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Chairman’s Statement

I am struck by how quickly the development agenda is changing. On the surface, the concerns remain the same as they always have – poverty, war, disease, the environment. Below the surface, however, the assumptions, the paradigms, and the policies are all changing. For example, we no longer talk about the ‘Washington Consensus’, in which liberalisation is the only goal. Instead, we have a Post-Washington Consensus, more concerned with the need for institutions to underpin markets, and with the impact of liberalisation on the poor. Poverty reduction has become accepted as an over-arching goal, and there is much greater consensus than there used to be that this means more than increasing income: empowerment and security have become new watchwords of the poverty debate.

I am pleased that ODI is keeping up with these changes. Indeed, ODI is leading change in many areas, as illustrated in Simon Maxwell’s report, overleaf. To cite just a few topics, we are doing good work, on poverty reduction and poverty strategies, on budget reform, on donor support to sector strategies, on rural development, and on humanitarian policy. This work is at the leading edge of development thinking, and also, equally important, of development practice. I am pleased that ODI is a reference centre for both researchers and practitioners: for example, the astonishing fecundity of our website attracts thousands of visitors each week.

Responding to new needs, ODI has grown rapidly in recent years, by 14% a year in real terms on average for the past four years. There are growing pains, of course, not least financial: it is especially hard for a fast-growing business like ours to sustain cash flow and build reserves. I am pleased to report, however, that ODI has made a surplus this year, not large in terms of our current turnover of £6.5m, but enough to protect our working capital and begin to rebuild reserves. We have more to do in coming years.

A London base is essential if ODI is to fulfil its public affairs and policy mandate, but a London base is expensive. After four years in Victoria, ODI moved in the summer of 2000 to new offices South of the river, in Waterloo. The new offices are less expensive and somewhat smaller, but provide an appropriate and convenient space. Our challenge will be to use the space creatively to achieve maximum return on the investment.

As in previous years we have seen both departures from, and arrivals to, our Council. I would like to thank our departing friends, John Eccles, Walter Elkan, Maria Elena Hurtado, William Ryrie and Michael Taylor - and very particular thanks to Richard Kershaw who has been on the Council since 1973 and a particularly helpful member of our Finance Committee. I am delighted that William Day, Larry Elliott, Richard Jolly, Avinash Persaud and Diane Stone have joined us. I look forward to their contribution.

The growth of high quality output, the improvement in our financial position, as well as the successful completion of our office move, are tributes to the dedication of our high calibre staff at ODI and the skills of Simon Maxwell and his team. These are the key assets of ODI and underpin together the prospect that ODI’s contribution to development in the years ahead will continue to be an important one.

Earl Cairns
In last year’s Annual Report, our Chairman, Lord Cairns, talked about ODI ‘moving up the value chain’. I want to explore what that term means.

In industrial policy, moving up the value-chain entails continual upgrading. What does this imply for ODI? Three things, I think. First, we need to continue addressing the big, ‘high-value’ narratives. Second, we need to make sure that the research which drives all our work is, as always, high-skill, quality-driven, and fit for a global market. Third, we need to make sure our voice is heard and influences the agenda, delivering influential communication packages which draw their authority from ODI’s quality, integrity and independence.

Addressing the big issues ....

Poverty
Our work on poverty, led by David Booth, certainly addresses the big issue of the day. At the most general level of theory and principle, we have been very active in the debate, for example in our writings and public meetings on the World Bank’s World Development Report for 2000/1, ‘Attacking Poverty’.

Operationally, we have been right at the forefront – contributing to guidelines for the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD, to the World Bank’s Poverty Source Book, to the design and quality control of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers, and, through the work of our Centre on Aid and Public Expenditure, led by Mick Foster, to ways of bringing governments and donors together in support of pro-poor public budgets.

These contributions are powerful because they engage with the real world, but also because they are grounded in and supported by our research programmes. ODI’s voice on poverty reduction is informed by research on topics as diverse as the role of assets in shaping livelihoods, social protection, and the institutionalisation of a poverty focus in government planning. It also draws increasingly on a comparative framework including both developed and developing countries: the boundary between North and South is dissolving.

Globalisation
Globalisation helps to explain the dissolving boundary, and is another big issue. Again, ODI contributes through research, and uses research to engage, both with a fervid international debate, and with practical policy.

For example, international finance and investment flows are frequently cited both as the villains of globalisation and as the white knights which will deliver poverty reduction in the poorest countries. Benu Schneider’s research on financial markets shows that the risks are indeed high, but that disengagement is not an option: prudential regulation is then the key to success, and this requires a mass of detailed policy. The same is true for foreign direct investment, as Dirk Willem te Velde has shown: FDI can be good for the poor, and the way to make sure it is is to engage with the rich detail of sectoral policy.

Rural Development
Rural development is another important topic, and this time one in need of new impetus. 70% of the poor live in rural areas, but lending to the sector is thought to have fallen by two thirds. The World Bank, FAO, IFAD, the EU, all have been busy re-thinking rural development – and all have drawn in one way or another on ODI. Equally important, we are active at country level, for example in India.

Our work for DFID on rural livelihoods, led by John Farrington and his colleagues, has provided the platform for much of this. The key challenge is to recognise the pace of change in rural areas – the increasing diversification of rural economies and income sources, the increasing sophistication of technological and institutional options, and the growing incorporation of small farmers into global commodity chains.

Humanitarian Policy
Consider, finally, the interface between the political and humanitarian spheres in conflict zones. The question here has to do with whether humanitarian intervention in places like Afghanistan or Sierra Leone is being expected to substitute for political engagement – and whether this compromises the basic humanitarian principles of neutrality, impartiality and independence. A substantial research agenda spins off from this core question, on war economies, on conflict management, and, as Joanna Macrae has shown, on the interface between politics and humanitarianism.

These are topics which again lead ODI into practical policy-making. Our Humanitarian Policy Group has a close relationship with official donors and NGOs, expressed through membership of the Humanitarian Practice Network and ALNAP (an independent forum on humanitarian evaluation, housed in ODI),
but also through the support of around ten bodies for HPG's Integrated Programme.

**With breadth and depth . . .**

It should be clear from the above that we attach the highest importance to research quality. And how do we recognise research quality? Not only by publications in refereed journals, though we acknowledge the value of journals, and manage two ourselves. Rather, we look more generally for engagement with theory, relevance of research questions, comprehensiveness of coverage, and quality of analysis. From that perspective, there has been much to be pleased with this year. Let me cite just three examples.

Caroline Ashley has investigated the contribution that rural tourism can make to poverty reduction – an important strand of our search for a new narrative on rural development. The results of six case studies, on three continents, show that it can, and in surprising ways, contributing not just to income, but also to social capital and organisational capacity.

Sheila Page, Michael Richards and others have studied the part played by developing countries in international negotiations, for example the WTO or climate change. Their research, often in the cauldron of international meetings, yields important insights about negotiating strategies, and about the need for capacity-building.

Finally, David Booth and colleagues have studied the institutionalisation of poverty reduction processes in eight African countries, bringing together insights from politics and public administration to find innovations that will cement the transition of poverty reduction from a social sector enclave to the mainstream.

And making sure our voice is heard

Communication is not an add-on at ODI: it is integral to every project and every programme. The website received 260,000 hits in April 2001, and deservedly so: thanks to the investment made in it by both the Institute and the individual research groups, it has become a rich resource.

The two journals, *Development Policy Review* and *Disasters*, are both flourishing. DPR was re-designed this year, and will increasingly aim to capture the high ground in policy debate, with more special issues and a wider range of contributors. The publications programme remains active: a total of 12 Working Papers during the year, and 18 Briefing Papers in our various series. Best-sellers include Koenraad Van Brabant's Good Practice Review on *Operational Security Management in Violent Environments*, and the review of Sector Wide Approaches by Adrienne Brown and others.

The Meetings Series go from strength to strength: three excellent series this year, filling the meeting room week after week with a diverse and enthusiastic audience.

And on this topic, a special mention, too, for the three ODI Networks, the Humanitarian Practice Network, the Agricultural Research and Extension Network, and the Rural Development Forestry Network. Between them, these reach close to ten thousand fellow professionals around the world, supplying information, stimulating debate and providing an essential matrix for our professional communities.

Last but not least, the ODI Fellowship Scheme, now in its 39th year, is in good fettle. More than 500 economists have served on the Scheme; there are currently 43 in post, working in 15 countries, almost all low-income.

No-one pretends that achieving all this is easy, especially for an Institute without core funding. I would like to end by thanking both Council and all our staff for their commitment to ODI. Lord Cairns has reported on Council changes. As regards Research Fellows, we have said farewell to Charlotte Boyd, Adrienne Brown, Lucia Hanner, Nick Leader, Henri-Bernard Solignac Lecomte, and Koenraad Van Brabant; and we have welcomed Sarah Collinson, Tim Conway, Oliver Morrissey, Caroline Moser, Nicola Reindorp and Dirk Willem te Velde. Our team is strong. We remain well-placed to keep moving up the value chain.

Simon Maxwell

‘. . . how do we recognise research quality? By engagement with theory, relevance of research questions, comprehensiveness of coverage, and quality of analysis.’

‘. . . contributions which are powerful because they engage with the real world, but also because they are grounded in and supported by our research programmes.’

‘. . . influential communication packages which draw their authority from ODI’s quality, integrity and independence.’
An international consensus on poverty reduction strategy came a step closer this year, with the publication of the World Bank’s World Development Report for 2000/1, Attacking Poverty.

‘Adoption of the International Development Targets commits countries and donors to being more strategic about poverty reduction.’

The new approach rests on three legs - opportunity (meaning growth), empowerment, and security. In themselves, none of these elements is new. However, the World Bank has moved the agenda forward, and in so doing has also moved closer to current thinking in UNDP and among the bilateral donors. For the first time, the Bank

- adopts a multi-dimensional concept of poverty;
- acknowledges the need for redistribution;
- gives high priority to empowerment;
- recognises the high risks of market liberalisation; and
- makes risk management and social protection central.

The main focus for the Poverty and Public Policy Group has been how to turn pro-poor principles such as these into practice, in both developing countries and donor agencies. There has also been work on the substance of poverty reduction and pro-poor policy.

Fighting poverty strategically

Adoption of the International Development Targets commits countries and donors to being more strategic about poverty reduction. For example, HIPC debt relief and new lending have been made conditional on the preparation of national Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers. Will this work better than previous forms of conditionality, which left little room for countries to work out their own plans?

An international team coordinated by ODI is looking at the early experience of eight African countries. So far, the PRSP initiative has had one clear benefit – to remove poverty-reduction from its marginal position as a social-sector issue and ‘mainstream’ it into the central policy processes of the country - particularly the budget (David Booth, Lucia Hamner, Alison Evans, John Healey, Tony Killick).

The first PRSPs have been developed primarily to access HIPC debt relief. They tend to be weak on linking overall objectives with sectoral action plans and resources. They contain medium term targets that are not sufficiently grounded in reality. Future revisions of PRSPs will need to tackle the missing link (Felix Naschold, Lucia Hamner, Alison Evans).

This implies a growing need for operationally-oriented research on how to use resources to have maximum effect on outcomes. In this vein, a CAPE paper estimated the costs of achieving education for all (Mick Foster, Felix Naschold). A study by Lucia Hamner, David Booth and Liz Lovell showed how to estimate the impact of transport investments on the poor using ‘sustainable livelihoods’ concepts. CAPE also explored possible contributions from the sustainable livelihoods school to the content and process of poverty reduction strategy papers (Mick Foster, Andy Norton).

Fighting poverty strategically implies country ownership of analysis and policy-making. It may also imply a role for geographical targeting of investments to the poorest areas. A study in VietNam

Participatory policy work

The idea that PRSPs should involve inclusive national processes of consultation was the focus of early attention at ODI (Rosemary McGee with Andy Norton).

Of course, the quality of participation and dialogue has been limited in many countries. But, in both Africa and Latin American countries like Bolivia, spaces have been opened for non-governmental actors to bring their ideas and experience to bear, and many are gearing up to engage more effectively in the future.

Though not a PRSP country, Jamaica
Public Policy

The CAPE agenda
While contributing to the wider work of ODI, the Centre for Aid and Public Expenditure (CAPE) focuses on how governments and donors can work together more effectively in pursuit of the International Development Targets. Central to this is the ongoing debate on moving from projects towards more flexible forms of support that are better integrated within the plans and budgets of partner countries. The work builds on direct practical experience, with new forms of budget support in Uganda, the established health-sector programme in Ghana, and ongoing research in six African countries. Recently, CAPE has examined how new approaches largely developed in Africa need to be adapted for different country circumstances in Asia (Mick Foster, Adrienne Brown, Tim Conway, Adrian Fozzard, Felix Naschold).

New approaches to poverty-focused aid
The 1990s saw a quiet revolution in thinking about aid, with progressive donors increasingly recognising the

Three factors appear to be critical:
- management and governance reforms that improve incentives at the field level and mechanisms of accountability to the public;
- a broad base of technically competent and well motivated personnel;
- both political vision and the authority to overcome vested interests, in both political and bureaucratic arenas.

CAPE’s advisory work on public sector financial management in Bangladesh, Tanzania and Uganda bears out the preliminary conclusions of this research (Mick Foster, Adrian Fozzard, Felix Naschold).

Themes in poverty reduction
Major themes in poverty reduction were addressed in an ODI Meeting Series on the World Development Report 2000/1, held in the autumn of 2000, and also in writings by various members of ODI (see website). The strengths of WDR were recognised, but the politics were thought to be weak. There was much more to do on some subjects, for example social protection, violence and redistribution.

Social protection
Social protection as mitigation measures targeted at the poorest in society has long

Poverty reduction in North and South
Poverty reduction is not just an issue in developing countries, but also in developed ones; and there are valuable lessons to learn about poverty policy across the boundary between developed and developing countries. An ODI Briefing Paper found that developing countries could learn from the life-cycle approach adopted in the UK. This implies targeting different programmes at different age groups, and with an explicit objective of modifying long-term pathways that lead to disadvantage and social exclusion (Simon Maxwell).
Poverty and Public Policy

Recognition of its key role in sustainable poverty reduction is more recent. The World Bank’s introduction of the theme of security into its report is a substantial step forward in this respect.

ODI work on social protection stresses advances towards a stronger conceptual framework, focused on social risk management. Outstanding issues include getting the right balance between contributory, insurance-based and social assistance schemes; responding to globalisation; and reframing social protection in terms of rights and citizenship (Andy Norton, Tim Conway, Caroline Moser).

The influence of the social protection framework can be seen in recent national approaches to poverty reduction. Policy in Bolivia now recognises that the primary focus has been on risk coping, rather than risk mitigation or reduction. Too little is known still about informal risk management strategies, or indeed those of the ‘third sector’ of NGOs (Caroline Moser).

The influence of the social protection framework can be seen in recent national approaches to poverty reduction. Policy in Bolivia now recognises that the primary focus has been on risk coping, rather than risk mitigation or reduction. Too little is known still about informal risk management strategies, or indeed those of the ‘third sector’ of NGOs (Caroline Moser).

Violence and conflict

Violence has emerged as a significant development problem. In Latin America, violence is an important dimension of poverty not only in countries experiencing political unrest, such as Colombia. It is also critical in war-to-peace transitional societies, such as Guatemala. Crime and violence erode physical, human, natural and social capital, undermine the investment climate and deplete the state’s capacity to govern.

But how do poor communities themselves perceive these problems? Evidence from urban Colombia and Guatemala suggests that economic and social violence are much more important than political violence in the daily lives of poor people. Violence relating to drug consumption, gangs and gender-based conflict are of particular importance. Armed conflict and political violence have tended to be viewed as ‘male domains’, perpetrated by men as soldiers, guerrillas, or peacemakers – leading to a simple vision of men as aggressors and women as victims. However, evidence from different parts of the world shows both men and women as victims and perpetrators – with important implications for the role of women in peace processes (Caroline Moser).

Redistribution

WDR 2000/1 puts income distribution and redistribution back on the agenda – not before time, given the marked inequalities in many developing countries, the dampening effect high inequality has on the degree to which growth translates into poverty reduction, and the generally growth-hampering consequences of high inequality. However, work at ODI and elsewhere suggests that the World Bank is too cautious on the scope for redistribution.

The conventional wisdom suggests that inequality measures change only very slowly. This needs to be challenged by higher political commitment and the more energetic use of tax and other measures (Simon Maxwell).
International Economic Development

Aid, trade, foreign investment, finance – these are among the most highly-contested areas of development policy, and provide a strong focus for IEDG research.

What does aid do?

It can make growth easier

Recent World Bank studies have argued that aid (and thus by implication investment) is only effective when the ‘correct’ policies are in place. However, there is an increasing body of evidence from independent researchers showing that aid works largely independently of policy – albeit conditional on other variables (such as external factors affecting a country’s performance) (Oliver Morrissey, Tony Killick, John Healey).

One such factor is economic uncertainty. As vulnerable countries will tend to have a poor growth performance, but will also tend to receive above average amounts of aid, failure to allow for exposure to shocks can result in the misleading conclusion that aid is ineffective. But if vulnerability to shocks is correctly accounted for, aid has a significant positive effect (Oliver Morrissey).

If it is allocated effectively

This research casts doubts on the policy that most aid should be given to the countries with the most poor people that also have good policies. An alternative view argues that allocations should start with the number of poor, the depth of poverty, and the ability of countries to tackle poverty on their own. Then other criteria, including policy performance, justify deviations from a poverty-based allocation.

One factor underlying recent work on aid allocation is concern that, in the past, donor commercial or strategic interests exerted greater influence than recipient needs. While there is very little evidence that aid increases trade, there is convincing evidence that some donors use trade links as a criterion in determining aid allocations (Oliver Morrissey).

But aid is also used to finance ‘public goods’

International public goods, whose benefits are global or shared by many countries, must be co-ordinated and financed at an international level, or the provision will be less than desirable. International public goods, whose benefits are global or shared by many countries, must be co-ordinated and financed at an international level, or the provision will be less than desirable. Furthermore, certain national public goods (such as a health care service) will be necessary for a country to be able to contribute fully to the provision of international public goods (such as the eradication of contagious diseases). Analysis of aid data found that some 15% of all aid was directly allocated to financing public goods in developing countries in the early 1980s, but this had risen to over 40% by the late 1990s, with the risk that aid might be diverted from other development uses (Adrian Hewitt, Oliver Morrissey, Dirk Willem te Velde).

The growing role of regulation in trade (both national and international) places high financial and administrative costs on poor countries. To the extent that regulation helps these countries ensure that trade policy is implemented efficiently and with due regard to the impact on incomes, this is an appropriate area for aid. Where the regulation is for the benefit of world efficiency or world climate controls, providing regulation can be considered instead a ‘global public good’, and is therefore appropriately financed through proportional or progressive international mechanisms, but not a subject for official aid (Sheila Page).

Scientific information on natural hazards and associated risks constitutes another highly relevant public good for many developing countries. Working in Dominica and Bangladesh, ODI has been assessing the costs and benefits of this information in the context of the economic and financial impact of natural disasters (Charlotte Benson and Edward Clay).

How can countries use trade for development?

Trade can make poverty reduction possible

The direct impacts of trade flows and changes in trade policies are generally positive for total income and the income of the poor in developing countries, but the actual impact of a particular trade change on an individual household will depend on a range of conditions: including production patterns, asset holdings, and previous policies (Sheila Page). Current trade negotiations offer some important potential gains for poverty reduction. By removing anti-export bias, trade liberalisation tends to benefit agriculture (typically the main export sector), reducing rural poverty directly. The losses for import-competing sectors from the withdrawal of trade protection are often offset by devaluation and natural protection and are countered by gains in export sectors (Oliver Morrissey). Countries whose export advantage is in labour-intensive, particularly female
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labour-intensive, sectors may also see important effects on poverty.

**But some trade is less effective**
Trade has been growing rapidly, and the share of developing countries has increased, but the rise in share has slowed, and there is a sharp contrast between price movements in manufactures and commodities. Those countries which have switched into modern goods and services or into new policies (exporting, removal of protection on subsidies). As changes may be particularly difficult or painful for the poor, donors have a role, to reduce poverty and to assist transition to efficient policies (Sheila Page, Oliver Morrissey).

have seen good market growth and performed well; but the share of Africa and of low income countries in general in world trade declined. Both mining and agricultural exports have lost share (Sheila Page). These trends are likely to continue, leaving the poorest developing countries still facing the question which dominated development research in the 1950s: how to develop if exports grow slowly, and their prices are falling relative to those of imports? The successful long-term strategy for development for most countries, remaining to reduce dependence on commodities or discouraging new policies (exporting, removal of protection on subsidies). As changes may be particularly difficult or painful for the poor, donors have a role, to reduce poverty and to assist transition to efficient policies (Sheila Page, Oliver Morrissey).

**And aid can reduce the costs of trade changes**
Changes are an unavoidable part of successful development, which requires movement into new products and services involved in such assistance this year, in programmes on building capacity in the Caribbean and Malawi, and advising the ACP countries and MERCOSUR on their negotiations with the EU (Sheila Page, Henri-Bernard Solignac Lecomte).

More generally, appropriate assistance to developing countries can help create the conditions for a successful diversification: good physical, social, and institutional structure; transport, communications, health, education, laws, banking system. Developed countries can ensure that their trade policy avoids favouring traditional commodities or discouraging new products and services. Even those countries which can change their export structure will continue to face the problems caused by the trend fall in commodity prices until they have made substantial progress in diversification, and require assistance to reduce current poverty alongside assistance to create the economic structure which will reduce poverty more permanently (Sheila Page, Adrian Hewitt, Henri-Bernard Solignac Lecomte, Benu Schneider).

**Developing countries can make better use of the international trading system**
Analysis of the growing role of developing countries in the WTO negotiations since the Tokyo Round and our own experience in helping countries prepare to negotiate suggest that the most power-based views of the international regime, that it is entirely determined by the interests of the most powerful, and that the outcome of international negotiations cannot be influenced by choices made by weaker countries, is not correct. While the role of the largest countries remains central, they cannot impose outcomes against the will of all other countries, and differences among them offer further opportunities to affect the outcome.

Drawing on their success in agriculture and textiles negotiation in the Uruguay Round, and their ability since then to block any agreement that excluded them, developing countries now believe that, if they can identify their priorities, and their strengths and weaknesses, they can include participation in international negotiations as part of their economic strategy. Countries also need, for trade negotiation as for other aspects of development, an effective way to coordinate policy at the national level. Working with Michael Richards (FPEG) and research associates in Bolivia, Guyana and Zimbabwe, we are continuing to analyse what countries can hope to gain from international negotiations, in climate change as well as in trade, and what strategies have proved most successful (Sheila Page, Henri-Bernard Solignac Lecomte).

**And outsiders can help**
The analysis of what countries need in order to negotiate effectively suggests that providing resources, expertise, and information could be helpful both in negotiating and in formulating trade policy. Members of IEDG have been directly

When does foreign investment help development?

Foreign direct investment (FDI) can have both positive and negative effects. In the best case, FDI contributes to growth and poverty reduction, by improving access to technology, external finance and foreign markets, and by easing balance of payments problems. Positive outcomes are not automatic, however, and depend in part on absorptive capacity, which can be improved by policy. Appropriate policies should aim not only to attract investment, but also to upgrade it to new technologies and to strengthen links between multinationals and domestic firms. Incentives are sometimes necessary, but must avoid attracting the ‘wrong’ sort of investment or encouraging rent-seeking behaviour.

Singapore and the Irish Republic are two countries that have successfully pursued an FDI-based development strategy, and the positive effects of foreign direct investment in these countries appear to outweigh negative effects. Getting the ‘fundamentals’ right, especially macro-economic stability, is important but not
sufficient. Beyond that, the experience of Singapore and Ireland shows that it is important to have education and technology policies aimed at upgrading skills in both domestic and foreign-owned firms, a consistent commitment over time, and a well-organised and pro-active Investment Promotion Agency (Dirk Willem te Velde).

And how about other financial flows?
Financial flows other than FDI have grown rapidly, particularly in developing country stock markets and financial instruments. These portfolio flows again offer risks as well as benefits, not least that funds will be withdrawn suddenly, as happened in the East Asian financial crisis. Should capital accounts be regulated to minimise risk? In recent years, the opening of the capital account has been a subject of intense debate.

ODI’s investigations show that liberalisation is hard to avoid, in a world where capital is highly mobile. However, the desirable degree of liberalisation varies with changes in the underlying conditions, and for most developing countries a gradualist approach is both feasible and desirable. The arenas for intervention include capital and money markets, credit operations, and a range of instruments specific to commercial banks and individuals. Some interventions work better than others: for example, banks, pension funds and authorised foreign exchange dealers are relatively easy to control, but price-based controls are found to have little impact on total inflows (though they may have a beneficial impact on the maturity structure of inflows, reducing the risk of short-term volatility). Research is continuing, especially in sub-Saharan Africa. (Benu Schneider).
The provision of international humanitarian aid reached its highest level ever at the end of the 1990s, mainly as a result of the generous response to the Kosovo crisis, the emergency in East Timor, and the cyclone in Orissa.

In the period since, there has been reflection and debate within the humanitarian system about its performance, the interface between humanitarian and political action, and the challenges of working in environments where the state is contested, weak or absent. HPG has contributed to this debate, aiming to improve understanding of the context in which humanitarian assistance is provided, and also to improve operational practice.

Politics and humanitarian aid
The provision of humanitarian aid has always been a highly political activity, whether through its impact on the political economy of recipient countries, or because of the motivations of donor countries. But there appear to be new dimensions to this relationship, and the issue has remained at the centre of HPG’s research agenda.

HPG’s recently published research on the politics of policy coherence was presented to an international conference in February 2001. Entitled ‘Politics and Humanitarian Aid: Debates, Dilemmas and Dissension’, the conference was hosted by ODI, CAFOD and the University of Leeds, and was attended by more than 150 participants. HPG’s research makes the case for a clear separation between the humanitarian and foreign policy strategies of donor governments; and warns that the integration of humanitarian assistance into a wider strategy of conflict management is unlikely to be effective in the absence of revitalised political engagement. At present, claims regarding the political impact of humanitarian assistance are overstated, masking the crisis of political engagement. Overall, the conference explored the changing nature of conflict, the subsuming of humanitarian objectives to foreign policy objectives (and whether ‘humanitarian war’ represents the final collapse of the distinction between humanitarianism and politics), and the role and relevance of traditional humanitarian principles such as neutrality, impartiality and independence. These issues were illustrated in case studies of Afghanistan and Serbia (Joanna Macrae, Nicholas Leader and Margie Buchanan-Smith).

An earlier conference for senior policy officials, jointly hosted by ODI and the Henry Dunant Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue in Geneva in May 2000, had explored the related issue of conditions and conditionalities on humanitarian assistance. The conference concluded that humanitarian assistance should not be subject to political conditionalities, and there needs to be more systematic debate regarding the conditions under which humanitarian agencies engage with belligerents. The latter issue was the focus of a presentation by HPG to the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) in September and is now being taken forward by a UN inter-agency working group, serviced by ODI. (Nicholas Leader and Joanna Macrae).

The ‘Brahimi Report’, commissioned to perform a thorough review of the UN’s peace and security activities, was published in 2000. In subsequent
discussions, the humanitarian and developmental implications of the report have tended to be overlooked, but this was the focus of a DFID-commissioned discussion paper, written by HPG. It concludes that the Brahimi Report’s ‘integrationist’ approach for countries in conflict risks associating humanitarian action with the use of force, once again subsuming it into political agendas and compromising the ability of humanitarian actors to promote the right to assistance of those affected by conflict. The report implies an enhanced role for humanitarian and development actors in peace-building. But peace-building is not apolitical. Once again, humanitarian aid could be co-opted to meet political objectives (Nicola Reindorp and Nicholas Leader).

Humanitarian coordination
HPG undertook a major study on humanitarian coordination, commissioned by the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). It is intended as a resource for the Emergency Relief Coordinator and for the IASC, to enable them to draw lessons from recent experiences in humanitarian coordination, to understand the advantages and disadvantages of different UN coordination models, and to identify features of coordination arrangements which have ‘added value’.

A review of studies of coordination over the past decade presents a recurring picture of UN humanitarian agencies whose governance structures, funding sources, management, institutional cultures and performance incentives all constitute multiple points of resistance to effective coordination. Meanwhile, donors often thwart coordination through their funding and role on UN agency executive boards. The push for profile in a competitive funding market pits UN agencies against each other. Institutional cultures foster agency allegiance over system-wide loyalty, further undermined by poor management. In short, the blight of adhocracy remains.

Yet, remarkably, humanitarian coordination does happen. Effective coordinators have built consensus around coordination through strong leadership, by clearly adding value, or because the context acts as an incentive to coordinate.

The Humanitarian Practice Network
The Humanitarian Practice Network (HPN) continues to provide a valued independent forum for policy-makers and practitioners to share information, analysis and experience on current debates and initiatives in the humanitarian sector. The aim is to improve humanitarian policy and practice by stimulating critical reflection and promoting learning and good practice.

During the past year, changes have been introduced to increase the accessibility of HPN materials: the website (at www.odihrp.org) has been redesigned and expanded, and was recently referred to as ‘one of the most advanced hubs for information on humanitarian issues’. All the HPN publications have been redesigned; the newsletter has been refocused, and renamed ‘Humanitarian Exchange’.

In the past year, the HPN has published widely, in English and French, on issues of crucial utility and interest to the humanitarian practitioner. Topics addressed include operational security management; aid in protracted crises; the political economy of war; refugee return; trends in global humanitarian assistance; the use of information technology in humanitarian emergencies; and the debate over accountability and standards.

HPN’s membership is now around 1,600 people in international and national NGOs, UN agencies, government institutions and among donors, academics and consultants in about 80 countries. (Koenraad Van Brabant, Rachel Houghton, Frances Stevenson, Matthew Foley, Rebecca Lovelace and Victoria Siddiqui).

The final report sets out some of the tasks, techniques and structures that should be part of a standard coordination package and contains a menu of options and arrangements on which the humanitarian system can draw. The options to improve coordination range from fundamental structural changes, to incremental changes which focus on requiring and rewarding coordination (Nicola Reindorp).

Security management
HPG has been at the forefront of efforts to improve and strengthen operational security management by humanitarian aid agencies. The experience gained over a number of years of developing training materials and running courses has culminated in the publication of a Good Practice Review (GPR) on Operational Security Management in Violent Environments by the Humanitarian Practice Network. A comprehensive and practical guide, it offers a systematic approach to security management from context analysis and threat and risk assessment, to security planning. The document is illustrated with case material drawn from all over the world. The GPR has been in great demand from operational agencies, and was second in the Humanitarian Times Top Ten Books of 2000 (Koenraad van Brabant).
The challenge of reforming aid architecture to better match the context and needs of protracted political emergencies e.g. Somalia – Catherine Longley

As a natural corollary, HPG researched how safety and security management is being mainstreamed by humanitarian aid agencies. This identifies some of the common constraints, such as excessive workload and complacency amongst staff, but also ways in which safety and security management can be strengthened. For example, there needs to be commitment from the top of the agency, and a common understanding within the organisation of the concepts of safety and security, and of the importance of risk assessment. The pros and cons of different management structures are explored. The case is made for a management plan for strengthening safety and security to achieve rapid and qualitative improvement within an organisation (Koenraad Van Brabant).

Humanitarian aid in situations of chronic political instability

Humanitarian aid has conventionally been designed for short-term, life-saving interventions, with a clearly defined exit strategy. Yet a common feature of many of today’s conflict-related emergencies is their protracted nature, requiring humanitarian aid year-on-year. And in a number of these situations there is no state or legitimate authority, a profound challenge to the conventional aid architecture.

HPG has researched how three different donor agencies have adapted their policies and institutional arrangements to respond to these challenges, exploring how, if at all, the traditionally compartmentalised boxes of relief and development have been adapted and linked. All three agencies have taken some significant steps in the last five years, and the objectives of humanitarian aid have generally been broadened to incorporate aspects of short-term rehabilitation. But most of the manoeuvring has taken place within the existing aid architecture. The linear relief to development continuum model, although discredited conceptually, still implicitly underpins many programming procedures and decisions. The assumptions of short-term interventions and a rapid and early improvement in the situation still tend to dominate. Perhaps as a result, pragmatism often prevails in programming and implementation decisions, where there is a vacuum of new and innovative policy. This can work, up to a point, if it enables experimentation, but this, in turn, must be fed into and inform policy-making processes, requiring the monitoring and capturing of best practice (Margie Buchanan-Smith).

A book on ‘Aiding Recovery: the crisis of aid in chronic political emergencies’ is soon to be published. This book challenges the call to make relief more development-oriented in order to address the conflict underlying crises. Instead, it argues that relief and development aid are...
ALNAP ‘Shifts Gear’

The Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action, the Secretariat of which is located in HPG, significantly expanded its workload and budget during the year. Its activities are organised under three themes.

Under the ‘evaluation’ theme, a programme of evaluation training activities is being developed including a course for Evaluation Managers in Dublin in May 2001, and modules for evaluators and operational personnel to be run by commercial training providers. An international symposium was held in Geneva in October 2000, reviewing the evaluations and other evaluative literature on the Kosovo operations. A first study on how evaluations of humanitarian action are followed up was also commissioned. Work was completed on an edited volume (to be published in August 2001) of reflections by evaluation practitioners on nine evaluations of humanitarian action undertaken between 1993 and 2000.

Under the ‘accountability’ theme, a Steering Group was formed and finances raised to undertake a two-year global study to develop good practice and guidance material for humanitarian agencies on beneficiary and affected population consultation and participation. A significant development was the preparation and publication of the first ALNAP Annual Review ‘Humanitarian Action: Learning from Evaluation’, which synthesised and meta-evaluated over 50 evaluations of humanitarian action published during the years 1999 and 2000. As part of the Annual Review, a proforma was developed for assessing the quality of evaluation reports.

Under the ‘learning’ theme, further work was undertaken in Sierra Leone and East Timor to develop the concept of the Learning Office, and a proposal prepared to run a test in an ongoing complex emergency during 2001.

ALNAP’s development since 1997 owes much to the effectiveness of ODI’s role in nurturing this international initiative. ALNAP is now well established and pursuing a membership-led agenda funded by 23 Full Member organisations.

(John Borton, Kate Robertson and Lucy Carver)
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very distinct processes. Without public policy-making authorities in recipient countries, aid becomes highly fragmented, often inadequate in scale, and incapable of building local sustainability for particular programmes. The book concludes that the international aid system faces real dilemmas, and remains ill-equipped to respond to the peculiar challenges of quasi-statehood that characterize chronic political emergencies and their aftermath (Joanna Macrae).

The recent HPN Network Paper, ‘The Political Economy of War: What Relief Agencies Need to Know’ (Le Billon, 2000), concluded that aid agencies need more robust frameworks and methodologies to guide their contextual analysis in such situations. Thus, a new project has been launched, which aims to explore how political economy research and analysis can be integrated practically into humanitarian agencies’ planning and programming.

Initial conceptual work suggests that household economy and livelihoods approaches provide a very practical tool through which political economy analysis, which is often conducted at a macro level, can be linked directly to the community and micro level. During 2000/01, a collaborative relationship has been developed with a number of operational agencies to take this work forward. A series of country-based field studies commenced in June 2001, in Angola, Democratic Republic of Congo, Somalia and Afghanistan. These studies will test and develop analytical tools and methodologies to help agencies identify patterns of need and vulnerability, and to help them identify the role and importance of specific commodities (including aid inputs) for supporting livelihoods and/or fuelling conflict (Sarah Collinson).

An integrated programme

Last year we reported upon our plans for developing an integrated approach to our work. This we have achieved, building links between individual projects, and conducting an annual strategic planning process, in consultation with members of the humanitarian sector – our new Advisory Group. HPG’s funding base has expanded, thus contributing to the independence of the group’s work. And some donors have made two-year grants, enabling us to engage in longer-term planning.

‘The linear relief to development continuum model, although discredited conceptually, still implicitly underpins many programming procedures and decisions.’

‘The international aid system faces real dilemmas, and remains ill-equipped to respond to the peculiar challenges of quasi-statehood that characterize chronic political emergencies and their aftermath.’
Institutional change is complex, but needs to be understood better in order to provide an adequate basis for pro-poor development.

States, markets and agricultural development

Development interventions in agriculture have hitherto been highly specific, focusing on such sub-sectoral activities as agricultural research, extension, land reform, input supply or marketing. Whilst such approaches allow interventions in ‘bite-sized’ chunks, they are rarely coherent. Seed provision, for instance, is typically undertaken by numerous public and private agencies, with a wide range of formal and informal rules that govern interaction among them. ODI work in this area (Robert Tripp) suggests that donor contributions to seed system development would be more effective if they paid attention to institutional growth, particularly strengthening the rules and networks that guide agricultural development. For instance, donor seed projects should seek entry points that build on local entrepreneurial capacity, strengthen existing markets, and encourage supportive regulation. Results from two other studies – one on agricultural extension, conducted jointly with the University of Uppsala and others (John Farrington, Ian Christoplos, Andrew Kidd), and one on rural people’s organisations, jointly with CIRAD (Karim Hussein), reach similar conclusions, namely that support specifically within these contexts is unlikely to generate pro-poor benefits unless backed by policies which make organisations and institutions work for the poor – and that our understanding of how this might be done remains incomplete.

Long-term support to the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Affairs in South Africa (John Howell) similarly challenges longstanding perceptions that the costs of farm acquisition, white settler resistance and the non-availability of farm land justify land expropriation at prices below market value. In reality, land markets are active, prices are generally declining, and the public funds available for purchase and redistribution not fully utilised. The real challenges lie in developing the administrative, legal and technical capacities to manage redistribution, and in providing support for land reform beneficiaries to engage productively in farming and to enter available markets.

Even under less stable conditions – such as the chronic political instability found in several countries of sub-Saharan Africa – research suggests that interventions such as the donor-supported distribution of seeds and tools are likely to be high cost and of low impact unless informed by a better understanding of institutional continuity and change. Work in the Horn of Africa (Catherine Longley) demonstrates that seed systems are remarkably resilient in the face of adversity, and that, with some exceptions, what is needed is not the delivery of new seed, but support to certain farmers in accessing what is still available locally. The distribution of vouchers provides one means of doing this – a finding which resonates with a review of voucher schemes elsewhere (Elizabeth Cromwell).

The critique of donors’ ‘seeds and tools’ approaches in post-crisis situations has led to major new research drawing on the strengths of RPEG and HPG (Catherine Longley, Karim Hussein, and Research Fellows from HPG, Sarah Collinson and Margie Buchanan-Smith) to identify options for finding more appropriate ways of supporting livelihoods in situations of chronic political instability.
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The Agricultural Research and Extension Network (AgREN)

AgREN publishes between ten and twelve papers a year on topics relevant to the challenges faced by development practitioners. A survey of membership in 2000 revealed that exclusively electronic publication of AgREN was not a preferred option, owing to difficulties in internet access in many countries. Electronic versions of the papers and newsletter will therefore continue to be produced in parallel with hardcopy. A special issue on globalisation and agriculture will feature among future issues.
Diversifying rural livelihoods

But there are limits to the effects that agriculture can have in reducing poverty, particularly among low-income, and often landless, rural people. A major new study funded by DFID and led by ODI (John Farrington, Craig Johnson, Daniel Start, Caroline Ashley), with a number of South Asian and UK partners, aims to identify new opportunities for policy to support the livelihood diversification efforts of rural people. The study builds on evidence from Africa, Asia and Latin America (see Natural Resource Perspectives 40, 52 and 55) indicating that diversification is more widespread than anticipated, and can be either opportunity-driven or desperation-induced. The study will test how far a range of policy interventions in India (Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh), Nepal and Bangladesh are relevant to the needs and opportunities faced by the poor, and how their relevance can be enhanced. A question specifically addressed in Orissa is whether and how livelihoods have recovered following the recent cyclone, so providing a South Asian reflection on the interface between relief and development paralleling those under chronic political instability in sub-Saharan Africa (see above). An important emphasis throughout is not on the need for growth promotion to be complemented by poverty-focused initiatives – currently a fashionable prescription for many countries, but a longstanding practice in India – but rather on how better understanding of the policy process can help in the identification of interventions which might otherwise appear sub-optimal. This includes questions of how politics influences the selection, design and delivery of interventions, what interventions are robust in the face of severe imperfections in implementation arrangements, and how, if necessary, such imperfections can be amended or bypassed. In a parallel study with the Institute of Development Studies, ODI staff are working on the livelihood dimensions of access to natural capital in southern Africa (Caroline Ashley and Alan Nicol). The project is assessing how policy processes relating to land, water and wildlife – including land reform, decentralisation, increasing reliance on private sector investment, and new water management institutions – affect the poor and their livelihood assets.

Whither rural development

Continuing calls for the ‘rolling back’ of the state, and the low performance of public investments in rural development, coupled with growing doubts over the validity of conventional distinctions between ‘rural’ and ‘urban’ have led to fundamental questioning of the role that donors can play in supporting rural development. A one-day seminar led by ODI (Simon Maxwell, Ian Urey, Caroline Ashley) with a number of commissioned papers, including (from RPEG) on decentralisation (Craig Johnson), diversification (Daniel Start), pro-poor tourism (Caroline Ashley), seed systems (Rob Trpp) and the role of donors (John Farrington) fed into discussion among the EC, European donors and the World Bank in Brussels in February 2001 on how the Bank’s Vision to Action strategy might best be reformulated. Findings focused on the diversification of rural livelihoods, the blurring of rural/urban divides, the potential opportunities (and, for many, threats) posed by globalisation, the opportunity for supporting private sector development, and the threats posed by HIV/AIDS and chronic political instability.

In parallel studies, Karim Hussein worked with CIRAD to help in formulating a francophone perspective on future rural development options, and Roger Blench, Tom Slaymaker, and Robert Chapman worked with NORAD to evaluate its special grant to the environment. These new initiatives are being followed up by a series of ten lunchtime meetings at ODI on the major debates in rural development.

Rethinking conflict over water

That there is likely to be increasing conflict over water within and between nations has become a commonplace premise of development interventions. However, several ODI studies on water (Alan Nicol) point to greater complexity than implied by a simple linear correlation between scarcity and conflict. First, the demands placed on institutions by economic reform and decentralisation in the 1990s have created new relationships between societies, their water demands, and the institutional environment capable of responding to these demands. For instance, the changes in governance following decentralisation in southern Africa are adding to the contestation among water management regimes (communal, private, municipal), but also creating conditions in which a service delivery ‘gap’ develops. Second, a finding paralleling that in seeds and agriculture (above), is that the capacity of communities to re-establish livelihoods post-conflict is higher than generally...
supposed. In particular, the capacity of communities to manage resources effectively even in situations of acute scarcity attests to the capacity of indigenous management institutions to prevent transitions to violence. Third, as indicated in work for the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs on effective water management as a public good, of crucial importance is the process of building institutions and organisations capable of effective management. A central concern here is the establishment of political environments favourable to the formation of common legal norms and principles, and of pathways for the inclusion of civil society.

**Pro-poor tourism and livelihoods**

Tourism is already significant or growing in many poor countries, but how can it benefit the poor more? Pro-poor tourism strategies aim to unlock opportunities for the poor, whether for economic gain, other livelihood strategies, or ‘voice’ in decision-making. However, there is little experience in the design or implementation of these. Recent work assessed six case studies of pro-poor tourism interventions (Caroline Ashley with IIED and Centre for Responsible Tourism at University of Greenwich). Results show that the scale of pro-poor interventions varies enormously: from one private enterprise working with poor neighbours to a national programme enhancing participation by the poor at all levels. Strategies often include, but go well beyond, ‘community tourism’. Preliminary findings suggest that, although the limited scope of pro-poor tourism to date means that the effects on poverty at national level are limited, and only a few of the poor manage to climb out of income poverty through tourism, many more reduce vulnerability through earnings at crucial times of year, and yet others gain non-cash benefits.

In a different context, Robert Chapman and Tom Slaymaker helped to prepare a ‘Toolkit’ on poverty and transport, designed as a guide for policymakers, and drawing on the results of a major study of the role of transport in poverty reduction.

**Sustainable livelihoods and the new architecture of aid**

RPEG continues to do considerable research, dissemination and advisory work on sustainable livelihoods (SL). These have included membership of the DFID SL Resource Group (Caroline Ashley, Karim Hussein, John Farrington), advice on the SL content of project proposals and reviews, and specific advice (e.g. to Sida) on the prospects of mainstreaming SL throughout their programmes, including questions of how SL and rights-based approaches might interface (John Farrington). A particular challenge is posed by changes in the architecture of aid, initiated from Washington by Comprehensive Development Frameworks, followed by Policy Reduction Strategy Papers, and accompanied by National Strategies for Sustainable Development, and by implementation changes, such as Sector-Wide Approaches and the introduction of Medium-Term Expenditure Frameworks. How and how far might SL approaches help in the focus, design and implementation of these? From a SL angle, Robert Chapman has investigated how spatial issues and rural-urban linkages have been treated in some PRSPs. Livelihoods diversification research from South Asia (see above) has started to suggest that SL approaches can help to illuminate the political and implementation aspects of policy processes, and, although potentially important, these are underplayed in aspects of the new architecture such as PRSPs. Research in the coming year will examine more fully the interface between SL and the new architecture.

**Methods for social inclusion**

Despite considerable advances in participatory methods in the last decade,
debate continues over their comparative advantage in relation to other methods. A study of participatory rural appraisal in the Gambia (Karim Hussein, Catherine Longley), conducted jointly with FPEG, suggested how it might best be complemented by organisational and institutional strengthening; work in Malawi (Elizabeth Cromwell) developed and tested participatory methods for monitoring and evaluation; and technical support to FAO aims to identify how participatory livelihoods analysis can complement orthodox approaches to assessing food security (Karim Hussein).

**Innovative approaches to dissemination**

Research results are only as good as the quality of their dissemination – at least with policy research. The Agricultural Research and Extension Network (AgREN) and Natural Resource Perspectives Series (NRP) are well-established RPEG products, now available in electronic options (see box). An innovation introduced during the year is an email alert service for NRPs, AgREN and Working Papers, provided to a list of some 7000 persons, to draw their attention to materials newly available on the ODI website. In addition, DFID and its Netherlands counterpart, DGIS, are co-funding a new series of Key Sheets for investment managers, the first of which, on corruption, was prepared for the Netherlands-hosted Global Forum on Corruption in the Spring of 2001 (John Farrington; Paul Mundy).

Particularly intense efforts at dissemination have been made in research projects on Multi-Agency Partnerships (MAPs) for Rice Production in West Africa and on Soil and Water Conservation in Africa. In addition to locally-produced research reports, these have included the scripting, cultural adaptation, and supervision of vernacular radio programmes for six language groups in northern Ghana, which explain and dramatise the results of research (Roger Blench, Robert Chapman, Tom Slaymaker).

**Natural Resource Perspectives series (NRPs)**

The NRP series provides accessible information on NR policy issues by mailing its four-page briefing papers to some 5,500 persons worldwide. These papers are accessed by many more via the ODI website. Recent topics have included: changing policies towards fisheries and aquaculture; a re-assessment of trends in African land degradation, and assessments of spatial development initiatives in southern Africa, and of government support for rural development in India.

Fieldwork in Avateme rice fields, Eastern Ghana - Rob Chapman

‘... the capacity of communities to re-establish livelihoods post-conflict is higher than generally supposed.’

‘A particular challenge is posed by changes in the architecture of aid...’

‘sustainable livelihoods approaches can help to illuminate the political and implementation aspects of policy processes ...’
Since the Earth Summit in 1992, forest and environment policy has increasingly focused on the multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). But the necessary synergies are yet to be forged between these processes, to ensure a positive impact on forest-dependent livelihoods. Developing countries encounter inconsistencies between the various agreements they are committed to, complicated by the fact that different donors have tended to support some conventions and processes at the expense of others. Safeguarding the interests of the poor in these arenas is FPEG’s chief concern.

Environmental governance

Forest-related MEAs
Governments can pursue their forestry objectives through a number of forest-related multilateral environmental agreements such as the UNFF (UN Forum on Forests), the UNFCCC (the Climate Change Convention) and the CBD (Convention on Biological Diversity) as well as through international institutions such as ITTO and FAO. In a review of the way in which the UK pursues its forestry objectives, FPEG researchers concluded that the key task was for the government to agree which objectives to pursue through which MEAs, noting that the more specialised the forum, the higher the quality of debate. The need for donors to address the political question of how to reconcile partially competing objectives of the MEAs was also highlighted (Gill Shepherd, Michael Richards and Kate Schreckenberg).

UNFCCC
Research into the effectiveness of participation of developing countries in the UNFCCC has revealed that the rather defensive negotiating pursued by G-77 along traditional north-south lines may not have been in the best interests of the poorest and most vulnerable developing countries. Training and capacity-building would help the transition by developing countries to clearer and more constructive policies, which pressurise industrialised countries more (Michael Richards, with IEDG Research Fellow, Sheila Page).

CITES
The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species has a strongly preservationist orientation. Research undertaken last year by FPEG to promote a more sustainable approach to ‘bushmeat’ issues has led to further work on the trade and management challenges which arise. Policy conclusions include strong endorsement for the reorientation of protected areas away from the exclusion of local people and their compensation through unrelated benefits in surrounding buffer zones, to an approach in which protected areas figure primarily in the
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‘The key to achieving an effective input at international level is a solid understanding of the realities on the ground.’

Understanding the realities on the ground.
service of consumer populations. Other findings include the need for research on the economics of bushmeat along the length of the commodity chain, and on the level of demand for bushmeat products in the North (David Brown).

**UNDP/PROFOR**

UNDP’s ‘Programme on Forests’ (PROFOR) has been the main vehicle for testing the 1998 IPF Proposals for Action on the ground, through the promotion of National Forest Programmes (NFPs). An FPEG evaluation found that PROFOR’s work to date has been most successful at country level, though this was dependent in part on country experience prior to its arrival. PROFOR has shown that helping an NFP to evolve is a time-consuming process, moving from information gathering to consensus building, to policy generation; that the range of actively involved stakeholders will only slowly broaden; and that sustainable financing will always be a challenge (Gill Shepherd).

**Improved environmental governance: From the ground up**

The key to achieving an effective input at international level is a solid understanding of the realities on the ground. FPEG’s research strategy has prioritised a number of issues central to sustaining poor people’s livelihoods.

**Fuelwood: crisis or balance?**

ODI has been involved with the Center for International Forestry Research, the University of Gothenburg, and the Tata Energy Research Institute in India, to see how a continuing diminution in woodfuel availability is being dealt with by poor rural and urban users. ODI’s work has been concentrated in Africa. The main findings emerging from rural research include clear evidence of a shift to more clear-cut forms of tenure over fuelwood: both on-farm planted and naturally-regenerated resources, and the turning of open access areas into tightly managed village-level common property resources.

The poor are losing out, and are using a higher proportion of poor fuels such as weeds, crop residues, and twigs. The poor are losing out, and are using a higher proportion of poor fuels such as weeds, crop residues, and twigs. It is becoming harder to accommodate both livestock and fuel resources in the landscape. In towns, per capita consumption of woodfuels is lower, as households can take advantage of indirect economies of scale such as pre-cooked street foods and purchased tinned foods and bread, as well as changes in cooking patterns favouring quickly prepared meals. With massive urbanisation predicted for Africa and India over the next twenty years, it is time to revisit this important but long-abandoned policy area. Government-subsidised urban fuel-switching should be revived, but rural users will switch away from wood fuels more slowly, and are very vulnerable, particularly since urban woodfuel use still lays a heavy footprint on rural areas. Land tenure systems which retain village commons for local use will become more and more important as a result (Gill Shepherd).

**Trees in the forest and on the farm**

FPEG research in southern Honduras has shown that, with market access, trees on farms can produce a greater and more stable income for farmers than their annual crops. To enable farmers to realise the full benefits of their farm trees, there is need to clarify the legal status of trees on farm. FPEG recommendations to this effect have been taken on board in the drafting of the new Honduran forestry policy. The same research tested the concept of ‘conservation through use’ and found that it is nearly irrelevant for individual species as there is little overlap between the many species which farmers value and protect, and those which most need conservation. The concept was found, however, to have significant validity at ecosystem level, as illustrated in coastal Oaxaca, Mexico, where communal forms of management have protected large tracts of high bioquality forests. To ensure their continued existence in the face of intense development pressures and changes in land tenure legislation, conservation agencies need to provide these communal forms of management and tenure with institutional and policy support (Kate Schreckenberg, Michael Richards and research associate Adrian Barrance).

---

**Rural Development Forestry Network**

A major vehicle for the sharing of ideas on community involvement in forest management is the Rural Development Forestry Network. In the past year, the RDFN has built up its electronic archive on rural development forestry. Beginning with the fuelwood theme, and shortly to be followed by items on social forestry, a selection of the best of ODI’s forestry grey literature collection is being made available on the website. These will add to the RDFN past papers, all of which (in English, French and Spanish) can now be downloaded. The forthcoming set of papers on Community forestry in Cameroon highlights the challenge of enabling communities to participate fully in the management, use and benefits of high value forests. (RDFN Coordinator, Kate Schreckenberg, and Mailing Co-editor, David Brown)
ODI is committed to a wide-ranging public affairs programme, aimed at reaching policy-makers at all levels.

Our website (www.odi.org.uk) is now at the forefront of our international communications and public affairs programme, with more than 75% of visitors to the site originating from outside the UK.

The range of material on the site has continued to expand, and a new fast search engine has made it all much more easily accessible. The home page, updated every few days, features the latest ODI news with details of meetings and publications, and links to all sections of the website. Apart from the home page, the most requested pages are those related to publications, meetings, research interests and job opportunities. Briefing Papers, ODI Poverty Briefings and Natural Resource Perspectives are widely accessed, and the full texts of working papers and reports have become very popular with seven attracting more than 500 downloads per month by the end of the year.

The five research groups and their associated networks each have their own home page, with links to summaries of research projects, reports and important activities in these areas. The Humanitarian Practice Network site has been redesigned, using database-driven technology, to permit greater accessibility and more rapid uploading of material. A similar approach is under consideration for other parts of the ODI site.

A major expansion of our increasingly used on-line publications catalogue and secure ordering facility is planned, incorporating a ‘shopping basket’ system, together with automated processing of requests to join ODI’s mailing lists.

Publications
This year we published ten new books, six in collaboration with external publishers. In selecting publishing partners, we place a great emphasis on affordable pricing, as the prices of specialist books continue to rise. An increasing proportion of our output consists of shorter papers and reports, including the twelve new Working Papers published this year, also available from the website.

Meetings, Seminars and Conferences
Meetings remain a key element in ODI’s communications programme, and we are regularly filling our new air-conditioned conference room at Westminster Bridge Road. There have been three series of

Additionally there have been many other events including seminars on developing country finance; Montserrat; capital account liberalisation; IDA; Improving Aid Effectiveness and Reaching the Poor; ‘First World? Third World? The internationalisation of poverty and social policy’ addressed by Clare Short MP, Secretary of State for International Development; Minority Rights in Development Aid Policies’ and Foreign Direct Investment in Developing Countries.

Reports from all our meetings are posted on the website, opening them up to a much wider constituency. Full details of all meetings are listed on page 32.

Media

ODI remains committed to working with the print and broadcast media, to inform current debates on issues in development and humanitarian affairs which help to shape policy agendas. ODI regularly receives enquiries from journalists and researchers, which often result in Research Fellows appearing on radio and television. Over the past year, ODI has appeared across the media from the Financial Times and the Guardian to ‘Newshour’, ‘World Today’ and ‘World Service News Hour’ on the BBC World Service; and The Voice of America.

Parliament

ODI’s work with parliament encompasses providing specialist advice to parliamentary committees and supporting the All Party Parliamentary Group on Overseas Development (APGOOD). Meetings of the Group, organised by Adrian Hewitt, have been well attended by politicians and people from civil society, business and academic sectors, with an impressive range of speakers. Clare Short MP, Secretary of State for International Development addressed APGOOD twice, on Improving Livelihoods in a Changing World and on the new White Paper on International Development Eliminating World Poverty: Making Globalisation Work for the Poor; Mark Malloch Brown, Administrator of the UNDP spoke on the UN’s role in human development; Bowen Wells MP, Chairman of the International Development Committee, speaking on his experience of twenty years of EU Development Policy before standing down from Parliament; and Jean-Claude Faure, Chairman of the OECD Development Assistance Committee, presented Development Cooperation 2000.

Among the presentations to Select Committees was a paper by Sheila Page and Adrian Hewitt on the contentious issue of the EU’s ‘Everything but Arms’ trade initiative. This went to Agriculture, Trade and Development Select Committees. Another paper by them on the lessons to be learned from the Seattle WTO ministerial meeting was used by House of Lords (European Scrutiny) and Commons (International Development) Committees.

Library and Information Centre

The process of transforming a predominantly document-based library into a largely electronically based information centre continues apace. Staff now have access to key journals online and many economic and statistical data sources (including World Development Indicators, Human Development Report) on CD. The move from Portland House to Westminster Bridge Road prompted a further extensive weed of the library’s non-electronic collection (especially forestry and agriculture grey literature) and its complete reclassification. The remaining hard copy collection of 16,000 documents is augmented by fast document supply services, notably from the British Library. An internal newsletter detailing research-relevant websites is produced each month.

External access to the ODI library online catalogue continues to be available via the Electronic Development Information System gateway at the Institute of Development Studies (IDS), University of Sussex (http://nt1.ids.ac.uk/eldis/odionly.htm). Internationally, the library networks with its counterpart libraries, and is active in the European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes (EADI) Information and Documentation Working Group.

‘Meetings remain a key element in ODI’s communications programme, and we are regularly filling our new .. conference room at Westminster Bridge Road.’

‘ODI’s work with parliament encompasses providing specialist advice to parliamentary committees and supporting the All Party Parliamentary Group on Overseas Development (APGOOD).’
During its 37-year history, the ODI Fellowship Scheme has placed over 500 economists to work for governments in developing countries. Requests for Fellows remain high, and the Scheme continues to be demand-led by governments.

Fellows in post* at April 2001

**Africa**

**Lesotho**

Habab Rab, Ministry of Finance

Shruti Patel, Research Department, Central Bank of Lesotho

**Malawi**

Thomas Leeming, Ministry of Finance

Ian Gillison, Tax Policy Unit, Ministry of Finance

Matthew Robinson, Planning Department, Ministry of Health

**Mozambique**

Lídia Cabral, Ministry of Planning and Finance

Carlos Oya, Poverty Alleviation Unit, Ministry of Planning and Finance

Alex Warren, Directorate of Customs Policy and Procedures, Mozambique Customs Service, Ministry of Planning and Finance

Gianlou Russo, Ministry of Health

Mafalda Duarte, Planning Department, Ministry of Education

**Namibia**

Richard Williams, Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development

Evelyn Dietche, Budget Formulation & Control, Ministry of Finance - Treasury

**Rwanda**

Helen Suich, Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Ministry of Environment and Tourism

**South Africa**

Karin Christiansen, National Poverty Reduction Programme, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning

Richard Erlebach, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning

Susy Evans, Planning Directorate, Ministry of Education

Sarah Hague, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning

Christopher James, Directorate of Planning, Ministry of Health

**Tanzania**

Phil Comprenolle, Macroeconomic Policy - National Treasury

**Swaziland**

Gregory Vaughan-Morris, Public Policy Coordination Unit, Prime Minister’s Office

Shabih Mohib, Policy Analysis Division (Revenue), Ministry of Finance

**Recruitment**

Recruitment for 2001–2003 Fellowships is complete. The calibre of candidates was outstanding. This time, a clear majority of Fellowships were offered to women. In line with previous year’s trends, we received the most applications from LSE, SOAS, Cambridge, Sussex, Oxford, UEA and UCL. Competition for Fellowships remains high due to the Scheme’s strong reputation among prospective candidates and their universities. It is seen by many applicants and future employers as the ideal way to begin a career in development. ODI has as a result been involved in the 2000 round of economics teaching assessments at a number of UK universities.

**Fellowship achievements**

The typical work of a Fellow varies greatly between posts and countries. Budget preparations and development of Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks and poverty reduction strategies remain key areas of involvement for many Fellows. Demand has grown in recent years for Fellows to work in specialised positions such as natural resource or environmental economics, and in social sectors such as health and education. An increasing emphasis has been placed on HIV/AIDS and a growing number of Fellows are becoming involved in this area. The demand for international trade postings has increased, as if in anticipation of the December 2000 UK White Paper on Globalisation. This is now being reflected in our recruitment of candidates and post...
Fellowship Scheme

Fellowship Scheme placements 1995–2000

Future of the Fellowship Scheme
In addition to the Scheme’s core fifteen countries which are expected to remain largely unchanged, we are also looking at the possibility of expanding into new countries such as Nigeria, Zimbabwe and Kenya/EAC as well as SADC. In addition we have been approached by East Timor (IMF), South Pacific Regional Environmental Programme (UNDP/GEF), UNECA (UN Economic Commission for Africa) Addis Ababa, as well as research institutes attached to African universities. All will be considered for additional placements in 2001–2003.

Career Prospects
On completion of their assignments, Fellows have gained highly relevant experience and are in great demand by potential employers. The majority of Fellows continue to follow a career in development, with only 5% over the last few years moving into other occupations. Of the Fellows who recently completed their assignments, six joined the UK’s Department for International Development as economists; a record three have gained places on the World Bank’s Young Professional Scheme; others are with UNDP, the Dutch Development Bank and private consultancies.

Capacity-Building
Capacity-building continues to be a key element of the Fellowship Scheme and Fellows are encouraged to pass on their skills through counterpart training. Our pre-departure briefing programme stresses the need for capacity building and helps Fellows develop ways of achieving this. Some Fellows run courses at local universities or civil service colleges.

Ali Abbas, Policy Analysis Division (Capital Markets), Ministry of Finance
Hazel Gray, External Finance Division, Ministry of Finance
Helen Tilley, Policy Analysis Division (Debt), Ministry of Finance

Uganda
Vincent de Boer, Bank of Uganda
Romilly Greenhill, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development - Budget Policy
Stephen Rice, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development - Health
Fiona Davies, Macroeconomic Policy Department, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
Lars Moller, Poverty Analysis and Monitoring Unit, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning

Caribbean Development Bank
Marco Petracco-Giudici, Research Department

Guyana
Hans Beck, Ministry of Finance

Sylvia Holman, Ministry of Health
Sarah Cooke, Ministry of Trade, Tourism and Industry
Pauline White, Agricultural Project Cycle Unit, Ministry of Agriculture

Montserrat
Gareth Forber, Development Unit, Ministry of Finance and Economic Development

Papua New Guinea
Juan Luis Gomez Reino, Department of National Planning and Monitoring
Joshua Jackson, Economic Policy Unit, Department of Finance and Treasury
Dominic Mellor, Research Unit, Bank of Papua New Guinea
Colette O’Driscoll, Internal Revenue Commission

South Pacific Applied Geo-science Commission
Robin Koshy, SOPAC, Suva

South Pacific Forum Secretariat
David Joiner, Trade Division, Suva

Central Banks 13%
Finance and Planning Ministries 48%
Development Banks 3%
Agriculture Ministries and Corporations 10%
Health Ministries 6%
Trade Ministries 2%
Environment Ministries 3%
Other (e.g. Prime Minister’s Office, Education) 15%
Finance

Balance sheet summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>31 March 2001</th>
<th>31 March 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible assets</td>
<td>68,103</td>
<td>109,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments (Market Value)</td>
<td>1,039,465</td>
<td>1,024,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,107,568</td>
<td>1,134,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocks</td>
<td>17,664</td>
<td>22,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debtors and cash</td>
<td>1,355,252</td>
<td>989,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,372,916</td>
<td>1,012,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creditors and accruals</td>
<td>(1,105,800)</td>
<td>(831,193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Current Assets</strong></td>
<td>267,116</td>
<td>181,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>1,374,684</td>
<td>1,315,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestricted reserves</strong></td>
<td>1,374,684</td>
<td>1,315,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income and expenditure account summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and project finance</td>
<td>6,346,521</td>
<td>5,498,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments income</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>3,678</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating income</td>
<td>173,107</td>
<td>79,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total income</strong></td>
<td>6,524,128</td>
<td>5,578,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs and related expenses</td>
<td>2,474,502</td>
<td>2,157,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>141,277</td>
<td>74,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Expenditure &amp; other direct costs</td>
<td>2,224,774</td>
<td>1,907,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating expenses</td>
<td>717,200</td>
<td>763,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings, conferences and publications</td>
<td>134,034</td>
<td>41,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and audit fees</td>
<td>25,440</td>
<td>7,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship supplements</td>
<td>762,520</td>
<td>650,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditure</strong></td>
<td>6,479,747</td>
<td>5,602,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/Deficit</strong></td>
<td>44,381</td>
<td>(24,580)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Auditor’s statement: ‘We have examined the summarised accounts (above), the preparation of which is the responsibility of Members of Council, and in our opinion the summarised accounts are consistent with the full accounts for the year 31 March 2001.’

Buzzacott, London, June 2001

Copies of the full accounts are available from ODI on request.
### Funders

- African Wildlife Foundation
- Agence Intergouvernementale de la Francophonie
- Aide à la Décision Economique
- Asian Development Bank Institute
- Australian Agency for International Development (AusAid)
- Barclays
- Bonn International Center for Conversion
- British Council
- British Red Cross
- CAFOF
- Canadian International Development Agency
- CARE International
- Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
- Centre de coopération internationale en recherche agronomique pour le développement (CIRAD)
- Centre for Arid Zone Studies, University of Wales, Bangor
- Centre for Defence Studies, King’s College London
- Centre for Development Research (CDR) Denmark
- Centre for Natural Resources and Development, University of Oxford
- Chaire Mercosur, Institut d’Etudes Politiques de Paris
- Commonwealth Secretariat
- Community AIDS Treatment Information Exchange (CATIE)
- Dames & Moore Group
- Danish Environmental Research Programme
- Debt Relief International Limited
- Department for International Development
- Department of Foreign Affairs, Dublin
- Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH
- Development Strategies Sari
- Disasters Emergency Committee
- EC Somalia Unit
- Emerging Market Economics Ltd
- ETC International Group
- European Centre for Development Policy Management
- European Commission
- European Parliament
- European Tropical Forest Research Network (ETFRN)
- Fondation Nationale
- Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations
- Ford Foundation
- Foreign & Commonwealth Office
- Forestry Research Programme, Natural Resources International Limited
- FRR Limited
- Hanson Cooke Ltd
- Imani Development (International) Ltd
- Information, Training and Development (ITAD) Ltd
- Institute Cooperation Economic International (ICEI)
- Institute for Development Policy and Management
- Institute of Latin American Studies, University of London
- InterAction
- Intermediate Technology Development Group
- International Committee of the Red Cross
- International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT)
- International Federation of the Red Cross & Red Crescent Societies
- International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)
- International Plant Genetic Resources Institute
- International Trade Centre
- Iwokrama International Centre for Rain Forest Conservation and Development
- Japan Bank for International Cooperation
- KanEnergi AS
- Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen
- Leventis Foundation
- London School of Economics and Political Science
- Médecins Sans Frontières, The Netherlands
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden
- Mokoro Ltd
- Mouchel Consulting Limited
- Natural Resources International Ltd
- Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Nordic Africa Institute
- Observatory of Globalisation
- Office of US Foreign Disaster Assistance, USAID
- One World Trust
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
- OECD Development Centre
- Overseas Development Group, UEA
- Oxfam International
- Oxford Policy Management Limited
- Planistat Europe
- RedR
- Rio Tinto
- Routledge
- Royal Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Save the Children Fund
- School of Agriculture and Forest Sciences, University of Wales
- School of Geography, University of Leeds
- School of Public Policy, University of Birmingham
- Social Development Direct Limited
- Société d’Eco-Amenagement
- SPM Consultants
- STAKES, National Research and Development Centre for Health and Welfare
- Swedish International Development and Cooperation Agency (SIDA)
- Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
- Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
- Synergy
- Tropenbos Foundation
- UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
- United Nations Childrens Fund (UNICEF)
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
- UNDP, Tanzania
- United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) - World Conservation Monitoring Centre
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
- Université de Genève
- University of California
- University of Edinburgh
- University of Goteborg
- University of Oxford
- University of Wales, Bangor
- Wilton Park Conferences
- World Bank
- World Conservation Union (IUCN)
- World Food Programme
- World Health Organization
- World Institute for Development and Economic Research, United Nations University
- World Vision
- Worldaware
- Zimconsult
Books


Working Papers


Natural Resource Perspectives

These short papers summarise research and are mailed to over 4,000 recipients in the UK and overseas. They are on ODI’s website.


POVERTY BRIEFINGS AND BRIEFING PAPERS

This series summarises contemporary debate, insights and experience on ways of more effectively reaching and benefiting the poor. New thinking on and recent experience of poverty reduction measures and emerging approaches to poverty alleviation by donor agencies as well as natural resource, finance and trade aspects are covered. The analysis, evidence and insights are drawn from ODI’s recent research and reviews of wider contemporary research, issues being debated and observation from the field. The papers are available free of charge.


The Political Economy of War: What Relief Agencies Need to Know. HPG Report 33.

Operational Security Management in Violent Environments. HPG Good Practice Review B. London: ODI.


Shifting Sands: The search for coherence between political and humanitarian action. HPG Report 8.

Mainstreaming the Organisational Management of Safety and Security. HPG Briefing 2.

NGO Responses to Hurricane Mitch: Evaluations for Accountability and Learning. HPN Paper 34.

Other significant publications by ODI authors


Meetings

The Agenda for Global Institutional Reform: Next Steps for Developing Countries

April–June 2000
- ‘The international agenda and developing country interests’. Richard Manning, Director of Resources, DFID, and Sheila Page, ODI. (5 April)
- ‘Services: opportunities and new regulations’. David Harrison, Centre for Leisure and Tourism Studies, University of North London, and Alan Winters, University of Sussex. (27 April)
- ‘The international financial system and developing countries’. Peter Kenen, Princeton University and Stephanie Griffith-Jones, Deputy Director International Finance Commonwealth Secretariat. (3 May)
- ‘Do developing countries need special and differential treatment?’. Chris Stevens, Institute of Development Studies, Sussex, Robert Read, Management School, Lancaster University. (11 May)
- ‘The international role and regulation of companies’. John Humphrey, Institute of Development Studies, Sussex, John Rakam, Rio Tinto, and Jacob Werksmann, Trade and Sustainable Development, FIELD, SOAS. (18 May)
- ‘The interface between the humanitarian and political agendas’. Mark Bowden, Foreign and Commonwealth Office and Joanna Maccrae, ODI. (31 May)
- ‘Global institutions and developing countries’. David Batt, Director, International Economic Policy, DFID, Peter Tulloch, Director, Development Division, World Trade Organisation, Ngaire Woods, University College, University of Oxford. (8 June)


October–December 2000
- ‘Institutions for markets – markets for the poor?’. Raoumeen Islam, Director WDR 2001 team, and Simon Maxwell, ODI. (5 October)
- ‘How important is redistribution for poverty reduction?’. Howard White, Institute of Development Studies. (18 October)
- ‘Insecurity and social protection: Has the World Bank got it right?’: Caroline Moser, ODI. (25 October)
- ‘Putting politics into poverty reduction? The WDR on empowerment’. Mick Moore, Institute of Development Studies. (8 November)
- ‘Pro-poor international public goods?’. Adrian Hewitt and Oliver Morrissey, ODI. (15 November)
- ‘Can aid be effective in reducing poverty?’. Alison Evans. (22 November)
- ‘HIV/AIDS, development and poverty’. Alan Whiteside, University of Natal, and Tony Barnett, University of East Anglia. (29 November)
- ‘Were “the Voices of the Poor” really heard?’. Robert Chambers, Institute of Development Studies. (6 December)

Financing for Development: Are the UN Proposals the Answer?

January–April 2001
- ‘Financing for Development: An overview of the agenda’. Tony Faint, Director (International), Department for International Development and Benu Schneider, Research Fellow, ODI. (17 January)
- ‘Is there a case for aid today?’. Jonathan Beynon, Economist, DFID. (31 January)
- ‘Financial architecture for poor countries: Does HIPC pave the way?’. Daniel Cohen, Professor of Economics, Ecole Normale Supérieure. (31 January)
- ‘Access to private sector finance: Do developing countries have access?’. Robert Gray, Vice Chairman, HSBC Investment Bank Plc; ‘Are there linkages between private capital flows, growth and poverty?’. Helmut Reisen, Head of Research Division, OECD Development Centre (15 February)
- ‘Private capital flows: Stable or not?’. Anh-Nga Tran Nguyen, Head of Investment Issues Analysis Branch, UNCTAD; ‘Are foreign direct investment flows really less volatile than portfolio and bank flows?’. Aminah Pensa, Managing Director (Global Market Analysis and Research), State Street Bank. (28 February)
- ‘Does trade have a role in financing development?’. Peter Tulloch, Director of Development, World Trade Organisation; ‘Liberalisation of trade in financial services: Is it the right way forward?’. John Thirlwell, Director, British Bankers Association. (14 March)
- ‘Getting the domestic financial architecture right’. Winston Cox, Deputy Secretary General (Development Cooperation), Commonwealth Secretariat, Subrendu Chatterji, Independent Consultant. (28 March)
- ‘Making the international financial architecture work’. Philip Turner, Head of Secretariat Group (Monetary and Economics Department), Bank for International Settlements, Benu Schneider, ODI. (11 April)

Other meetings, conferences and seminars

- ‘Developing Country Finance’. Stephanie Griffith–Jones, Institute of Development Studies, Sussex; and Benu Schneider, ODI. (13 April 2000)
- Learning from Montserrat: Science, Public Information and Policy, Ed Clay, ODI and Peter Kokeelaar, Liverpool University. (4 May 2000)
- ‘Capital Account Liberalisation: The Developing Country Perspective’, Ben Schneider, ODI; Christopher L. Gilbert, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam; Gregor Irwin and David Vines, Department of Economics Oxford University; John Williamson, Institute for International Economics; Wilson T. Banda, Reserve Bank of Malawi; Dr. V.Y. Reddy, Deputy Governor, Reserve Bank of India; Louis A. Kasekende, Deputy Governor, Bank of Uganda. (21 June 2000)
- ‘IDA: Improving Aid Effectiveness and Reaching the Poor’. Kathleen Stephenson, and Jean-Michel Happi, World Bank. (10 October 2000)
- ‘First World? Third World? The Internalisation of Poverty and Social Policy, conference sponsored by ODI with the Institute for Public Policy Research and the New Policy Institute, held at ODI: Rt Hon Clare Short MP; Secretary of State for International Development, Matthew Taylor, Adrian Wood, Kevin Watkins, Peter Robinson, Peter Kenway, Fran Bennett, Andy Norton, Ruth Lister. (9 January 2001)
- ‘Politics and Humanitarian Aid: Debates, Dilemmas and Dissension’, conference organised by ODI, POLIS at the University of Leeds and CAFFOD, held at the Commonwealth Institute: Mohammed Haneef Atmar, Mark Bowden, Mark Duffield, Fiona Fox, Joanna Maccrae, André Pasquier, Michael Pugh, Vanessa Pupavac, Marina Skirin-Prodanovic, Hugo Slim, Susan Woodward. (1 February 2001)
- ‘Minority Rights in Development Aid Policies’. Launch of Minority Rights Group Issues Paper by Katarina Tomaszewska, Professor of International Law, University of Lund, jointly with Minority Rights Group International) Dr Phil Evans (Senior Social Development Advisor, DFID), and the New Policy Institute Simon Maxwell (Director, ODI), Kate Phillips (MRG ). (7 February 2001)
Research Specialisations

Caroline Ashley (RPEG): sustainable livelihoods and natural resource management; pro-poor tourism; community-based natural resource management and private partnerships; wildlife; Southern Africa.

Roger Bleich (RPEG): natural resource conflict; animal traction issues in sub-Saharan Africa; climatic issues (especially drought) in relation to policy (e.g. El Niño); ethnoscience and the domestication of the wild in sub-Saharan Africa; emerging policy issues in Central Asia.

David Booth (PPPG): poverty; poverty-reduction strategies and institutional reform; combined methods for monitoring and analysis; theories of states and society.

Charlotte Boyd (RPEG): incentives for conservation; wildlife; Non-timber forest products; trees on farm; community-based natural resource management and tourism.

John Borton (HPG): humanitarian aid; evaluation; organisational and system learning; accountability mechanisms; conflict; natural disasters.

Adrienne Brown (PPPG): Public sector planning and management, and institutional reform; donor coordination, especially sector wide approaches.

David Brown (FPEG): community based forest management and biodiversity conservation; institutional dimensions of participatory development; environmental governance and accountability; Francophone perspectives.

Margie Buchanan-Smith (HPG): complex political emergencies; relief-development aid linkages; evaluations; natural disasters and early warning.

Edward Clay (IEDG): economic and financial aspects of natural disasters; food and nutrition policy, especially food aid and food security.

Sarah Collinson (HPG): humanitarian aid; political economy of conflict; international migration, including forced migration.

Tim Conway (PPPG): donor policies and practices; social policy and social protection; poverty analysis and monitoring; evaluation; rural poverty and poverty reduction policies, especially in Cambodia and Vietnam.

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

John Farrington (RPEG): sustainable livelihoods, diversification; policy processes.

Mick Foster (PPPG): public finance; aid policies, especially sector wide approaches and budget support.

Adrian Fozzard (PPPG): public expenditure management and reform; aid management; and decentralisation.

Lucia Hamner (PPPG): micro-economics; gender relations and the household; quantitative methods and econometrics.

John Healey (PPPG): aid policy and practice and poverty reduction aspects; governance and the politics of economic policy-making in developing countries.

Adrian Hewitt (IEDG): EU/South relations; foreign aid; international trade; commodities; WTO; Parliament; development strategy; global public goods.

John Howell (RPEG): agricultural and rural poverty; land reform in southern Africa.

Karim Hussein (RPEG): Rural development policy; participatory approaches; rural organisations; sustainable livelihoods; livelihoods monitoring; food security and poverty; anglophone and francophone West Africa.

Tony Killick (IEDG): international economic policy; World Bank and International Monetary Fund; debt, PRSPs and conditionality; African economic problems; aid; poverty.

Nicholas Leader (HPG): emergency management; aid policy in unstable situations; humanitarian principles and food distribution during conflict.

Catherine Longley (RPEG): seed security and agricultural rehabilitation; farmers’ management of crop diversity.


Oliver Morrissey (IEDG): Aid effectiveness and policy; conditionality and policy leverage of aid; aid and government behaviour; trade policy and barriers to exports; WTO and developing countries; economic policy reform, especially East Africa.

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

Caroline Moser (PPPG): Participatory poverty analysis; urban violence, social capital and community peace initiatives; vulnerability and formal and informal social protection; gender mainstreaming.

Alan Nicol (RPEG): transboundary water resource management; public goods, water resources and water supply development, sustainable livelihoods and poverty elimination; institutions of water management.

Andy Norton (PPPG): Social policy analysis and social development; participatory approaches to policy development; poverty reduction and public policy processes.

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

Nicola Reindorp (HPG): complex political emergencies and humanitarian aid; UN and donor coordination; conflicts in Africa, particularly the Great Lakes region, advocacy.

Michael Richards (FPEG): economic analysis of forest management; innovative incentive mechanisms; forest policy and governance.

Benu Schneider (IEDG): issues in international finance; capital flows; capital flight; international financial architecture; national monetary and exchange rate policies; domestic financial markets; economic policy in India and Uganda.

Kathrin Schreckenberg (FPEG): on-farm tree resources; non-timber forest products; participatory forestry; curriculum development.

Gill Shepherd (FPEG): international forest and environment policy; national forest programmes; landscapes; biodiversity and people; Asia and Africa.

Henri-Bernard Solignac Lecomte (IEDG): future of ACP-EU cooperation; industrial growth in Africa; trade policies and trade agreements; regional cooperation.

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

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

Dirk Willem te Velde (IEDG): trade and development; foreign direct investment; income inequality; trade and macroeconomic modelling.