules-based system, to provide the conditions for efficient, non-distorted growth. It also attempts to promote development, through offering favourable conditions for developing countries. How these objectives are to be achieved is perhaps one of the most fundamental challenges confronting the WTO. Recent reports suggest the need for objective graduation and eligibility criteria; greater flexibility; a targeted approach to trade-related technical assistance; and, more coherence of special and differential treatment issues at the global and national levels (Ian Gillson).

Trade with the European Union
- The EU has asked its associated African, Caribbean and Pacific countries to negotiate with it ‘Economic Partnership Agreements’, combining aid with free trade. Helping ACP countries and regions with little negotiating experience to identify priorities and to make necessary preparations can reduce the imbalance in the negotiations. (San Bilal and Sheila Page).
- The most successful alliances of developing countries in multilateral negotiations have been based on interest groups (small islands, agricultural exporters, even sugar exporters), and broad regions (Africa, for example), rather than formal customs unions or free trade areas. To succeed, regions may need to concentrate on technical issues where they can coordinate interests (Sheila Page).
- The EU and MERCOSUR (the customs union of Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay) have strong politico-economic interests in a bilateral agreement, to balance each side’s other relationships, but the negotiations are stalled. On agriculture, the approaches appear irreconcilable. While MERCOSUR argues that liberalisation will benefit both exporters and importers, by increasing efficiency and income, the EU maintains that agriculture is a sector where non-market objectives have priority (Sheila Page).
- The ACP countries can learn from the experience of other groups which have negotiated agreements with the EU. They are in a weaker bargaining position than South Africa, Mexico, and Chile because they had more market or political leverage, and less need for an EU agreement. And they cannot hope for the advantages of EU membership which compensate the weakness of Eastern European countries. The ACP countries are further weakened by their dependence on the EU for both general aid and assistance in trade negotiations (Sheila Page).
- Trade facilitation encompasses areas ranging from government regulations and controls, business efficiency, transportation, information and communication technologies and the financial sector. An ODI analysis for UNECE examined its income distribution effects through its impact on international trade, economic growth and government revenue, and found that trade facilitation is an ally in the fight against poverty. Trading more efficiently tends to increase average incomes, providing more resources with which to tackle poverty. While it may affect income distribution, it may not do so in a systematically adverse way (Ian Gillson and Adrian Hewitt).

Trade’s impact on poverty and inequality
- Trade and trade policy have various effects on the welfare and economic opportunities facing different groups in society. These act both directly (e.g. if a trade change or policy affects the employment of poor people, and therefore their income) and through potential effects: if a trade policy changes the type or extent of anti-poverty policies available to and implemented by governments (or donors). Finding a framework within which these effects can be classified and better understood provides a basis for future assistance to African countries trying to coordinate their domestic poverty reduction priorities with their positions in trade negotiations (Andrew Shepherd (PPPG) and Sheila Page).
- An assessment of the Ghana Trade Policy Project a trade policy capacity-building project funded by DFID,
reviewed the Quarterly Reports and made suggestions (Oliver Morrissey).

**Investment**

- We examined the implementation of home country measures to promote foreign direct investment in the context of the Cotonou agreement between the EU and ACP countries, and how such measures could have affected FDI in the ACP (Dirk Willem te Velde and San Bilal).

**Aid and conditionality**

- We are examining how the provision of public goods can overcome market failures in industrial development (Dirk Willem te Velde and Oliver Morrissey).
- A study of IMF approaches to the ‘streamlining’ of its conditionality and their implications for the policies of the UK government led to preparation of case studies on Kenya and Zambia (Tony Killick).
- An evaluation of Swiss programme aid for the Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (Seco) made recommendations for future programme aid policies. Seco have since prepared a new statement of policy on programme based on our report, and plan a case study on Tanzania (Tony Killick).
- An Independent Monitoring Group examined relations between the Government of Tanzania and the donor community. This is being promoted as a model that could be applied elsewhere (Tony Killick).

**Globalisation**

- A report to DFID on the feasibility of establishing an African Growth Resource Centre recommended a programme of support for research and policy advice on growth policies to be undertaken by national African policy research institutes (Tony Killick).

**Economic consequences of disasters**

- Major natural disasters commonly have substantial short negative macro-economic impacts and that the reallocation of financial resources is the typical response by both governments of affected countries and aid agencies (Edward Clay).
Trade and investment matter for poverty reduction
Trade and investment are too important to be left out of national development strategies as they exert powerful effects, direct and indirect on poor people and poor countries. Even if the overall effect is positive, some groups may be adversely affected, and analysis must take into account the interaction between economic flows and policy responses. The poor and the non-poor themselves may adapt their behaviour to any incentive or shock from trade – but as our work in Africa shows, there are real differences in opportunities to participate.

Africa has experienced both the earlier non-economic globalisations (religious, cultural) and the last two centuries’ economic globalisation, with high trade dependence and strong trade, capital, and political links to both north and east. The links are less dense than for other regions because of the nature of its trade, and it is less likely to see structural change from trade because its exports are still largely in commodities. To be less globalised than the average puts it at a disadvantage in a world where international regulation and international institutions are adapting to more globalised countries (Sheila Page).

Trade policy is absent in PRSPs
Given the importance of trade policy, it is surprising that it has not been given prominence in the new development framework of donors and national governments - Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs). Where trade policy is reflected in PRSPs, the policy line tends to mirror the simplistic language of wholesale and rapid liberalisation. Donors and governments have failed to encourage a national debate on trade and investment policy choices and trade-offs. Only one PRSP (for Vietnam) makes reference to a Poverty and Social Impact Analysis conducted on trade policy.

Most PRSPs tend to focus more on expenditure rather than economic growth. The trade content that does exist is rarely underpinned by poverty analysis. While some trade policy choices have been considered within existing PRSPs, few developing countries go beyond a simple discussion of standard export promotion measures (Ian Gillson, Adrian Hewitt).

Trade can be good for (some of) the poor
There is evidence that openness to trade and investment contributes to growth, as well as increasing efficiency and income, given conducive economic conditions and government policies. But growth itself does not guarantee poverty reduction. The impact on poverty depends on how the gains from trade liberalisation and investment are distributed among sectors, workers, households and government. Where poverty is highly concentrated in rural areas, broad-based agricultural growth will have strong effects on poverty. The cases of coffee and fish in Uganda illustrate this point.

Since the early 1990s, Uganda has grown rapidly, with a significant reduction in measured income poverty. Trade, notably coffee exports, made a major contribution to growth and poverty reduction in 1992–97. In recent years, trade growth has been dominated by non-traditional exports (especially fish). Trade has expanded employment opportunities and contributed to increased incomes.

The main benefits have accrued to households employed in agriculture in the Central and Western regions, and to urban households employed in trade and services. A significant proportion of the population, the chronic poor, have not benefited and some have become worse off. The remote and insecure Northern region has not benefited (Oliver Morrissey).
By opening up new production possibilities, trade contributes to the shift from traditional activities to modern (often from agriculture to manufacturing or services).

**So can investment**

Investment affects wages and employment through the types of labour which foreign firms demand. There is evidence that foreign-owned firms in developing countries tend to pay higher wages but skilled workers tend to benefit more than less-skilled workers. With the exception of investment in textiles, most investment in manufacturing is likely to employ labour that is relatively skilled (in terms of the local market), and would not directly benefit the poor, although the poor may move into existing jobs.

Research on Latin American countries found that foreign direct investment tends to increase wage inequality there. FDI raised real wages of skilled workers more than wages of less skilled workers in Chile, while it lowered real wages of skilled workers less than wages of less-skilled workers in Bolivia. Appropriate policies to improve the distributional impact of FDI include good quality and appropriate education and training and linkage promotion between multinationals and domestic firms (Dirk Willem te Velde).

**Trade in services**

‘Trade policy’ and trade now go well beyond simple trade in goods. In particular, services trade is increasing rapidly. A higher share of services than goods has always been regulated nationally, while the reduction in barriers to goods trade has brought more previously regulated goods into trade. National regulation is increasingly either impinging upon trade or being required to change to accommodate trade. New conflicts have appeared between freer trade and national rules.

**Developing countries need to participate more effectively in the WTO**

Developing countries are increasingly taking part in international negotiations. From successfully modifying the outcomes of negotiations in the early 1990s, and then blocking an unwanted settlement (Seattle, 1999), many are now promoting their own initiatives (Doha Round). To succeed they need to develop domestic capacity to identify and coordinate objectives. But for them to be fully effective, the way in which the WTO makes decisions also needs to be changed: informal procedures are inadequate now that both its membership and its responsibilities have expanded.

**Both developed and developing may need new policies**

There are at least two ways to deal with the possible negative impacts of trade liberalisation on the poor. The first, the approach assumed in analysis of trade that finds that it increases welfare, is to compensate those who are hurt by trade liberalisation with effective safety nets. The second is to plan trade liberalisation to favour sectors with a direct impact on poverty, in the context of a comprehensive development agenda encompassing structural and institutional change and improved delivery of social services.

For investment, policies can increase the potential for workers and the economy to benefit from investment. For workers, these include education, training and industrial relations. Encouraging efficiency of domestic firms will enable them to benefit from linkages with foreign firms. Attracting investment into areas or sectors that are most likely to benefit the poor will improve direct effects.

Finally, trade and investment policies should be developed in a transparent and accountable manner, by national governments, with the support of donors. National governments should be responsible for opening up debates on the trade-offs associated with different policies for different groups of people. Northern governments could contribute by removing the constraints to improved trade and investment. This will include aid investments to strengthen transport infrastructure, health, education, and regulation and also to meet adjustment costs. But it will also include removing market access restrictions harmful to producers in developing countries.

---

**Exports of least-developed countries by destination, 2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufactured exports</th>
<th>Agricultural exports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western Europe</strong> 51%</td>
<td><strong>Western Europe</strong> 39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North America</strong> 37%</td>
<td><strong>Asia</strong> 38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asia</strong> 8%</td>
<td><strong>North America</strong> 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others</strong> 4%</td>
<td><strong>Others</strong> 16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Despite the rapid expansion of urbanisation, the majority of poverty is still found in rural areas. RPEG’s work spans a range of issues that affect rural livelihoods and poverty reduction. RPEG is devoting increasing attention to the role of livelihood diversification; the results of a major research effort in South Asia are now being drawn together, and work is expanding on policies for the rural non-farm economy. RPEG’s programme on pro-poor tourism provides policy-relevant information for the development of an important rural-based enterprise. The programme in water policy has expanded, encompassing new partners and new directions. RPEG also continues to devote attention to natural resource issues in rural development. Current work includes an examination of the impact of decentralised watershed development management in India, an assessment of policies for agricultural biodiversity conservation in Eastern and Southern Africa, and several studies related to agricultural development in sub-Saharan Africa.

Livelihood Diversification

- In rural India, agriculture-related work makes much more of a contribution to livelihoods than recent overviews have suggested, and migration has a positive impact. Perversely, participation in local public investment and service delivery decisions are higher in a State which has played down formal strengthening of local government (Andhra Pradesh) than in one which has promoted it strongly (Madiya Pradesh), raising questions about the relevance of local government reform. Government poverty reduction support could usefully be switched away from supply-focused approaches (including the provision of subsidised food) to demand-side measures, which could include cash transfers to disadvantaged groups (old age pensioners; the disabled; widows etc.) who have a high propensity to spend on food, in a setting where government food reserve policy has led to surpluses (John Farrington).

- The rural non-farm economy in developing countries contributes 40 - 60% of incomes and jobs in rural areas, mainly in trading and primary product processing while also providing goods and services. Improved education and infrastructure with effective microfinance are needed (Steve Wiggins).

Water Policy Programme

Understanding poverty and the institutions of water governance...

- In southern Africa new institutions of water management are seeking to make local-level resource development more ‘pro-poor’. However, recent research conducted with partners in Zimbabwe underscores the ways in which to effect political and social complexities of local environments make the reality of policy reform and user-driven catchment management difficult (Alan Nicol). Similarly in Asia (India and Sri Lanka), WPP research illustrates the complex local political and institutional environments challenging the notion of effective demand-responsive approaches to water supply and sanitation delivery (Alan Nicol/Tom Slaymaker). At a broader scale, incorporating effective pro-poor water and sanitation strategies in PRSP development and implementation in sub-Saharan Africa involves a number of key stakeholders – and relationships between them – that are at heart questions of pro-poor water governance (Peter Newborne). Work in both the West Bank and Gaza with the Palestinian Water Authority and in the Nile basin – through support to the DFID Nile Team – has addressed the linkage between local level livelihoods and broader policy development and implementation (Alan Nicol).

...Getting the message across

- Understanding the complexities of rural and urban livelihoods, the links between poverty and resource governance, and the way ‘demands’ are articulated by different groups (and responded to by different institutions) is beyond a single research programme. The WPP is therefore developing informal partnerships with organisations and groups based regionally in Asia, Africa and Latin America and is increasing its focus on website development. Recently the WPP has developed (with the British Geological Survey) a water and livelihoods website, www.waterandlivelihoods.org, which seeks to weave together global experience and best practice on water and livelihoods sustainability. Our global
networking activities have included participating in and sending teams to both the Johannesburg WSSD (2002) and to the Kyoto World Water Forum (2003). See box opposite for one of the WPP’s key recent dissemination events.

Tourism for pro-poor growth and poverty reduction

• Working with leading South African tourism operators, this project aims to explore, facilitate and document the implementation of pro-poor strategies at six ‘pilot sites’. By focusing on six mainstream industry players – including Southern Sun’s InterContinental Hotel in Sandton (Johannesburg) and Sun City, South Africa’s biggest resort – the aim is to move pro-poor tourism out of its ‘niche’ status to demonstrate its relevance across the industry, and to disseminate lessons to the wider tourism industry in Southern Africa (Caroline Ashley and Mboza Tourism Projects).

• Evaluating opportunities and obstacles in implementing pro-poor tourism strategies, looking at local economic linkages, the livelihood impacts of tourism and strategies for dispersing tourism to marginal, rural areas. Case Studies have examined the Narok district in Kenya where tourism is declining; and its potential to move pro-poor tourism out of its ‘niche’ status to demonstrate its relevance across the industry, and to disseminate lessons to the wider tourism industry in Southern Africa (Caroline Ashley). Local government reform and the management of NR in India

• In India, the decentralisation of natural resource management has not significantly increased access by the rural poor. Programmes have been valued for generating wage labour for the rural poor, and the opportunity for rural elites to buy property and dispense patronage. On the plus side, more strategic local political mobilisation is now possible. Decentralised natural resource management programmes need to be more aware of their political and ecological limitations, and more strategic in resolving them (John Farrington).

Supporting on-farm conservation in Eastern and Southern Africa

• Strategies to conserve agricultural biodiversity by paying farmers to maintain at-risk animal species to maintain at-risk animal breeds or crop varieties have proved to be unsustainable. ODI, working with international and regional institutions, has evaluated alternative small-scale grass-roots projects in Eastern and Southern Africa. See: www.sustainable-biodiversity.org (Elizabeth Cromwell, John Young).

Secure Water

Building up to the Third World Water Forum in Kyoto, Japan, in early 2003, ODI’s Water Policy Programme, working with photographer Andy Johnstone, mounted an exhibition at the Oxo Gallery on London’s South Bank attended by 2000 people. Illustrating the water problems of communities in urban Kenya, rural Sri Lanka and India, the exhibition’s highlight was the film Secure Water, which depicts linkages between, and the challenges of addressing, water, poverty and livelihoods through discussions with communities and decision-makers.

The film was then taken to the Kyoto World Water Forum and presented by Tom Slaymaker as part of the Asian Development Bank’s Water and Poverty Initiative. Developing appropriate media formats for presenting issues and arguments arising from our research, and ‘getting messages across’ to different target audiences is a key challenge for ODI and many positive lessons can be drawn from this project. (Secure Water was produced in collaboration with Wild Dog Ltd: photographs ©Andy Johnstone)

The Agricultural Research and Extension Network (AgREN)

ODI will continue to co-ordinate the Agricultural Research and Extension Network (AgREN). AgREN has approximately one thousand members and publishes full-length papers and a newsletter twice a year. DFID will extend its support of the network for a further three years. In addition to its traditional concerns with the methods and technologies of pro-poor agricultural development, AgREN will pay particular attention to the implications of three factors: globalisation, the reform of public service delivery, and rural livelihood diversification.

Protecting and promoting livelihoods in rural India: what role for pensions?*

John Farrington and N.C. Saxena

It is a major challenge to design and implement effective social protection schemes to tackle rural poverty. Specific protection measures are essential for the many who are unable to engage fully with the productive economy (because of old age, disability, ill-health or large numbers of dependents) since these can at best benefit only very indirectly from livelihood promotion efforts, such as those to stimulate agricultural growth.

In India, 70% of the 30% of the population currently in poverty, live in rural areas, and nearly three quarters of these depend primarily on agriculture. Malnutrition is widespread, with 207 million people unable to access enough food to meet basic nutritional needs, and over half of children under 5 years underweight. The Indian government spends US$5.5bn on poverty-reduction schemes, including around US$3bn on schemes administered by the Rural Development Department. These include: transfers to the poorest (the National Old Age Pension Scheme, the National Housing Scheme, and many food distribution schemes); asset-building schemes, (e.g. the Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme and the Drought Prone Areas Programme); employment creation; and promotion of self-employment. Other government departments have their own initiatives, the largest of which is the Public Distribution System, in which over 450,000 ‘fair price shops’ nationwide serve some 160m families with subsidised food. Together with its storage and acquisition system, this costs around a further US $5.0bn.

However, at least 20% of the funds disbursed through these channels fail to reach the poor and for some schemes ‘leakage’ is as high as 70%. Many government schemes have proved to be too complex and vulnerable to misappropriation. For instance, resources are diverted to political supporters; local officials demand ‘special payments’ to provide signatures or even the application forms; payment is extended to non-eligible groups; and contractors help to distort scheme provisions (e.g. using machinery instead of labour) and then share the ‘surplus’ with officials. However, according to a recent ODI study (see: www.livelihoodoptions.org), one method of resource-transfer which has been effective and relatively free from misappropriation is the transfer of cash, paid mainly through Post Offices as part of the Indian National Old Age Pension scheme (NOAPS).

Old Age Pension Scheme

At present around US$100m of central government funds are earmarked each year for transfer to the poor above the age of 65 through the NOAPS. This amounts to only US$1.60 per month, with the States adding on roughly the same amount again, though payments are irregular. Pensions are paid in various ways, the least misappropriated being small monthly payments either via the Post Office or a bank account. Once those eligible have been registered, payments can be made automatically in a tamper-proof manner. In rural drought-prone areas, practically all over 65 years are below the poverty line, and they all might be included, while mother and child allowances might become automatic via the Post Office in much the same way.

There are strong arguments to suggest that the level and scope of schemes for pensions and allowances could be increased substantially with little wastage. As a first step, the allocation could be doubled by extending the pensions scheme to all below the poverty line. Then, the individual pension allocation could be raised fourfold for all over 65s below the poverty line, costing some US$800m per year in total. Reducing the age limit to 60, making widows’ pensions universal, and providing an allowance to single-parent families would cost around an extra US$2.0 bn per year. Additional mother and child allowances might also be provided for a further US$0.5- US$1.0 bn. None of this would require “new” money: funds could be transferred out of weakly performing schemes with little loss of impact.

Using computer technology widely available in India, the efficiency of transfer processes can easily be strengthened. And, ideally, over the next ten years, pensions and allowance records would be linked to birth, death and marriage data, so that the personal discretion of local level officials or politicians over beneficiary selection could be kept to a minimum and all adults be provided with a record of their personal identification details.

Wider implications of protecting and promoting livelihoods

There are a number of general lessons about the identification of target groups. For acute problems such as drought, they can be selected by location, so that food aid can be delivered as rapidly as possible to those who need it. For chronic poverty, to use a ‘poverty line’ as a criterion poses serious difficulty – it is difficult to identify who is above or below the line, individuals in any case drift above and below, and official lists (even if accurate) are generally out of date. There is therefore wide scope for discretionary decisions by local officials, facilitating corruption and resulting in many eligible people being excluded while the ineligible gain benefits. Other criteria such as age, caste or marital status (in the case of pensions) might be more robust, though repeated updating will be
Agricultural development in Sub-Saharan Africa

- Improving the enabling environment for agricultural technology in sub-Saharan Africa will require a co-ordinated approach to regulatory reform, enterprise development, and public agricultural research (Robert Tripp).

- A proposal for a venture capital fund to support small seed companies in Eastern and Southern Africa, has led to the establishment of a limited partnership (African Agricultural Capital, L.P.) to invest in seed companies and related businesses (Robert Tripp).

- Improving the participation of black African small stock owners in wool and mohair markets in Southern Africa requires particular attention to inadequate market information (John Howell).

- The National African Farmers Union (NAFU) in South Africa is responding to the new opportunities provided by government’s black economic empowerment policies. NAFU has argued that grant-assisted land acquisition is not enough to promote the restructuring of farming and that much investigation is required into a range of barriers to profitability among the black producers. ODI research initiatives have covered specific commodity markets as well as access to services provided by insurers and inspection and certification agencies (John Howell).

Forum for Food Security in Southern Africa

The crisis affecting large parts of Southern Africa stems from a ‘perfect storm’ of factors – poor integration into input, output, finance and labour markets; the impact of HIV/AIDS, deteriorating institutional accountability; and the limitations in agricultural technology. Donor support for agriculture and rural development has also declined.

Conventional interpretations of drought and famine cannot explain the current crisis. The climatic events of the 2001 and 2002 agricultural seasons were less severe than those in the 1991/1992 drought. Rates of mortality have not risen significantly, although underlying rates of child malnutrition and morbidity and mortality associated with HIV/AIDS are high. This evidence points to root causes in the deep, widespread and persistent vulnerability of the human population in the region in the early twenty first century, which food aid will only alleviate in the short term. The need now is to understand how to break the stranglehold of poverty and vulnerability over the longer term. This is likely to involve a long hard look at: aid modalities in high HIV/AIDS environments; the role of government in economic coordination; and governance and accountability in national, regional and international institutions working in the region.

The Forum resulted from a meeting held at ODI in July 2002, and aims to support strategic thinking on food security issues in Southern Africa. It links together specialists and key policy stakeholders from the international and regional research community, governments, donors, NGO, civil society and the private sector in analysis, e-conferencing, and high level policy seminars. For more information on the Forum and its findings. See www.odi.org.uk/food-security-forum

(Elizabeth Cromwell, Steve Wiggins, Rachel Slater, and PPPG staff: Laure-Hélène Piron, David Booth, Kate Bird and John Young).


Farming family in Tsholotsho, Zimbabwe (Morag Ferguson/Elijah Rusike)
The Forest Policy and Environment Group aims to inform the processes of policy change in ways that will raise vulnerable groups out of poverty. Currently, FPEG is pursuing research and dissemination activities around two major themes: environmental governance, and forests, markets and the poor. Under the first, FPEG is working to demonstrate how progress in the forest sector, in areas such as public participation, accountability, the rule of law, public sector delivery and decentralisation, can leverage far wider gains in good governance, environmental stewardship and pro-poor change. Under the second theme, FPEG aims to increase understanding of the livelihood values of forests and to identify opportunities for the rural poor to obtain greater benefits from the subsistence and commercial use of forest products.

Environmental governance

- Policy makers are often unaware of the multiple dimensions of poverty, its root causes, and the role sustainably managed forests might play in supporting livelihoods. Where, as in Indonesia, the timber industry is powerful, livelihood interests tend to be forgotten. By working at the national level as well as in selected regions, an ODI-led project is focussing on civil society advocacy and policy impact, shared learning between all actors, and the links between the forest sector, the PRSP process and pro-poor governance reforms. (Gill Shepherd and Adrian Wells.)

- Participatory forest management has been widely promoted by donors. An ODI-led study showed that there is still no commonly accepted definition of PFM or understanding of what different stakeholders wish to get out of it, nor a clear assessment of its impacts to-date on either poverty or the forest resource. Successful implementation of PFM is further constrained by a variety of institutional and governance issues (Kate Schreckenberg and Cecilia Luttrel).

- Illegal logging and trading of timber in Central America are causing heavy economic losses to the countries involved. They erode the formal mechanisms of government and impact very negatively on the rural poor. A diagnostic analysis by ODI, REMBLAH and Nicambiental of the governance, poverty and economic impacts of the illegal timber trade in Honduras and Nicaragua has highlighted the legal, policy and institutional ‘barriers to legality’ facing small forest producers. See: www.talailegal-centroamerica.org (Adrian Wells).

- The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) requires that Parties to the Convention report on activities in relation to the conservation and sustain-able use of biological diversity. ODI provided support to the European Union’s DG Environment in the preparation of the Second Report from the European Community to the Conference of the Parties, as well as in the preparation of three ‘Thematic Reports’ – on forests, alien species and benefit sharing (Adrian Wells and Gill Shepherd).

- Support by DFID for the forestry sector in South Africa since 1996 was reviewed by ODI (Neil Bird).

- The rapidly disappearing Mesoamerican dry forest tree species be conserved? A joint ODI and Oxford University project highlighted the value of strong community organisation in Mexico, where dry forest occurs predominantly on ejido-owned land, whereas policies in the agricultural landscape of southern Honduras should build on existing management of the on-farm tree resource (Kate Schreckenberg).

- Hunting wild meat for human consumption is a key component of rural and urban livelihoods. Yet ‘bushmeat’ is vilified in the international press and marginalised in national policy. While there is evidence that the trade is often unsustain-able, the solution may not be to suppress it but rather to improve its management. An ODI study is examining the human dimen-sions of bushmeat and the bushmeat trade, focussing on social perspectives and management models. FPEG has also supported the development of bushmeat policy for CITES member states. See: www.odi-bushmeat.org (David Brown).

- Despite South Africa’s considerable woodland resource, benefits for the poor and forest livelihoods remain little understood. FPEG policy research support is promoting a better understanding of the underlying issues (Neil Bird and David Brown).

- An ODI-led study in Cameroon and Nigeria illustrated how a participatory approach to domestication of indigenous fruit trees could greatly improve their contribution to farmers’ livelihoods (Kate Schreckenberg).
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Floating illegal mahogany down the Rio Paulaya to the Mosquito coast, Honduras (Adrian Wells)
Many countries look to the Nepal model when framing their own community forestry policies. But experience comes with reflection on detailed outcomes. A special joint issue of the Rural Development Forestry Network and the Nepal-based Journal of Forest and Livelihood will showcase the methodological contributions made by British-funded research to understanding the impact of community forestry on livelihoods, particularly of the poorest (Kate Schreckenberg).

Democratic decentralisation offers a number of benefits to local people though it does not guarantee that management will respond to their concerns. A scoping study of decentralisation in Ghana was critical of the quality of debate around environmental issues (see below). A follow-up research study is now developing a new methodological framework and approach to environmental management (David Brown).

**Policy brief**

Decentralising environmental management – beyond the crisis narrative*

David Brown and Kojo Amanor

Democratic decentralisation is much in vogue in development policy. But what are the implications for environmental management? Collaborative research on this theme is being carried out by ODI and the Institute of African Studies at the University of Ghana.

**Modernisation theory lives on?**

Environmental issues figure prominently in the District Assemblies in Ghana’s Brong-Ahafo Region. However, the debate is preoccupied with narratives of an impending environmental crisis which arguably have more to do with promoting elitist models of change than representing local concerns.

Such crisis narratives are simplifying stories which claim special explanatory power to influence the future course of events. They tend to conjure up images of the catastrophes which will occur if major changes in policy and/or public behaviour are not urgently brought about. In the developing world, they often function to justify shifts in authority away from the rural resource users towards urban elites.

In the case of Ghana, as elsewhere in Africa, the crisis narratives are marked by their simplicity and uniformity. Their common theme is the culpability of smallholder agriculture. They speak of the burgeoning rural population; a system of traditional ‘slash and burn’ agriculture which is marked by destructiveness of the natural environment, loss of forest cover and non-sustainability; recurrent bush fires which devastate the natural environment; and an impending crisis in agriculture which can only be solved by modern technology and ideas.

**Assessing the narratives**

Such negative perceptions can be questioned on a number of grounds. Farm practices in Brong-Ahafo vary so much as to make the concept of a ‘traditional farming system’ a very doubtful analytical tool to understand environmental change. A broader view of the history of fire in this transitional zone suggests that human causality is only one influence among many. The focus on the overall loss of forest biomass obscures some important variations in experience, both positive and negative. Evidence from areas where the landscape has been enriched in recent years may be just as important, from the perspective of policy-making, as that from areas where it has been degraded.

Interestingly, the crisis narratives make very little mention of the often-catastrophic effects of previous modernising interventions, such as state and other large-scale mechanised farms.

**Sustaining the doomsday narratives**

Why, if the narratives of cultural modernisation are so dismissive of local capacities, are they not rejected outright by the rural dwellers?

One explanation lies in the way in which they are manipulated by local groups to support partisan interests. They thus develop an appearance of ‘local ownership’. Paradoxically, the great social heterogeneity typical of rural Ghana tends to sustain and dynamise the narratives on behalf of factional interests, in support of their own claims and against those with competing interests.

**How can environmental management be more responsive to local interests?**

Local government in Brong-Ahafo is not responding well to the needs of the farming population. New approaches are required to improve decision-making in natural resource management at all levels, from local producers up to national administrators. Yet there is some hope for future democratic reform. On the positive side, the legal framework for decentralisation provides ample scope for greater public accountability, and for communities to develop their own development plans, aided by civil society.

To achieve this will require institutional innovations which: create strong local platforms for negotiation by the users of the key resources; promote feedback on the environment and production systems to decision makers; and lead to the creation of information systems that the public and policy makers can use to learn about the conditions which affect the farmers’ daily lives.

Better policy processes are unlikely to be achieved by increased public awareness, but rather through the fostering of information flows which are socially and occupationally inclusive and which bind policy-makers to downward accountability. The institutional mechanism must ultimately be the democratic process. Whatever its limitations, the process of decentralisation in Ghana offers the only avenue through which rural dwellers can come into contact with development administration and can have any say in development planning. It is equally the only forum with the authority to arbitrate between competing interests in a manner which accords legitimacy. Thus, the ultimate aim of the research is to strengthen elective local government, to allow it to achieve its mandate of environmental democracy.

---

ODI’s new Research and Policy in Development (RAPID) Programme is looking for answers to three key questions: how can policymakers best use research, and move towards evidence-based policy-making; how can researchers best use their findings in order to influence policy; and how can the interaction between researchers and policymakers be improved?

Research-policy links

• A review of the literature on research-policy links and publication of web and paper-based annotated bibliography (ODI Working Paper 174, 2002).

• The development and publication of a new framework for understanding research-policy links (ODI Working Paper 173, 2002).

• Collaboration with the Global Development Network on the collection and analysis of 50 short case studies about research-policy links, development of the RAPNet Website. (www.gdnet.org/subpages/rapnet) and planning and coordination of Phase II research.

• New research on three recent policy changes: the adoption of PRSPs by the World Bank in 1999; the adoption of the humanitarian charter of the Sphere project by humanitarian agencies since 1997; and the legalisation of paravets in Kenya.

• Collaboration with ITDG to evaluate the role of research in the process leading to the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources.

Improving capacity to communicate research findings and influence policy

• Development of guidelines on how information can contribute to Sustainable Livelihoods and presentation at FAO’s 2nd Consultation on Agriculture Information Management. See: www.fao.org/waicent/portal/outreach/livelihoods/index-en.html

• A literature review to identify information about the demand for information on rural and urban transport for the WB/DFID Transport and Rural Infrastructure Services Project. See: www.transport-links.org/trsp-kda

• The development of an information and communication strategy for the DFID Multi-Stakeholder Forestry Project in Indonesia. See: www.odi.org.uk/rapid

• Support to the DFID Andhra Pradesh Rural Livelihoods Programme to influence policy and practice on rural service provision through the implementation and promotion of new livestock services.

• Advising on information and developing and running the website and e-discussions for the Darwin-funded Options for Supporting On-farm Conservation in Eastern and Southern Africa Project. See: www.sustainable-biodiversity.org

• Advice to DFID on the Livelihood Connect website. See: www.livelihoods.org

• Working with others in ODI to develop simple approaches and tools to help researchers communicate better with policy makers – for example with Simon Maxwell to develop and test a simple self-assessment tool to help researchers identify their communication strengths and weaknesses.

Improving knowledge management and learning systems

• Practical advice to ITDG on their Knowledge Management Strategy.

• Development of a Knowledge Management Strategy within ODI.

• A seminar on knowledge management for development organisations with speakers from Accenture, DFID and IDS.

Sometimes it seems that researchers and policy makers live in parallel universes. Researchers cannot understand why there is resistance to policy change despite clear and convincing evidence. Policy makers bemoan the inability of many researchers to make their findings accessible and digestible in time for policy decisions. Yet better utilization of research and evidence in development policy and practice can clearly help save lives, reduce poverty and improve the quality of life. For example, the results of household disease surveys in rural Tanzania informed a process of health service reform which contributed to a 28% reduction in infant mortality in two years. On the other hand, the HIV/AIDS crisis has deepened in some countries because of the reluctance of governments to implement effective control programmes, despite clear evidence of what causes the disease and how to prevent it spreading. Although evidence clearly matters, there is no systematic understanding of when, how and why evidence informs policy. A better understanding of how research can contribute to pro-poor policies, and systems to put it into practice, are urgently needed.

ODI has been working on these issues for several years. A literature review published in 1999 identified theoretical approaches in political science, sociology, anthropology, international relations and management, and provides a 21-point checklist of what makes policies happen. In 2002, ODI developed a new Framework for understanding research-policy links, and used it to analyse four policy events: the adoption of PRSPs by the World Bank in 1999; the development and adoption of an ethical charter by humanitarian agencies since 1997; animal health policies in Kenya since 1985 and the incorporation of the PRSPs by the World Bank in 1999; the development and adoption of an ethical charter by humanitarian agencies since 1997; animal health policies in Kenya since 1985 and the incorporation of the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach within the DFID White Paper in 1997. ODI also coordinated the collection and analysis of 50 short case studies based on existing knowledge about research-policy links for the Global Development Network “Bridging Research and Policy Project”, and has undertaken a wide range of advisory and consultancy work on these topics.

Traditionally, the link between research and policy has been viewed as a linear process, whereby a set of research findings is shifted from the ‘research sphere’ over to the ‘policy sphere’, and then has some impact on policymakers’
Research and policy: parallel universes?

John Young

decisions. Opinion is now shifting away from this model towards a more dynamic and complex view that emphasises a two-way process between research and policy, shaped by multiple relations and reservoirs of knowledge.

The traditional question ‘How can research be transported from the research to the policy sphere?’ has been replaced by a more complex set of questions ‘Why are some of the ideas that circulate in the research/policy networks picked up and acted on, while others are ignored and disappear?’

The answer seems to lie in a combination of several determining influences, which can broadly be divided into three overlapping areas: the political context; the credibility of the evidence; and the links between policy and research communities (see Figure).

Emerging results from ODI’s work so far confirm this, indicating that research is more likely to contribute to evidence-based policy if:

- it fits within the political and institutional limits and pressures of policy makers, and resonates with their ideological assumptions, or sufficient pressure is exerted to challenge those limits;
- the evidence is credible and convincing, provides practical solutions to current policy problems, and is packaged to attract policymakers interest;
- researchers and policy makers share common networks, trust each other, honestly and openly represent the interests of all stakeholders and communicate effectively.

But these three conditions are rarely met in practice, and although researchers can control the credibility of their evidence and ensure they interact with and communicate well with policy makers, they often have limited capacity to influence the political context within which they work, especially in less democratic countries.

So what should researchers do if they want to achieve policy impact? Evidence from ODI’s work so far provides preliminary recommendations in three areas (see Box). First, there are some things researchers need to know about the political context, issue area (evidence) and key actors and networks (links). Second, there are some things researchers need to do in each of these areas. Third, some clear evidence is emerging about the most effective way to go about things.

ODI’s work so far has focused on practical, policy-relevant research, so it is perhaps not surprising that our results indicate that policy-relevant think-tanks, do-tanks and operational agencies have more policy impact than more academic research. It is clear from ODI’s four case studies that new ideas from academic research, and less policy-constrained thinking do contribute enormously to the general discourse within which policy decisions are made. We need to know more about this.

We also need to know more about how different political contexts influence research-policy links, especially in less democratic countries; about how different types of networks and policy communities influence policymakers, and about how international donor policies influence national policy imperatives.

There is much more to be done. Over the next two years the RAPID Programme will work with policymakers, researchers and practitioners to undertake further research, and to develop practical guidelines on how to improve the uptake of research in different development policy contexts.
Our multi-dimensional communications and public affairs programme sets out to reach policy makers and influence wider public debate on development and humanitarian policy in the UK and internationally.

ODI Website
The ODI website is now the most widely accessed part of ODI’s communications and public affairs programme. Visitor numbers have continued to grow, doubling again during the year to exceed 2,500 per day by April 2003, while total monthly hits now exceed 1.38million.

The numbers are still rising every month, forcing us to migrate to a new and more powerful dedicated web-server. In part, this growth reflects the range of new material available from the site in full text free of charge. More than 27,000 copies of Working Papers, Briefing Papers, Natural Resource Perspectives and other documents are downloaded each month by visitors from across the world.

The home page is updated every few days, featuring details of current meetings and events, the latest publications, and other ODI news, with links across the site. Among recent innovations have been a ‘shopping basket’ secure system for ordering publications on-line, expanded information about ODI and its staff, and video clips. An extensive redesign of the website last year improved navigation and introduced a more consistent appearance across the site, but further changes are planned to make it easier for visitors to access the entire range of ODI’s output, and to introduce a system for registering users.

In addition to the main website, ODI also hosts several sites in association with other organisations, including:

- www.keysheets.org
- www.prpsynthesis.org
- www.propoortourism.org

Publications
Printed publications remain another major part of ODI’s output. Although we continue to publish full-length books in hardback and paperback editions (six this year), the greater part of the publications programme is now published in shorter formats, also available on-line from our website. This year a record 38 new Working Papers were produced, presenting research results in detail. Four new ODI Briefing Papers were published, together with another twelve Briefings from ODI research groups, plus five Natural Resource Perspectives, and 14 network papers.

ODI’s two journals – Development Policy Review and Disasters – are central to our publishing programme. Published in association with Blackwell Publishing, both journals have had another successful year, with significant increases in circulation. Development Policy Review has moved up from five to six issues per year. Both journals regularly publish special thematic issues, with ‘Poverty, Risks and Rights: New Directions in Social Protection,’ ‘Supermarkets and Agrifood Systems: Latin American Challenges’ and ‘Are PRPS Making a Difference? The African Experience’ in Development Policy Review, and ‘Beyond Seeds and Tools’ in Disasters. The publishers are promoting the journals world-wide with a particular focus on electronic subscription access for libraries and development agencies, as well as additional individual subscriptions.

Meetings, seminars and other events
Discussion meetings remain a key component of ODI’s public affairs programme. Over the past year there have been four major series attended by a constituency of more than 650 people encompassing civil servants, journalists, researchers and NGO representatives. Can Africa make it? Prospects for Africa’s development, organised jointly with the Royal African Society, The Royal Institute for International Affairs and the Africa Centre attracted crowds at eight meetings from April to June. This overlapped with ‘Putting politics back into development’, a joint venture with the LSE’s Development Research Centre, from May to July, followed in the autumn by ‘B_3b: stimulating a step-change in the development performance of corporations’ and then ‘Intellectual property rights in developing countries: rights or wrongs?’

Topics addressed in other meetings (listed in full on p. 36) have included food insecurity, capacity-building, evaluation of World Bank and IMF poverty and debt relief programmes, Southern African food crises, livelihoods and chronic conflict, and international humanitarian law (in response to the Iraq crisis). The reports published on the ODI website after each meeting, now often enhanced by video and audio ‘clips’ open up debates to a much wider audience, not least to those outside London.

A successful new departure for ODI was the photographic exhibition on Secure Water, mounted at the Oxo Gallery on London’s South Bank, which also included the launch of a film (see page 19).

Media
Working with the print and broadcast media is an essential element in ODI’s communication programme. Journalists and media researchers regularly
Meetings reports on the website also featured audio and video clips.

Parliament

ODI, located just across Westminster Bridge, is well-placed to work closely with parliament. In particular, ODI researchers provide advice to parliamentary committees, and this year we held a joint press conference with the International Development Committee to launch its Southern Africa Report. We also provide support for the All Party Parliamentary Group on Overseas Development (APGOOD). Meetings of the Group, organised by Adrian Hewitt, have been attended by politicians, academics, business people and NGOs. From the government, the Chancellor, Rt. Hon. Gordon Brown MP has spoken on ‘Funding for Development – post Monterrey’ and ‘the International Finance Facility’; and Clare Short MP, formerly Secretary of State for International Development on ‘Debt Relief and the HIPC Initiative’ and on ‘Access to Medicines’.

Other speakers have included Chris Holt and Claire Melamed on the Trade Justice Movement, Pascal Lamy on ‘EU Trade Policy and Development’; George Soros on ‘Globalisation and Development’; Ruud Lubbers, UN High Commissioner for Refugees; Stephen Browne, UNDP, on ‘The World Summit on Sustainable Development’; Dante B. Canlas, on ‘Economic Scenarios for the Philippines and the Region’; Kevin Watkins, Oxfam and Martin Howarth, National Farmers Union on CAP Reform; Anton Simanowitz, Institute of Development Studies on ‘Microfinance and Microcredit’; Lord Dubs, Lord Deedes, Marie Staunton and Amer Jabry, on behalf of Plan International, on ‘The role of children in disaster mitigation’; and His Excellency Meles Zenawi, Prime Minister of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia.

International Development on ‘Debt Relief and the HIPC Initiative’ and on ‘Access to Medicines’. 

Meetings reports on the website also featured audio and video clips.
2002/03 was an exceptional year for the ODI Fellowship Scheme – we placed a record number of Fellows, successfully completed a Review by DFID, negotiated a three-year ongoing agreement with DFID confirming a core budget of over £3 million for the next three years, and won the DTI Award for Capacity Building in the Commonwealth at the January 2003 WorldAware Business Awards.

In 2002, a record cohort of 32 Fellows were sent into the field (see box), to work as economists for governments in 16 countries in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific, 40% more Fellows than in 2001. By nationality, 17 are British, 2 Australian, 1 American, 3 Italian, 1 Belgian, 1 Dutch, 1 Dane, 1 Indian, 1 French, 1 Spanish, 1 Angolan/Portuguese, 1 Chilean and 1 Jamaican/USA. The gender breakdown was 12 women and 20 men. This year, we are working with several new countries including Ghana and Botswana, and have made new placements with existing Scheme countries. These include: Intergovernmental Affairs in South Africa, the Ministry of Trade and Industry in Tanzania, the Ministry of Local Government Affairs in Rwanda, the Privatisation Unit in Rwanda, The National Directorate of Tax and Audit in Mozambique, the Department of Trade and Industry in Papua New Guinea, the Ministry of Commerce, Business Development and Investment in Fiji, the Trade Policy Unit, Ministry of Labour, Commerce and Industries in Tonga and the Department of Trade, Industry and Investment in Vanuatu. As at June 2003, there are 55 Fellows in the field.

Activities

Fellows play a significant role in policy development, formulation and implementation. In the last year, there has been an increased focus on trade issues, both on a regional and a global level, and the Fellowship has been very active in supporting and leading in this area. Fellows are also increasingly involved in responding to HIV/AIDS – our move back into Botswana was a direct response to a request from the President for a health economist to look at the long term impact of HIV/AIDS on the country’s economy. The following examples indicate areas in which Fellows are currently, or have recently been working:
• Preparation of the Interim National Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) and monitoring of existing PRSP (Rwanda and Uganda)
• Preparation of MTEF 2003 (Mozambique)
• Income Tax modelling (Malawi)
• Preparation of a report on the monitoring and commitments of African Heads of State and Governments on HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (Economic Commission for Africa)
• Participation in the CARIFORUM-European Rice Project – aimed at improving the competitiveness of ACP Rice Exporters as part of the Cotonou Agreement (Guyana)
• Forecasting the impact of the implementation of the SADC Regional Trade Protocol (Mozambique)
• Elaboration of stronger regional trade agreements (PICTA in the Pacific and CARICOM SME in the Caribbean)

Worldaware Business Award

The ODI Fellowship Scheme was awarded the DTI Award for Capacity-Building at the 2003 Worldaware Awards for Business. The aim of the Worldaware Awards for Business is to recognise the vital role which commercial activity plays in supporting economic and social progress in the developing countries of the world. It is often claimed that most technical assistance does not work and is not wanted, so it is refreshing to receive an award for one which is a success and whose success has been reaffirmed every year over the last 40 by the constant demand for fellows by developing country governments.

ODI was able to broaden the funding base for the Scheme with the inclusion of...
Commonwealth Secretariat funding and the establishment of a pilot programme to place economists in international trade posts, initially in the Pacific. Particular attention was paid to countries in the process of accession to the WTO, by providing technical capacity to help formulate policy and enhance negotiating capacity in trade talks with the WTO, and also with the EU under the new economic partnership agreements. The new scheme is being piloted in the Pacific, in Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Tonga and Vanuatu, with the placement of an initial four Fellows, who were sent to the WTO in Geneva for training before taking up their posts.

2003–05 Recruitment

We have recently completed the interviews for the 2003–05 round of recruitment. This year we had a record number of applications, totalling 321, and interviewed 68. Formal offers were made in June 2003. The calibre of ODI Fellowship applicants remains extremely high and demand for Fellows from developing countries continues to outstrip both supply and funding.

40th Anniversary of the Scheme

2003 marks the Fellowship Scheme’s fortieth anniversary, and to celebrate this a reception was held in the House of Commons in July. A newsletter has been sent out to all previous Fellows, and it is planned to set up an alumni association.

Fellows in post (June 2003)

Africa
Botswana
Rachel Smyth, National AIDS Coordination Agency (NACA), Georgia
Kobi Bentley, Programme Budgeting, Monitoring and Evaluation Department, Ministry of Education
Carolina Monsalve, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
Ethiopia
Mani Teresa Iruzun-Lopez, Economic and Social Policy Division, United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
Naili Kistairay, Economic and Social Policy Division, United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
Lesotho
Gaimin Kamary, Research Department, Central Bank of Lesotho
Adrian Nembhard, Privatisation Unit, Ministry of Finance, Lesotho
Malawi
Sutapa Choudhury, Planning Division, Ministry of Education, Science and Technology
Hannah Galvin, Macroeconomic Unit, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
Seema Bhatia, Aid Management Division, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
Kasper Dalten, Budget Division, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
James Jarrett, Planning Department, Ministry of Health and Population
Mozambique
Elena Arjona Perez, Sector Policy & Research Division Ministry of Planning and Finance
Bruce Byers, Macroeconomic Programming Division, Ministry of Planning and Finance
Leonardo Iacovone, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
Enrique Blanco de Armas, Technical Unit for Multilateral and Regional Trade Negotiations (UTCOM), Ministry of Trade and Industry
Stijn Broecke, Technical Planning Unit, Ministry of Health
Eleanor Canning, National Directorate of Tax and Audit, Ministry of Planning and Finance
Joao Van Dunem Directorate of Customs Policy and Procedures, Mozambique Customs Service
Namibia
Chris Isaac, Ministry of Finance, Ghana
Richard Miller, Department of Water Affairs, Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development
Rwanda
Bethan Emmett, Budget Preparation Division, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
Moez Cheni, Privatisation Unit, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
Tim Powell-Jackson, Directorate of Planning, Ministry of Health
Afua Sarkodie, Department of Planning and Development Coordination Ministry of Local Government, Information and Social Affairs
Bruno Versailles, Poverty Reduction Programme, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
South Africa
Ana Bellver, Department of Public Enterprises
Aditi Maheshwari, Budget Division, National Treasury
Aarti Shah, Intergovernmental Affairs, National Treasury

South Pacific

Swaziland
Gemma Wilson-Clark, Public Policy Coordination Unit, Prime Minister’s Office
Geoff Handley, Budgets and Economic Affairs Section, Ministry of Finance
Tanzania
Elaine Baker, Policy Analysis Department, Ministry of Finance
Kripali Manek, Policy Analysis Department, Ministry of Finance
Africa
Liz Turner, Ministry of Industry and Trade
Uganda
Giulio Federico, Budget Policy and Evaluation Department, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
Samantha Smith, Health Sector, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
Diego Angemi, Poverty Monitoring and Analysis Unit (PMAU), Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
David Brown, Lands and Environment, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
Zambia
Jon Pycroft, Zambia Revenue Authority
Zanzibar
Daniel Wilde Department of External Finance, Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs
The Caribbean
Caribbean Development Bank
Jason Jackson, Research Department, Caribbean Development Bank, Bridgetown, Barbados
Guyana
Moortaza Iwanji, Environmental Protection Agency
Gayathri Radhakrishnan, Ministry of Foreign Trade and International Cooperation
Magnus Saxegaard, Debt Management Division, Office of the Budget, Ministry of Finance
Tim Green, Commerce Division, Ministry of Tourism, Industry and Commerce
Michael Weatherhead, Agricultural Project Cycle Unit (APCU), Ministry of Agriculture
The Pacific
Fiji
Virginia Horstcroft, Ministry of Commerce, Business Development and Investment
Papua New Guinea
Andrew Masters, Department of National Planning and Rural Development
Mark Slade, Structural Policy and Investment Division, Department of Treasury
Alessandro Martinatto, Internal Revenue Commission
Francesco Rampa, Trade Division, Department of Trade and Industry
Tonga
Samantha Newton, Trade Policy Unit, Ministry of Labour, Commerce and Industries
Vanuatu
Daniel Gay, Department of Trade, Industry and Investment
South Pacific Applied Geo-science Commission
Owen White, SPC/GECCOM, Suva, Fiji
Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
Lindsey Block, Trade and Investment Division, Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, Suva, Fiji

Samantha Newton, Trade Policy Unit, Ministry of Labour, Commerce and Industries, Tonga (Susan Barron)
Balance sheet summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>31 March 2003</th>
<th>31 March 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible assets</td>
<td>40,484</td>
<td>51,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments (Market Value)</td>
<td>1,080,811</td>
<td>1,160,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,121,295</td>
<td>1,212,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocks</td>
<td>12,566</td>
<td>12,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debtor and cash</td>
<td>2,497,969</td>
<td>1,408,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,510,535</td>
<td>1,420,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creditors and accruals</td>
<td>(1,866,829)</td>
<td>(1,241,079)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Current Assets</strong></td>
<td>643,706</td>
<td>179,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>1,765,001</td>
<td>1,391,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted reserves</td>
<td>1,765,001</td>
<td>1,391,565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income and expenditure account summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and project finance</td>
<td>8,490,204</td>
<td>6,386,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments income</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>5,472</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating income</td>
<td>111,929</td>
<td>118,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total income</strong></td>
<td>8,607,612</td>
<td>6,507,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs and related expenses</td>
<td>2,935,908</td>
<td>2,647,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>39,726</td>
<td>42,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Expenditure and other direct costs</td>
<td>3,335,876</td>
<td>2,279,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating expenses</td>
<td>732,759</td>
<td>567,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings, conferences and publications</td>
<td>45,813</td>
<td>82,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and audit fees</td>
<td>21,074</td>
<td>11,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship supplements</td>
<td>1,043,014</td>
<td>880,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditure</strong></td>
<td>8,154,170</td>
<td>6,511,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated fund transfer</td>
<td>(203,519)</td>
<td>27,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus on general fund</td>
<td>249,923</td>
<td>23,148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement by the Council

The members of the ODI Council confirm that the summarised accounts on this page are a summary of the information extracted from the full annual accounts which were approved on 28 July 2003.

The summarised accounts do not contain sufficient information to allow for a full understanding of the financial affairs of the Institute. For further information the full annual accounts and the auditors’ report and the Report of the members of the Council on those accounts should be consulted. Copies of the full annual accounts may be obtained free of charge from the Institute.

The summarised accounts do not constitute full accounts within the meaning of the Companies Act 1985 and the Charities Act 1993. A copy of the statutory accounts of the Institute, upon which the auditors have reported without qualification, will be delivered to both Companies House and the Charity Commission.

Approved by the members of the Council and signed on their behalf by the Chair, Baroness Jay, 28 July 2003.

Statement by the Auditors

We have examined the summarised financial statements of the Overseas Development Institute. The members of the Council are responsible for preparing the summarised financial statements in accordance with the recommendations of the charities SORP. Our responsibility is to report to you our opinion on the consistency of the summarised financial statements with the full financial statements and Council Report. We also read the other information contained in the summarised annual report and consider the implications for our report if we become aware of any apparent misstatements or material inconsistencies with the summarised financial statements.

We conducted our work in accordance with Bulletin 1999/6 ‘The Auditors’ statement on the summary financial statement’ issued by the Auditing Practices Board for use in the United Kingdom. In our opinion the summarised financial statements are consistent with the full financial statements and the Council Report of the Overseas Development Institute for the year ended 31 March 2003.


ODI Turnover 1990/91 – 2002/03 (2002/03 prices)
## Finance

### Funders

- ActionAid
- AEA Technology Environment
- African Development Bank
- African Economic Research Consortium
- Agence Intergouvernementale de la Francophonie
- Agripolis, Università degli Studi di Padova
- AusAID
- Belgian Department for Development Cooperation
- Bradford Centre for International Development, University of Bradford
- British Academy
- British Red Cross Society
- Cambridge Economic Policy Associates
- CARE International
- CARE International UK
- Catholic Agency for Overseas Development (CAFOD)
- Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Natural Environment Research Council (NERC)
- Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
- Centre for International Studies, University of Toronto
- Chaire Mercosur, Institut d’Etudes Politiques de Paris
- Christian Aid
- Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA)
- Commonwealth Secretariat
- Conrad Hilton Foundation
- Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu
- Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs, Darwin Initiative (DETRA)
- Department for International Development (DFID)
- Department of Foreign Affairs, Ireland (IrelandAid)
- Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH
- Ebony Consulting International (Pty) Ltd
- Engineers Against Poverty
- Enterprise LSE Limited
- Environment Canada
- European Commission
- European Commission Humanitarian Aid Office (ECHO)
- European Tropical Forest Research Network
- Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
- Ford Foundation
- German Development Institute
- Harvest Help UK
- Henry Dunant Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue
- Hobley Shields Associates
- HTS Development Ltd
- IAK Agrar Consulting GMBH (IAK)
- Imperial College, London
- Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex
- Institute for Development Policy and Management
- Intermediate Technology Development Group
- International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT)
- International Development Committee
- International Development Department, School of Public Policy, University of Birmingham
- International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
- International Labour Organization (ILO)
- International Monetary Fund (IMF)
- International Save the Children Alliance
- International Training Centre of the ILO
- Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC)
- Maxwell Stamp PLC
- Médecins Sans Frontières
- Intermediate Technology Development Group
- National Audit Office
- Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (USAID)
- Oxfam International
- Oxford Policy Management Limited
- Parc Consultants
- Planstat Europe
- PMTC International Limited
- Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford
- Regional Community Forestry Training Center for Asia and the Pacific (RECOFTC)
- Rockefeller Foundation
- Royal Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DANIDA)
- SPM Consultants
- Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)
- Syngenta Foundation for Sustainable Agriculture
- Technopolis Limited
- The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation
- UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)
- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
- United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
- United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) – World Conservation Monitoring Centre
- United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)
- Valid International
- World Bank
- World Food Programme
- World Health Organization
- WS Atkins plc
- WWF-International

### Central services staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen Brown*</td>
<td>Company Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrienne Watson</td>
<td>Personnel Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patsy de Souza</td>
<td>Personnel Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Sunderland</td>
<td>PA to the Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Glennon*</td>
<td>Finance Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Kongwa</td>
<td>Finance Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Crow</td>
<td>Assistant Finance Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Henderson*</td>
<td>Assistant Finance Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Lewis*</td>
<td>Assistant Finance Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cara O’Connor</td>
<td>Assistant Finance Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* left during the year
Publications

Books
ALNAP Global Study on Beneficiary Consultation and Participation Monograph Series: Sri Lanka: August 2002
ALNAP Global Study on Beneficiary Consultation and Participation Monograph Series: Angola: February 2002

Working Papers
169: Indian Public Expenditures on Social Sector and Poverty Alleviation Programmes during the 1990s, Abusaleh Shariff, Prabir K. Ghosh, Samir K. Mondal, 2002
170: Decentralisation in Madhya Pradesh: from Panchayati Raj to Gram Swaraj (1995 to 2001), Amitabh Behar and Yogesh Kumar, 2002
172: Good Practice in the Development of PRSP Indicators and Monitoring Systems, David Booth and Henry Lucas, 2002
173: Bridging Research and Policy: Context, Evidence and Links, Emma Crewe and John Young, 2002
174: Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography, Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland and John Young, 2002
176: Moving Mud, Shifting Soil: Change and Development in Wage Labour Livelihoods in Uttar Pradesh, India, Orlanda Ruthven and Sushil Kumar, 2002
177: Peoples’ Social Movements: An Alternative Perspective on Forest Management in India, Amitabh Behar, 2002
180: Democratic Process and Electoral Politics in Andhra Pradesh, India, K. C. Suri, 2002
186: Rural Livelihoods in Kambia District, Sierra Leone: The Impacts of Conflict, Catherine Longley, Victor Katie Kamara and Richard Fanthorpe, 2002
188: Food Economy in Situations of Chronic Political Instability, Tanya Boudreau and Philippa Coutts, 2002
189: Assessment of Needs of Internally Displaced Persons in Colombia, Deborah Hines and Raoul Balteso, 2002
190: The Use of Participatory Methods for Livelihood Assessment in Situations of Political Instability: A Case Study from Kosovo, Karen Westley and Vladimir Mikhalev, 2002
192: ICI's and Rural Development: Review of the Literature, Current Interventions and Opportunities for Action, Robert Chapman and Tom Slaimaker, 2002
193: Conductive Conditions: Livelihood Interventions in Southern Somalia, Abigail Montani and Nisar Majid, 2002
197: Devolution as a Threat to Democratic Decision-making in Forestry? Findings from Three States in India, Madhu Sarin with Neera M. Singh, Nandini Sundar and Ranu K. Bhogal, 2003
201: Results-oriented Public Expenditure Management in Cambodia, Catherine Dom, Tim Ensor, Leon Bernard Suy, 2003
202: Results-based Public Expenditure Management in Bolivia, Carlos Montes, 2003
205: Targets and Results in Public Sector Management: Uganda Case Study, Tim Williamson, 2003, £8.00
206: Results-oriented Public Expenditure Management: Case Study of Mali, Marc Raffinot, Jean Muguet, Alhoussyeyou Touré, 2003
207: Results-oriented Expenditure Management: the Case of Burkina Faso, Sandrine Mesple-Somps, Marie-Eugénie Malgoubri, Jean Muguet, and Blaise Zongo, 2003
209: Results-oriented Budget Practice in OECD Countries, Aidan Rose, 2003

Briefing Papers
Humanitarian Policy Group (HPG) Reports
6 International Humanitarian Action and the Accountability of Official Donors. Sarah Collinson and Margie Buchanan-Smith
7 Coordinating Humanitarian Action: The Changing Role of Official Donors. Nicola Reindorp and Anna Schmidt

HPS Briefings
4 Financing International Humanitarian Action: a Review of Key Trends. Margie Buchanan-Smith and Judith Randel

Agricultural Research and Extension Network (AgREN) Papers
113: Farmers’ access to natural pest control products: experience from an IPM project in India, Robert Tripp and Arif Ali
114: Partnership in agricultural extension: Lessons from Chitwan (Nepal), Gana Pati Qjha and Stephen R. Morin
115: Supporting local seed systems in southern Somalia: A developmental approach to agricultural rehabilitation in emergency situations, Catherine Longley, Richard Jones, Mohamed Hussein Ahmed and Patrick Audi
116: Dilemmas of agricultural extension in Pakistan: Food for thought, Dr. Andrew P. Davidson, Dr. Munir Ahmad and Dr. Tanvir Ali
117: The role of forages in reducing poverty and degradation natural resources in tropical production systems, M. Peters et al
118: Smallholders and niche markets: Lessons from the Andes, Jon Hellin and Sophie Higman
119: Agriculture and micro enterprise in Malawi's rural south, Alastair Orr and Sheena Orr
120: Improving the access of small farmers in eastern and southern Africa to global pigeonpea markets, Richard Jones, H. Ade Freeman and Gabriele Lo Monaco
121: Agriculture and rural livelihoods: Is globalisation opening or blocking paths out of rural poverty?, Jonathan Kydd

Forestry Briefings
1. Forestry as an Entry Point for Governance Reform, David Brown, Kate Schreckenberg, Gill Shipperd and Adrian Wells. (2002)

Keysheets for Sustainable Livelihoods
Policy Planning and Implementation
10 Rural-Urban Linkages
11 Decentralisation and Governance
12 Decentralisation and Political Accountability
13 Sovereignty and Global Governance
14 Non-Farm Income in Rural Areas
15 Environmental Assessment
17 National Forest Programmes

Water Policy Briefs
1: The ‘Water Crisis’: Faultlines in global debates, July 2002
2: Financing Transboundary Water Management, July 2002
3: Poverty Reduction and Water: ‘Watsan and PRSPs’ in sub-Saharan Africa, July 2002
4: Secure Water? Poverty, Livelihoods and Demand-Responsive Approaches, Jan 2003

Water Policy Programme (WPP) Research Report

ODI Policy Papers
Developing Countries: Victims or Participants – Their Changing Role in International Negotiations, Sheila Page, 2003
Poverty Reduction, Equity and Climate Change: Global Governance Synergies or Contradictions?, Michael Richards, 2003

Publications

International Humanitarian Action: A Review of Policy Trends, April 2002

Natural Resource Perspectives
78. Rights and livelihood approaches: exploring policy dimensions, May 2002, Tim Conway, Caroline Moser, Andy Norton and John Farrington
79. Combining growth and social protection in weakly integrated rural areas, May 2002, John Farrington and Gerald J. Gill
81. Supermarkets and Farming in Latin America: Pointing Directions for Elsewhere? December 2002, Thomas Reardon, Julio A. Berdegué and John Farrington
82. Do Area Development Projects have a Future? December 2002, John Farrington, Roger Blench, Ian Christoplas, Karin Ralsgård and Anders Rudqvist

ODI Journals
Development Policy Review
Editor: David Booth
Co-editors: John Farrington, Adrian P. Hewitt, Oliver Morrissey, Caroline O. N. Moser and Tony Killick
Associate Editor: Margaret Cornell

Disasters: The Journal of Disaster Studies, Policy and Management
Editors: Joanna Macrae, Helen Young and David Alexander
Assistant Editor: Conven McCutcheon

Humanitarian Practice Network (HPN) Papers
39: Reconsidering the tools of war: small arms and humanitarian action. Robert Muggah with Martin Griffiths
41: Politically informed humanitarian programming: using a political economy approach. Sarah Collinson with Michael Bhatia, Martin Evans, Richard Fanthorpe, Jonathan Goodhand and Stephen Jackson
42: The role of education in protecting children in conflict. Susan Nicolai and Carl Triplehorn
A selection of other significant publications by ODI authors


Publications


Can Africa make it? Prospects for Africa’s development (April–June 2002) • Economic strategies for Africa Paul Collier, World Bank; Michael Holman, FT; Hugh Bayley, MP (22 May) • Africa in the world economy Barry Coates, Director, World Development Movement (UK) (29 May) • Unlocking Africa’s human potential Dr Henry Kaluba, Chief Programme Officer, Education Dept, Commonwealth Secretariat (5 June) • Where next? The Right Hon Claire Short MP, Secretary of State for International Development (12 June)

Putting politics back into development (May–July 2002) • Poverty reduction prospects in India: what difference does state politics make? John Farrington, ODI; Anne Marie Goetz, IDS; Rob Jenkings, Birbeck College (1 May) • Understanding the politics of development statistics Michael Ward, UN Intellectual History Project; Robert Wade, LSE DESTIN (8 May) • Domestic politics and the WTO Rob Jenkins, Birbeck College; Barbara Evers, Manchester University; Lyla Mehta, IDS (15 May) • Can PRSPs influence the national politics of poverty reduction? Sandra Pepera, DFID Governance Department; Chris Scott, LSE (22 May) • Social capital and development: part of the solution or part of the problem, or part of the solution? Ben Fine, SOAS; Michael Woolcock, World Bank/ Cambridge University (29 May) • ‘Crisis states’, humanitarian aid and the reconstruction of civil governance Joanna Mavromatis, LSE DRC (5 June) • Promoting good governance: some lessons from history and recent experience Richard Higgott, University of Warwick; Roger Wilson, DFID Governance Department (12 June) • Taxation and accountability: how does revenue influence political change? Mick Moore, IDS Centre for the Future of the State; Jonathan Dillow, LSE DRC (19 June) • ‘Civil society’: institutional concept or donor fad? John Harris, LSE DESTIN; Jan Aart Scholte, University of Warwick (26 June) • Local governance and poverty reduction: does decentralisation help? Jay Monterciglio, ODI; Jean-Paul Faguet, LSE DESTIN; James Putzel, LSE (12 June)

B.4b: stimulating a step-change in the development performance of corporations (October–December 2002) • Project finance and poverty reduction: “You can’t expect something to be poverty focused and make a profit for shareholders” Allan Gillespie, Chief Executive, CDC Capital Partners; Michael McWilliam, author; Simon Maxwell, Director, ODI (16 October)

• Return to core business: are we neglecting business competencies in the pursuit of poverty reduction? Michael Warner, ODI; Ebhish Holld, Social Investment Manager, BP plc; David Logan, London Benchmarking Group (23 October) • Social vs environmental management instruments: convergence or divergence? David Harvey, National Contact Point, OECD Multinational Enterprise Guidelines; Simon Zadek, Chief Executive, AccountAbility; Chris Marsden, Oxfam, Market Group, Amnesti International (30 October) • National poverty reduction strategies: where are corporations in the PRSP process? Edward Bickham, Vice President, Anglo American; Simon Maxwell, Director, ODI (6 November) • Corporate social responsibility and the role of the state: where do we draw the line? Halina Ward, International Institute for Environment and Development; Roger Cowe, journalist; Simon Maxwell, Director, ODI (13 November) • The new London Principles: will there be a poverty dividend? Rob Lake, Henderson Lee; Brian McHire, Forum for the Future; Avnish Persaud, State Street Bank and Trust Company (20 November) • Social partnerships between corporations, government and civil society: pleasure or pain? Will Day, CARE International; Murray Jones, Social Performance Unit, Shell International; Toby Webb, Editor, Ethical Corporation Magazine (27 November) • Promoting business linkages: will the WTO Doha round stimulus access to multinational enterprises for local SMEs? Richard Higgott, University of London, ODI, Jack Newham, Deloitte & Touche (4 December)

Intellectual property rights in developing countries: rights or wrongs? (February 2003) • Intellectual property in developing countries: rights or wrongs? Julian Morris, Director, International Policy Network; Sandy Thomas, Director, Council on Bio-Ethics, Nuffield University; Simon Maxwell, ODI (5 February) • Do patents help stimulate research on medicines developing countries need? Are they a barrier to accessing medicines? Nathan Ford, Access to Medicines Advisor, Médecins sans Frontières; Chris Strutt, Vice President, External Relations, Worldwide and International, GlaxoSmithKline; Charles Clift, DFID (12 February) • Can IPRs help promote agriculture and food security in developing countries? Dwjwn Rangnekar, Senior Research Fellow, University College, London; Tim Roberts, Intellectual Property, Linda Brown, Senior Natural Resources Adviser, DFID (19 February)

Other meetings, workshops, seminars, lunches, press conferences

• New Humanitarians: A review of global humanitarian response (14 May) Humanitarian Policy Group • What Use Is International Humanitarian Law? (30 May) Humanitarian Practice Network debate, Françoise Bouchet Saulnier, legal counsel, MSF Foundation, Paris; Philip Spoerri, Coordinator of Legal Advisers to Operations, ICRC; Stephen Pattison, Head of the UN Department, Foreign and Commonwealth Office • Group behaviour and development – is the market destroying cooperation? (23 September) – OUP launch of Frances Stewart’s book, Simon Maxwell, ODI; Kevin Watkins, Head of Research, Oxfam; Tony Addison, Deputy Director, DFID • Grain markets, food security and the WTO: what future for developing countries? (3 October) Sophia Murphy, Program Director, Trade and Agriculture Program, Institute of Agriculture and Trade Policy (IATP), Minneapolis, US; C Stuart Clark, Senior Policy Advisor, Canadian Foodgrains Bank

The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2002 (16 October) – UN Food and Agriculture Organization’s annual publication launched at an ODI-hosted news conference Hartwig de Haen, Assistant Director-General, UNFAO; Simon Maxwell, Director, ODI • Developing Capacity through Technical Cooperation: Country Experiences (28 October) – UN Development Programme book launch Stephen Browne, Principal Advisor on Capacity Development, UNDP; Simon Maxwell, Director, ODI; Morne Du Preez, Asseine Balihuta, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda; Dr Debapriya Bhattacharya, Director, Centre for Policy Dialogue, Dhaka, Bangladesh • Prolonged Use of Forcible Resources – international workshop on an evaluation of the IMF by the Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the IMF (25 November) David Goldsborough, Deputy Director, IEO; Isabelle Mateos y Lagarda, Director of Independent Evaluation Office; Tony Killick, Senior Research Associate, ODI; Simon Maxwell, Director, ODI • Uncertain Power: The changing role of donors in humanitarian action, HPG (15 January)

• Iraq: war, law and humanitarian protection, HPG (22 January) • The Livelihoods and Chronic Conflict Working Paper Series (30 January) London launch seminar Kate Longley, ODI • Global Development Network workshop (17 February) Bob Picciotto (ex-World Bank); Keith Bezanson, Director, IDS; Charles Clift, CIPR • Secure Water – making water work for communities, exhibition – Oxo Tower Gallery (25 February–10 March) • Foreign Direct Investment, Income Inequality and Poverty: Experiences and Policy Implications (28 February) with Sheila Page, Dirk Willems te Velde, Michael Mortimore (United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean), Carolyn Jenkins (Centre for the Studies of African Economies, University of Oxford) Watipaso Mkandawire (Regional Investment Agency Unit, COMESA, Lusaka) Prof Rhys Jenkins (University of East Anglia), Eddy Lee, (ILO, Geneva)

• Southern Africa Report, International Development Committee (11 March) IDC • Coherence in Crisis: Introduction to the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Debt Initiative (5 March) – workshop on the evaluation of the HIPC debt relief initiative – Operations Evaluation Department of the World Bank, Simon Maxwell, Director, ODI; Victoria Elliott, Manager, Corporate Evaluation and Methods Group, OED; Madhur Gautam, Task Manager of HIPC evaluation; Vikram Nehru, Manager of World Bank unit dealing with HIPC, Ann Pettifer, Jubilee 2000; Alistair Milne, City University Business School
Research Specialisations

Research Fellows
Caroline Ashley: pro-poor tourism strategy; rural livelihoods; community-based natural resource management; community-private partnerships; Southern and Eastern Africa.

Kate Bird: poverty and chronic poverty; policy reform; rural livelihoods; diversification and coping strategies; project, programme and policy evaluation.

Neil Bird: national forest programmes; sustainable forest management; forest resource assessment; forest governance.

David Booth: poverty-focused aid and the national policy process; process-oriented monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment; sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America.

David Brown: governance and social development; institutional aspects of environmental management; forests, poverty and development assessment.

Tim Conway: poverty analysis and reduction strategies; vulnerability and social protection; donor policy and management; country strategy evaluation; south-east Asia.

Elizabeth Cromwell: agricultural biodiversity economics and policy; agricultural sustainability; livelihood options for rural households.

James Darcy: humanitarian principles; protection of civilians and refugees; international human rights and humanitarian law.

John Farrington: livelihood protection and promotion, diversification, policy processes.

Ian Gillson: trade in services with and among developing countries; GATS; tariff preferences (especially GSP); political economy; trade facilitation.

Paul Harvey: humanitarian programming and operations; AIDS and humanitarian action; complex political emergencies; food and livelihood security in emergencies.

Adrian Hewitt: European development policy; foreign aid; international trade; commodities; the WTO; global public goods; development strategy; Africa and the Caribbean.

John Howell: agricultural commodity markets; land reform in southern Africa; SADC trade facilitation.

Catherine Longley: seed security and agricultural rehabilitation; rural livelihoods in chronic conflict and political instability; farmers’ management of crop diversity.

Joanna Macrae: aid policy in unstable situations; the relationship between humanitarian and political responses to conflict; official humanitarian policy.

Andy McKay: poverty and inequality analysis; poverty and PRSP monitoring; chronic poverty; impact of policy, especially trade policy, on poverty.

Oliver Morrissey: aid and government behaviour; aid and policy; trade policy reform and poverty; the WTO; FDI and developing countries; public goods.

Simon Maxwell: development theory and policy; poverty; food security; economic, social and cultural rights; aid; policy processes.

Alan Nicol: social, institutional and political dimensions of water resources management and water supply development at all levels.

Sheila Page: international and regional trade; the WTO; comparative trade and development performance; capital flows; foreign investment; tourism; Southern Africa and Latin America.

Laure-Hélène Piron: governance: political analysis; civil society and political empowerment; conflict and the state; access to justice; human rights and development.

John Roberts: public finance; aid management and effects; results-oriented public expenditure management and PRS; determinants of social sector outcomes.

Kathrin Schreckenberg: on-farm tree resources; non-timber forest products; participatory forestry; information management.

Andrew Shepherd: poverty reduction policies and poverty analysis; Africa; South Asia; policy and programme evaluation; rural development; aid management.

Frances Stevenson: complex political emergencies; humanitarian programming and operations; protection; advocacy.

Robert Tripp: seed systems; agricultural research and extension; natural resource management.

Dirk Willem te Velde: foreign direct investment and development; income inequality; financing international public goods, private sector development.
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