



## In this Issue

### Editorial

#### EADI Directors' Meeting 2009

Reforming and Reinvigorating Development Studies - *by Jean-Luc Maurer*

Climate Change and Development Studies - *by Asuncion Lera St. Clair*

Selected Issues in Urbanisation - Coherent and Interactive Body of Knowledge Needed - *by Isa Baud*

Integrating Natural Resources Management (NRM) in Development-Oriented Research - *by Paul Vlek*

Managing Change: New Challenges for Development Research Institutes and Think-Tanks - *by Simon Maxwell*

Achieving Visibility: Open Access and Journal Ranking in Development Studies - *by Maja Bucar and Anja Möller Rasmussen*

EADI Accreditation Project: Status and Next Steps - *by Andy Sumner and Joost Mönks*

#### Development Beyond 2015

Rethinking the Millennium Development Goals

Development Beyond 2015: The Future of European Development Co-operation

#### News from EADI

Overcoming Fragility in Africa: Forging a New European Approach - Launch Event in Germany of the European Report on Development

Urban Chances: City Growth and the Sustainability Challenge - Comparing Fast-growing Cities in Growing Economies - New EADI Project

In Search of New Narratives and Universals in a Changing World - EADI-DSA 2011 Conference

EADI Prize 2009

New EADI Books

Focus on New Members

## Impressum

THE EADI NEWSLETTER IS PUBLISHED TWO TIMES A YEAR BY:

European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes (EADI)  
Kaiser-Friedrich-Str. 11  
D-53113 Bonn, Allemagne  
Tel.: (+49) 228 - 26 18 101  
Fax: (+49) 228 - 26 18 103  
Web: [www.eadi.org](http://www.eadi.org)  
E-mail: [postmaster@eadi.org](mailto:postmaster@eadi.org)  
Executive Secretary: Thomas Lawo  
Editor: Susanne von Itter  
E-mail: [itter@eadi.org](mailto:itter@eadi.org)

LANGUAGE CHECKING:  
Ute Reusch

PRINT:  
V + V Druck, Bonn

COVER PICTURE:  
Doris Theisen

Material from the EADI Newsletter may be reproduced or adapted with prior permission of EADI, provided it is not distributed for profit and is attributed to the original author(s).

The views expressed are those of the individual authors and do not necessarily reflect those of EADI.

# Editorial

"The key issue for development studies is not to jump on the bandwagon of mainstreaming climate change with ongoing development work, as we can see many donors and global development agencies rushing to do now, but to acknowledge that there is a correlation between the actual problem, dangerous environmental change, and models of progress and development of which the actual discipline of 'development studies' is part," Asuncion Lera St. Clair said at EADI's Annual Meeting of Directors. This year's leading question was what could be done in our centres to mainstream issues of climate change, poverty, urbanisation and natural resources management in order to be able to respond to crises and to work on at least parts of the solution towards a more sustainable future.

This Newsletter presents a selection of contributions to this meeting. It also presents the results of the workshops we had on "Managing Change: New Challenges for Development Research Institutes and Think Tanks", on "Assuring Quality: Accreditation and Peer Review in Development Studies" and "Achieving Visibility: Open Access and Journal Ranking in Development Studies". The results of these workshops will be discussed further in our Association.

The Millennium Development Goals and beyond are another focus of the Newsletter. A series of meetings addressing questions relating to a post-2015 MDG plus agenda were convened in co-operation with the Development Studies Association of the UK and Ireland (DSA), and the results are presented in this issue. A more detailed report as part of the IDS Bulletin entitled "After 2015: Promoting Pro-Poor Policy after the MDGS - The Plenary Presentations and Discussion" can be downloaded from our website.

Reaffirming its long-term commitment to the debate on the post-MDG development narrative, EADI will hold a session entitled "New Crises - New Policy Responses? Rethinking European Development Co-operation (EDC)" at the GDN annual conference on 18 January 2010 in Prague. On 25 January, EADI will be co-operating at a MDG Roundtable on "The 2010 MDG Review

and Beyond: What to Do Differently? What to Do the Same?" in co-operation with IDS, DSA, UNDP and Dfid in New York.

With EADI as co-ordinator, a consortium of eight organisations from around the globe has drafted a successful project proposal within the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7). The project carries the title *Chance2Sustain*. In this programme we want to examine how governments and citizens in cities with different patterns of urban economic growth make use of participatory (or integrated) spatial knowledge management to direct urban governance towards more sustainable development.

In 2009, the *European Journal of Development Research* published five issues, among those a special issue on "China in Africa: A Relationship in Transition" co-edited by Olu Ajakaiye (African Economic Research Consortium, Nairobi) and Raphael Kaplinsky (Open University, UK and University of Cape Town). The *European Journal of Development Research* is a multi-disciplinary journal that seeks to broaden our understanding of the processes that advance or impede human development, whether from a political, economic, sociological or anthropological perspective, as part of the EADI membership package. Special issues will be published in 2010 on "New Avenues for Pastoral Development in Sub-Saharan Africa" and "Female Entrepreneurship across Countries and in Development", among others.

A top priority in EADI's work plan for the next two years is to engage in the preparation of the 13th EADI General Conference, which will be held in September 2011 in co-operation with the Development Studies Association of the UK and Ireland (DSA). This major event (working title: "In Search of New Narratives and Universals in a Changing World") is described in this Newsletter and we cordially invite you to contribute to shaping the discussion and to framing the conference introduction with us. The DSA-EADI 2011 joint conference seeks to be one convening space among many others for global debates and to fundamentally revisit and rethink the development paradigm(s) in all its dimensions



in an era of plurality, uncertainty and change. A call for papers and combined EADI working groups/DSA study groups will be issued by mid-2010 at the latest. EADI working groups have also planned several major events for 2010. Please see the calls and announcements on our website.

In the context of the European Development Co-operation to 2020 programme, we have established a dialogue between researchers and policy-makers. On 16 March 2010, EADI and SID Europe will be holding a briefing session in Brussels for parliamentarians and policy-makers entitled "Post-Copenhagen: Practical Consequences for Europe".

We congratulate Claudie Fiorini from Switzerland and Jean-Louis van Gelder from The Netherlands on winning the EADI Prize 2009 and for their very original pieces of research, a critical analysis of the migration policy of the European Union (Fiorini) and an analysis of urban tenure security in developing countries (van Gelder).

We thank you for being a member of EADI, welcome our new members and wish you a peaceful 2010.

*Susanne von Itter*

Susanne von Itter  
E-mail: [itter@eadi.org](mailto:itter@eadi.org)

## EADI Directors' Meeting 2009

# Reforming and Reinvigorating Development Studies

by Jean-Luc Maurer, EADI President

The Directors' Meeting of EADI member institutes, which took place this year in Copenhagen on 29 and 30 October, is a key moment in the calendar of our association. With more than 50 directors of development research and training institutes, it has become a vital forum for debate on themes of common interest as well as on the direction and aims of the association as a whole. We extend our most sincere thanks to Nanna Hvidt, Director of DIIS, who was kind enough to host this meeting during key other meetings of the Danish and Scandinavian Development Research Institutes, as this opened the door to deeper co-operation and synergies.

Ian Manners (DIIS) kicked off the Directors' Meeting with his presentation on "The European Union's Normative Power". Later the EADI prize was awarded, as it is every year, to a remarkable publication from young scholars. This year the prize went to Jean-Louis van Gelder of Amsterdam University for his outstanding paper on "Urban tenure security in developing countries: On perception, property rights, and slum development" and Claudie Fioroni of the Graduate Institute in Geneva for her equally remarkable paper entitled "La cohérence des politiques pour le développement de l'UE comme instrument de promotion d'une 'approche positive' des migrations". We congratulate both on their equally notable

achievements. As EADI President, I take great pride in a result that bears witness to the diversity of the field of development studies, both in terms of content and language.

Friday, 30 October was dedicated to a morning session on one major common theme: "The future of development studies in the light of crises: mainstreaming climate change, poverty, urbanisation and resource management in development research institutes." The session started with introductory remarks by Alison Evans (ODI, London) on poverty, by Asuncion Lear St.

discussion launched three years prior by EADI member institute directors on "Managing change: new challenges for development research institutes and think-tanks", on which Finn Valentin (Copenhagen Business School) gave an introductory speech. The second task force, led by Andy Sumner (IDS, Sussex) and Maja Bucar (Ljubljana University), aimed at tackling more technical issues. It focused successively on "Assuring quality: accreditation and peer review in development studies" and on "Achieving visibility: open access and journal ranking in development studies" on the basis of introductory presentations by Cecile Jackson (SDS, East Anglia), Anja Möller Rasmussen (NIAS Copenhagen) and Joost Moenks (Geneva University).

The meeting ended with a plenary session where the leaders of each task force gave a presentation on the results achieved during their parallel efforts. Concretely this meant the following decisions for EADI: first it was decided to test and put in

place a system of accreditation of programmes and development institutes as well as to start to co-ordinate and consolidate alternative journal ranking systems better suited to interdisciplinary fields of study such as development, as pioneered by institutes such as CERES in Amsterdam. There was also general consensus on the need for directors of European development institutes to meet once a year to discuss required steps to adapt development research programmes and training courses to new standards in a changing world.



Clair (CROP, Bergen) on climate change, by Paul Vlek (ZEF, Bonn) on resources and by Isa Baud (Amsterdam University) on questions of urbanisation. The participants then discussed the way in which their institute could better integrate and develop these major themes in their training and research programmes as a means to adapt and reinvigorate the field of development studies.

After lunch, participants were divided into two task forces. The first, led by Simon Maxwell (ODI, London), marked the continuation of a

# Climate Change and Development Studies

by Asuncion Lera St. Clair

What should be the role of development studies in the face of the climate change crisis? Is climate change one more topic to be taken up (mainstreamed) by development studies? Should actors engaged in development work incorporate climate change as one more core element of their work? In this short opinion piece I argue that these are the wrong questions to ask. More importantly, they point toward a misleading understanding of the problems posed by climate change. While development studies have a crucial role to play in responding to fundamental challenges posed by climate change, it is very misleading to treat this issue as one more "area of work" in addition to ongoing development work.

The concern about the relation between environmental change and development processes is nothing new. Scholars and activists have been talking about the limits of our models of development for decades. Specifically on the issue of climate change, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) mentioned back in 1993 that stabilisation of greenhouse gases should be "achieved within a timeframe sufficient to allow ecosystems to adapt naturally to climate change, to ensure that food production is not threatened, and to enable economic development to proceed in a sustainable manner" (Article 2, UNFCCC).

What is happening now is that, at last, there is wide consensus on the legitimacy of the reports published by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

What climate change science shows us is that humans have the capacity to be geological actors, that is human actions are the most important source of geological change. We are living in what has been termed the Anthropocene Era, which more or less started in the 18th century with the start of modernity and the invention of the steam engine. So the fundamental relation

between climate change and development is that the dominant development models of the past 200 years have caused the climate crises. Thus, speaking of a mainstreaming of climate into development is a road to nowhere.

The natural sciences and interdisciplinary researchers working on climate change impacts have demonstrated that the changes facing society are anything but trivial. Scientific studies are consistent also on one fundamental issue:



Climate change will be most dramatic in those areas of the planet that are poorest and most vulnerable to any kind of shock. The predicted decline in agricultural productivity, the predicted water scarcity, the predicted increases in severe weather events, the predicted rise in sea levels, the predicted droughts and flooding, for example, are already occurring in those areas of the world that have benefited the least for the past two centuries of industrial development, those communities and groups that have been negatively affected by global development. Those with the least capacity to adapt are those who have contributed least to the problem. Of course, it is a mistake to think climate change will not lead to serious changes and threats in

advanced economies. It will, but there too it will first and foremost intensively affect those who are poorest.

But this scientific knowledge does not (and cannot) explain how individuals and communities can best respond to threats to their environmental, social and human rights, or what climate change means for the future of humanity. The natural sciences can help us to monitor impacts and likely consequences of environmental change, but they cannot solve the tricky and complex questions related to who wins and who loses out, whose issues should be prioritised and which actors should act first and how. We need a new type of science that dovetails the areas of work in development studies into new knowledge emerging from climate science, but that acknowledges the limitations of its area of work. We need critical perspectives that are capable of self-reflection, capable of questioning what development studies has and has not achieved, and how it has or has not been able to produce knowledge relevant to eliminating poverty and to protecting people from the negative effects of change. This requires the broad-based co-ordination of work across scholars and knowledge networks.

Whilst the IPCC represents an organised scientific community, a global knowledge institution that co-ordinates research, there is no comparable knowledge body that co-ordinates poverty and development research. The empty space is already being filled by short-term political interests (often related to national goals and not to global perspectives), on the one hand, and by global development institutions, in particular the World Bank, on the other. The latter group are already building up expertise on the issues in a similar way they built up expertise in the past regarding questions of poverty and development. But climate change and its relation to development cannot be solved, and in fact may be worsened, by the narrow institutional logic, narrow disciplinary perspectives

(mainly economics) and lack of credibility of key actors in institutions like the World Bank.

European development research can pioneer the necessary deterritorialisation of the notions of "poverty" and "development" to include development models of advanced economies and their inadequacies and failures toward poor groups, as well as to the environment. It can pioneer the taking of this area of work outside the boxes created by aid bureaucracies that have consistently defined underdevelopment and poverty as issues that are separate from the histories of development that advanced economies have pursued, or their current prioritised development paths. These paths have reinforced inequality both within and among many countries. Poverty and development have been framed outside social relations, ignorant of the real problems of poor people and their positionality, exclusion and lack of power.

Although much progress has been made in terms of learning how to enable and promote good development, aid continues to be driven by charitable, moralistic and top-down expert knowledge that frames poverty as separate from power and social relations, or as the geographically self-contained problems of poor countries that are unrelated to other global processes. Dominant framings have constructed the issues as problems with an economic fix, while at the same time there has not been a substantial commitment on the side of wealthy countries to invest the necessary funding. Not surprisingly, global commitments such as the Millennium Development Goals are both insufficient and unlikely to be met, and eliminating poverty remains one of the biggest moral challenges of our time.

We are already seeing a strong tendency in the dominant responses to climate change to follow this pattern. Over the past few years there has been a rapid reorganisation of development aid bureaucracies as they have sought to include and mainstream climate change into their technical and expert work in relation to the global South. Adaptation funds are being sought to supplement existing development funds, marking new efforts to "climate-proof" development. But most of these efforts are reinventing or reinforcing decades-old development and poverty reduction strategies that have framed these issues as managerial matters that are mainly dealt with and defined by outside experts and driven by technocratic

and economist perspectives. We are already "othering" the problem of climate change by focussing too much on adaptation without sufficient commitment to real compensation or the required transformation of global institutions and rules that consistently harm the poor. And mitigation efforts are in shameful deadlock, primarily because of profound perceptions of historical unfairness by poor countries, and the inability to acknowledge the need for change and compensation in advanced economies.

European development studies can take the lead role by forging the new type of science that is needed to protect poor people and promote truly sustainable development (just one part of addressing climate change). We can be key actors in building the required knowledge on how to devise new forms of development work in both the North and the South that accomplished both the eradication of poverty and of gross inequalities while promoting advances in quality of life and well-being that may not necessarily be associated with conspicuous, never-ending consumption. The key issue for development studies is not to jump on the bandwagon of mainstreaming climate change with ongoing development work, as we can see many donors and global development agencies rushing to do now, but to acknowledge that there is a correlation between the actual problem, dangerous environmental change, and models of progress and development of which the actual discipline of "development studies" is part.

The first task of European development studies is to scrutinise and question what conceptions of development we are endorsing and promoting. We must tap into everything we have learned in the past decades about what works and what doesn't, such as, for example, the emergent consensus of focussing on social cohesion, ethical principles and solidarity, quality of life and well-being, human rights, capabilities and human security as solid paths for reducing poverty and promoting a sustainable global society. Development studies must open up its expert base to include many (other) disciplines that we need, including the humanities, law, religious studies and psychology, to name but a few. Development researchers have learned a lot about interdisciplinary research teams. We must now learn to produce and promote "integrated" research by co-operating more with the natural sciences. This means we also need

new forms of institutional collaboration with earth system science and sustainability science. Development studies has also learned a lot in terms of integrating majority and minority research teams. The interface between climate change, poverty and development calls for partnerships and collaborations with the global South to be strengthened and further established, and for work on joint educational activities.

Lastly, I would suggest that what climate change calls for in the context of development studies is to further promote the imperative of poverty avoidance in our understanding of the challenges presented by environmental threats, and this in turn requires a much fuller understanding of the nature, extent, depth, distribution, trends, causes and effects of poverty. There may not be any real dichotomy, as we often hear, between addressing poverty and addressing climate change, if both problems are grounded in questions of justice and solidarity. While development studies requires major infusions of resources for renewed collaborative efforts, and while our discipline should promote the need for economic aid from wealthy to less wealthy countries and groups, we must resist the temptation to make adaptation and mitigation of climate change in relation to developing countries a question of aid. Like persistent poverty, climate change is a question of global justice and it is unlikely that we will succeed in addressing one without addressing the other.

*Asuncion Lera St. Clair is Professor at the Department of Sociology, University of Bergen, Norway and Scientific Director of the Comparative Research Programme on Poverty (CROP), International Social Science Council*

*E-mail: [asun.stclair@crop.uib.no](mailto:asun.stclair@crop.uib.no)*

# Selected Issues in Urbanisation - Coherent and Interactive Body of Knowledge Needed

By Isa Baud

An urban revolution is taking place in the world, and very little attention is being given to it in discussions on development co-operation. The proportion of national populations that live in cities varies by region; in Latin America 75% of the population lives in cities, whereas in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia this proportion is only around 40%. Urbanisation is taking place rapidly in the global South, however, where in the 1990s annual growth rates were between 2 and 4%. In high-income countries, where generally speaking about 75-80% of the population lives in cities and towns, the proportion of the population remained stable. According to forecasts, by 2050 there will be 1.1 billion people in the developed world living in cities, 3.3 billion in Asia, and 1.2 billion in Africa. The pattern of urbanisation varies: in Asia cities merge into metropolitan areas, whereas in sub-Saharan Africa there is urban primacy and extensive slum formation in capital cities.

Major issues in debates on urbanisation follow four major debates:

- (In)equality of life issues in cities (housing, basic services, security and violence)
- Urban economies as drivers of national economies and their connectivity to wider economic networks (regional and global)
- Urban governance and citizenship issues, with their linkages to other scale levels of government, and
- Environmental issues (brown and green agenda, climate change).

The quality of life issue is usually framed in terms of government responsibilities vis-à-vis citizens. Social housing, facilitation or provision of basic services and security in particular are local (or national) government activities. In practice, housing is largely a function of the private sector (large and small), and individual household efforts through incremental building (informal settlements). Similarly, basic service provision has become increasingly privatised over

the last 20 years, and security remains a constant problem in many cities in the global South.

The recognition that urban economies are drivers of local/regional and national economies has been recognised (among others by the WDR 1999/2000), linked to international city networks at different levels of economic domination. The links between cities, global value chains and their sub-national regions are under-researched



topics and deserve more attention in development co-operation discussions.

In governance discussions, the focus has been on improving government practices internally (new public management issues, more effective public administration, tax collection, using SDI as support instruments), as well as improving relations between government and other actors (i.e. governance). That discussion has focused on decentralisation, giving a greater role to city government, privatisation of basic services, and strengthening local government and NGO/CSO networks. Emerging trends show a polarisation in cities in various respects: middle-class agendas are becoming stronger in planning, priorities of corporate companies in making "world class cities" and slum dwellers are forming alliances,

combining global networks with local advocacy.

As regards environmental issues, the brown agenda of reducing pollution in urban areas as well as the "greening" of cities is now being integrated into discussions on how climate change will affect cities in particular, and what mitigation and adaptation strategies city governments and populations need to develop.

Current research and development co-operation patterns do not recognise the importance of these issues and trends. In most European countries bilateral programmes target only specific issues on a small scale (slums, basic services) and ignore the breadth and increasing depth of the issues involved. Multilateral agencies provide the impetus to programmes concerning these issues - notably UN-Habitat, the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank (and their networks, e.g. the former UMP programme). An advocacy network of city governments exists through the United Cities and Local Governments association (UCLG). Networks also exist on specific issues, such as ICLEI around environmental issues and the IIED-led network. There is a double bind when it comes to research at universities. Research on urban issues is relatively strong when it concerns European and North American cities - these groups, however, have little to no interest and knowledge of the global South. Theory formation is therefore very biased towards trends in the global North. Research is also divided among the various disciplines of planning and architecture, sociology, institutional economics, and environmental sciences.

The resulting situation is fragmentation of knowledge on cities in the global South and little support and interaction between researchers from various disciplines or between researchers and policy-makers. Efforts to build up a more coherent and interactive body of knowledge should focus on developing North-South research networks (such as the recent EU 7th Framework

Programme grant on Cities and Sustainable Development obtained by members of the EADI Working Group on Urban Governance) in which major urbanisation issues are analysed on a cross-city basis. Such research networks also need to work as advocacy networks towards

policy-makers on the urgency to develop development co-operation programmes in this area. Finally, within the research community, more interaction with researchers working in the global North is needed to produce a more integrated body of knowledge on urbanisation

patterns and trends towards the future.

*Isa Baud is Professor at the University of Amsterdam (UvA)*

*E-mail: I.S.A.Baud@uva.nl*

## Integrating Natural Resources Management (NRM) in Development-Oriented Research

by Paul Vlek

The question has been raised at the EADI Directors' meeting of whether the future of development studies is under threat, and whether issues such as climate change, urbanisation and natural resources management should be mainstreamed into development agendas. As a bio-geochemist deeply involved in development research, the question appears odd. Development the world over has been resource-based, be they natural, human or financial. Our climate, air, water and soils are among the most basic natural resources available to mankind and have been taken for granted for far too long. The drive for economic growth and population dynamics have caused us to reach the boundaries of what is available, and it is an open question as to which of the limits will hit us soonest or hardest: climate, P depletion or a major phyto-pathological pandemic.

Experience gained at the Center for Development Research (ZEF) at the University of Bonn may be a reasonable point of departure in a debate on how to integrate NRM aspects into the development debate. From the outset it is important to make it clear that ZEF is not a think-tank in the classic sense. It has little in common with such institutions as The Brookings Institute, ODI, IDS or DIE. It is more aligned with institutes such as the Earth Institute at Columbia University, the Institute of Development and the Environment in Berne, Switzerland or the NRI, UK. Modelled after the HIID, ZEF was established to compensate for Bonn losing out to Berlin as the capital of Germany after reunification and shifted the role of the university from dealing critically with the political establishment in town to doing the same with the newly established secretariats of the UN conventions (climate, biodiversity and

desertification), and the UNU Centre on the Environment and Human Security.

The Centre became operative in 2007 and celebrated the 10th anniversary of its doctorate programme in 2009. It was charged with the following:

- Inter- and trans-disciplinary research on development-related issues;
- Graduate training (PhD level) in close association with the research programmes overseas;
- Policy advice and decision support.

Implementation was left to three directors who each head one of three departments on Political and Cultural Change, Technological and Economic Change, and Natural Resources and Ecological Change. The institution is autonomous, reporting directly to the university's Senate, as well as interfacultative as it has no degree-granting powers of its own. The modus operandi has often been represented by three interlocking rings that have over the past 10 years gradually moved closer together as the staff have learned to execute inter-disciplinary projects, at a transaction cost that should not be underestimated. At the centre of the overlapping circles one would find such topics as water or land management as well as more abstract topics such as marginality. On the periphery the departments have studied topics that contribute to knowledge accumulation in the disciplines. However, all students are equipped with T-shaped skills that solidly ground them within their disciplines and also make them comfortable in debating development issues with experts from a wide spectrum of disciplinary backgrounds. The demands on students are such that the programme is not for the faint-hearted.

At any one time, ZEF aims to operate three

to four larger and long-term projects that are undertaken collectively and accommodate the majority of the around 140 PhD students that are enrolled at any one time. These students graduate from a variety of universities that are tied into the ZEF network, providing our students with access to top expertise within Germany and Europe. The topics of these programmes are often complex and require a complexity-research approach. This research frontier is actively explored by our young students across the disciplines, who come from a generation that has fewer inhibitions in crossing disciplinary boundaries in solving development issues. The research also often demands extensive and costly field research programmes. Fortunately, it is not unusual in the natural sciences to find donors that will underwrite expensive and long-term projects, though these donors are generally not those most active in the development scene. The added complexity of the interdisciplinary approach is increasingly being recognised as great added value. In that context, one could argue that development research is not in crisis, just changing with the times. NRM issues have long since been mainstreamed. This actually creates both dangers and opportunities. It is up to the development studies institutes to stop development issues disappearing in the global change debate and to capture some of the new resources that this community makes available to further the development dialogue with the global change community.

*Paul L. G. Vlek is Executive Director at the Center for Development Research, University of Bonn, Germany*

*E-mail: p.vlek@uni-bonn.de*

## Workshop Report

# Managing Change: New Challenges for Development Research Institutes and Think-Tanks

by Simon Maxwell

Do biotech firms, consultancies and other “knowledge businesses” have anything to teach university departments, research institutes and think-tanks? In particular, can “we” learn from “them” about how to structure research teams and manage researchers in a fast-changing environment?

These were the questions EADI Directors met to discuss in Copenhagen, in the latest of a series of workshops on planning for the future and managing change. We have already tapped a rich seam of knowledge and experience among EADI Directors - see articles in previous issues of the EADI Newsletter, and also a collection of materials and case studies on the EADI website ([www.eadi.org/dm2009](http://www.eadi.org/dm2009)). EADI Directors share many preoccupations, whether they manage university teaching and research centres or independent institutes, and whether or not they are core-funded by the public sector. Many have had to re-position their institutes, adjust their work programmes, find new sources of funding, introduce new incentives for staff, even merge. It is always inspiring to hear Directors find common ground on these topics, and share experience.

Our guide in Copenhagen was Professor Finn Valentin from the Copenhagen Business School, a leading authority on knowledge and knowledge businesses. Finn provided us with a theoretical background which emphasised the need for knowledge businesses in the private sector to “configure their knowledge assets” in new ways in order to secure competitive advantage. As new knowledge is acquired, codified and eventually disseminated, its value in the market place declines. Knowledge businesses can delay that process and capitalise on what they know, for example using intellectual property legislation, but eventually they need to move on to the next innovation. Often, this will require creating new teams, training people to work together on new topics or with new applications of their core skills. Finn’s empirical

studies of firms in Denmark strongly supported this model of managed innovation - “upgrading from inside”.

Of course, EADI Institutes do not behave in every respect like biotech start-ups. There is a strong ethos of public service and of treating research outputs as public goods rather than instruments of market engagement. Collaboration is valued and partnerships feature prominently, both in a national context and internationally. Researchers do not much like to be described as “knowledge assets”, and most are likely to resist being “configured”, even for the greater good.

Nevertheless, these differences should not obscure the shared imperative of putting together new teams to address new problems. EADI Directors had, after all, spent the morning discussing how the development agenda was changing and how their institutes should respond. Many shared their experience of organisational change, often difficult. One Director described how she had encouraged her staff to work together “in the swamp” while they worked out new priorities for the institute. Another talked of breaking down traditional departments and creating temporary “research platforms” specifically designed to focus attention on a problem for three to five years and then disband. Others talked about the challenge of developing new programmes, products or services - new courses, for example.

In all these cases, Directors had a role as change managers, with well-known issues around managing expectations and dealing with nervousness about,

sometimes resistance to, change. Sometimes, staff had seen real opportunities for exciting new work, and had joined in willingly. Sometimes, staff had been won over because reorganisation had opened opportunities for them to take on new responsibilities. On other occasions, staff turnover had provided opportunities for reconfiguration. Several Directors talked about the importance of gradual evolution, of recognising “path dependency” in institutions.

Our main conclusion was that EADI member institutes had undergone constant change in the past and would have to continue changing in the future. Whatever their history and culture, there seems little doubt that in one way or another, all will now be “re-configuring their knowledge assets”.

*Simon Maxwell was Director of the Overseas Development Institute from 1997 until April 2009. He leads the EADI workstream on Planning for the Future and Managing Change in Research Institutes and Think-Tanks.*

*E-mail: [s.maxwell@odi.org.uk](mailto:s.maxwell@odi.org.uk)*



Finn Valentin

## Workshop Report

# Achieving Visibility: Open Access and Journal Ranking in Development Studies

Anja Moller Rasmussen and Maja Bucar

Open Access (OA) as a model of online publication has received significant attention within the EADI network. Not only was the topic addressed at the Directors' Meeting in the Hague and at the EADI General Conference in Geneva, EADI's Working Group on Information Management has identified and addressed the issue of the Open Access since 2005 and promoted the concept intensively within the EADI community.

Open Access presents opportunities for the use and dissemination of development research for those with least access at present. It also poses risks, including possible increased costs for the author, a decline in perceived quality control and potential damage to the sustainability of "traditional" research publishing. However, the potential of Open Access has encouraged funding agencies, authors, publishers and librarians to examine new approaches. While areas of dispute still exist, it seems there is a willingness among all the stakeholders to explore the advantages, and discuss tackling the disadvantages of Open Access in a spirit of collaboration.

In spite of initial reluctance, commercial publishers have begun to realise that it is possible to combine the traditional model, providing the benefits of the existing system like peer review, the protection of the scholarly record and quality assurance with the opening up of access to those unable to afford print versions. Two basic forms of implementation have established themselves, with a focus on academic journals:

1. the 'green road': copies of previously published, peer-reviewed research articles are deposited in university or research institute repositories;
2. the 'golden road':
  - a. publication by Open Access publishers or in Open Access journals, financed either upfront through publishing fees (e.g. BioMed Central) or through public funds (e.g. the Digital Peer Publishing Initiative, DPPI);
  - b. the publication in parallel of books in printed form (for a fee) and in an electronic version (free access) in Open Access publishing houses, in particular university presses.

Also, further developments reveal new possibilities for Open Access modes. The European Science Foundation has accepted the ERC Scientific Council Guidelines for Open Access, the UK Research Councils and the Wellcome Trust have mandated that all work they fund be deposited in an open access archive within a short period after publication. Specialist open access publishers like BioMed Central (BMC) and Public Library of Science (PLOS) continue to expand their journals and content. BMC also assists institutions in developing their own research repositories, as does the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC). Academic repositories are developed using open source software. A look at DOAJ hosted by Lund University reveals 4386 free, full-text, quality controlled scientific and scholarly journals. More than 100 of these come from development studies.

However, there is still a need for a similar initiative in development studies and we need a debate on the relationship between institutional repositories and subject-area repositories. How to harvest and re-publish in the development studies context is a very important subject for the EADI working group. EADI members are called to publish in OA journals. EADI institutes should encourage the development of open access repositories, following the Scandinavian model.

The promotion of open access publishing is closely connected to the issue of the evaluation of such publishing. Since publishing record is the predominant criterion for the assessment of researchers and research institutes, the ranking of the OA publishing/journals is critical. Most of the journal ranking applied so far by the scientific community starts with top journals, as those with the ISI and new journal and open access journals would not be included. EADI should play an active role in development studies journal ranking in the same way as it developed the accreditation process for development studies.

*Maja Bucar is Vice-President of EADI and chair of the sub-committee on publications.*

*E-mail: maja.bucar@guest.arnes.si*

*Anja Moller Rasmussen is convener of the EADI Information Management Working Group*

*E-mail: amr@nias.dk*

## Workshop Report

# EADI Accreditation Project: Status and Next Steps

Joost Mönks and Andy Sumner

EADI and its members wish to proactively influence the increasingly important process of accreditation and quality assurance in higher education as far as development studies are concerned. To this end EADI launched an ambitious project in 2005 with the objective of eventually setting up an

EADI accreditation unit or agency for development studies. Such an agency should become an authoritative point of reference within the framework of national accreditation processes.

At the Directors Meeting in Copenhagen, progress made and next steps were discussed.

In the course of 2009 EADI was able to pilot test the normative frameworks it developed in the draft "Guide for the EADI Peer Review of Development Studies Programmes" at Master level. Two important Master's programmes were peer reviewed, namely the Master's Program-

me in Development Studies at the Department of International Environment and Development Studies (Noragric) of the Norwegian University of Life Sciences (UMB) and the Master Complémentaire en Développement, Environnement et Sociétés, an inter-university programme co-ordinated by the l'Institut d'études du développement at the Université Catholique de Louvain in Belgium.

These pilots allowed the the content and process of the EADI peer review approach to be tested and consolidated. The pilot peer reviews generally felt that the Guide provided for an appropriate substantive basis and dealt with the most important issues a peer review and an accreditation of a development studies programme should deal with. The peer review was considered to be a useful and constructive exercise. Issues that need to be addressed in more detail in the Guide in particular relate to criteria on multi- and inter-disciplinarity, admission criteria and the inclusion of an action plan for the identified weaknesses of the programmes.

As to the peer review process itself, again it was by and large considered adequate, though the visits were felt to be too short and should be extended to a minimum of two full days. The idea of integrating follow-up visits was also raised.

In the discussion of the EADI accreditation project, the concept of reciprocity and the opportunity to use the developed normative framework as a capacity-building tool were both discussed. There are good reasons to move ahead with building the professional status of development studies across Europe. Whilst some countries have considerable quality assurance, in others there is very little and/or such mechanisms are not necessarily conducted by those who understand the cross-disciplinary and normative nature of research and teaching in development studies.

Based on the encouraging results to date with the EADI accreditation pilots, the EADI Secretariat wishes to pursue and extend its peer review programme. The next programme that

will be peer reviewed is at the Institute of Social Studies (ISS) in The Hague, the Netherlands, one of the major development studies programmes in Europe. Simultaneously, EADI will initiate the setting up of an EADI Accreditation Committee in order to complete and formalise the EADI accreditation project. This Committee will probably be a separate chapter of EADI. EADI accreditation "trademarks" will eventually be awarded by this Committee and European recognition of the EADI trademarks will be sought.

*Andrew Sumner is Chair of the EADI Sub-committee on Training*

*E-mail: a.sumner@ids.ac.uk*

*Joost Mönks is secretary of the EADI Task group on Accreditation*

*E-mail: joost@moenks.com*

## EADI Prize 2009

We are very delighted to award the 2009 EADI Prize for Excellence in Development Studies to two young researchers who each submitted a paper which raises questions at the heart of the research process.

The prize was created in 2005 to reward and bring recognition "to encourage creative, interdisciplinary, multifaceted research on development issues" from the upcoming generation of development specialists.

From among the entries in this year's competition the jury has identified two winners:

Jean-Louis van Gelder for his outstanding paper on "Urban tenure security in developing countries: On perception, property rights, and slum development" and Claudie Fioroni for her outstanding paper entitled "La cohérence des politiques pour le développement de l'UE comme instrument de promotion d'une "approche positive" des migrations".

In the paper by Jean-Louis van Gelder, the general insistence on narrow definitions of tenure security, and the dominant tendency to equate tenure security with property rights in particular, is identified as a central problem in current policy-making and theorising. Gelder argues that only

under specific conditions can the allocation of property rights hold promise as an effective strategy for slum development and where these conditions are absent, alternatives should be sought. He has thereby contributed to both the academic study of tenure security and provided input for future development policy with respect to informal habitat.

Claudie Fioroni addresses in her paper the role of the EU in pioneering the emerging development-migration nexus. While she underlines the role of the EU in leading policy coherence for development (PCD) efforts, she also critically examines its shortcomings with regard to migration policies. She aims to show that a lack of political will rather than institutional mechanisms is to blame for a very security-oriented European policy on migration.



Both papers are very relevant for the activities of EADI as an association of research institutes. We will be taking stock of both Claudie Fioroni's papers in our endeavours, such as the EDC2020 project and the chance2sustain projects on cities and sustainable development.

We congratulate both winners and wish them all the very best for their future career!

# Rethinking the Millennium Development Goals

On 23 June 2009 an EADI High-Level Policy Forum took place in Brussels in co-operation with DFID, IDS, DSA, ActionAid and the Broker. The forum was entitled "After 2015: Promoting Pro-Poor Policy after the MDGs".

The first session, chaired by **Lawrence Haddad** (President, DSA), addressed the impact of the MDG paradigm on poverty reduction and its implications for an MDG plus agenda. **Salil Shetty**, (Director, United Nations Millennium Campaign) stressed that the MDGs should (i) be delinked from the international aid system, (ii) be local rather than technocratic and statist, and that (iii) monitoring and reporting need to be given higher priority. **Enrico Giovannini** (chief statistician, OECD) emphasised the importance

of the concept of equitable wellbeing, as well as for a better information-knowledge relationship. He was "optimistic about the possibility of building a new narrative".

**Sakiko Fukuda Parr** (New

School, New York) underlined the fact that the MDGs need to be internalised within the policy systems of developing countries and that human rights should play a greater role when redefining the MDGs. She concluded by saying: "we need to recast the MDG agenda and I would say that the most important thing to do is to add a goal on reducing inequality".

The second session, chaired by EADI president **Jean-Luc Maurer**, tackled the topic of key meta-processes that will be shaping development over the next 10-15 years, as well as their implication for an MDG plus agenda. **Charles Gore** (Research and Policy Analysis, UNCTAD) underlined the need for greater consensus, not on the MDGs but on sustainable productive capacity, by addressing the "contradictions in the global development trajectory". He finally called for wellbeing objectives to be built into the MDGs, including taxes on global transactions. **Alfred**

**Nhema** (Director, AERC) called for a more inclusive vision of the MDGs that would be local, regional, as well as international. He also promoted a bottom-up approach for all countries "to get involved in the whole debate". **Richard Morgan** (UNICEF, Director of Policy and Planning) underscored the importance of a new paradigm that would better take into account urban development. He called for the inclusion of physical protection in the MDGs as an essential part of human development and finally advocated local ownership of development goals. Mr Morgan added that this debate "boils down to citizens with rights and integrity: the development agenda in the end has to be part of people's lives understood in a holistic way".



The third plenary session, chaired by **Andrew Steer** (DFID), aimed to define the groundwork for a post-2015 MDG plus agenda. **Louis Kasekende** (African Development Bank) outlined urgent action points, such as the need to focus on fragile states, and the imperative to broaden Goal 7 to include sustainability, while dividing Goal 1 into wealth creation on the one hand and reducing inequality on the other. Mr Kasekende called for a higher level of ODA for basic social services, while mitigating the risks of future external shocks. Beyond 2015 it will be vital to "rethink pro-poor policies in terms of target alignment, prioritisation of the targets, and issues of sequencing". **Claire Melamed** (Head of Policy, ActionAid) underlined the fact that developing countries' governments had a responsibility to deliver the MDGs. She stressed that funding mechanisms need to shift from uncertain "aid" to more predictable redistributive

mechanisms providing funds based on rights. "You cannot tackle poverty in its totality," she said. **Yehualashet Mekonen** (Co-ordinator, African Child Policy Forum) proposed the following action points: (i) targets should not be universal, (ii) indicators should be further qualified in terms of quality, (iii) long-term capacity-building programmes on science and technology are needed. **Andreas Rechkemmer** (Director, International Human Dimensions Programme) called for the international community to design a new meta-narrative for the future that incorporates uncertainty. In his concluding remarks, **Andrew Steer** (Director General of Policy and Research, DFID) highlighted the unanimous call for "a new and different narrative", as well as a more

integrated approach. He added that while the financial crisis provides us with a great opportunity for action, serious research is needed to think beyond

2015. Full report, videos and podcasts of the event are available at <http://www.eadi.org/>

## Main action points

Main action points to come out of this high-level policy forum were: i) Focus on achieving the MDGs; ii) develop country ownership of the new framework; iii) developed countries need to meet their commitments; iv) international income and global social justice should be a right; v) international inequality should be given more emphasis; vi) urbanisation needs to be better accounted for; vii) fragile states and global uncertainty need special treatment; viii) quality of MDGs needs emphasis.

*Report by Aurélien Lafon, EADI Secretariat*

EADI at the European Development Days 2009

## Development Beyond 2015: The Future of European Development Co-operation

The fourth edition of the European Development Days, with over 6,000 visitors and hundreds of participating development organisations, proved a resounding success. Part of the Secretariat team - Natalia Werner, Can Akdeniz, Thomas Lawo and Aurélien Lafon - were present at the Development Village to greet members and colleagues. The European Development Days provided us at EADI with the opportunity to discuss ongoing and upcoming activities face to face with others. Some EADI members presented their work. The German Development Institute/ Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) presented their Users Guide on Fragility Indices. EADI members Simon Maxwell and Dirk Messner moderated a panel on "Getting development right in the EU's new architecture".

We also took part in the wider debate: the EDC 2020 project hosted an event on 22 October called "Development Beyond 2015: The Future of European Development Co-operation" in co-operation with Development Gateway, to gauge challenges and opportunities facing Europe up to and beyond 2015. The aim of this high-level debate was to follow up on a high-level policy forum EADI had organised in co-operation with DFID, IDS, DSA and ActionAid on 23 June 2009 on the MDGs after 2015.

As the economic crisis is leading to significant changes in the context of development co-operation, what does this new context for development co-operation mean for the

European Union and its partner countries beyond the MDGs? How should EDC respond to these challenges? How will the new paradigm uphold standards of transparency and accountability? What avenues lie open to the European aid architecture post-2015? These were the guiding questions of the EADI /Development Gateway panel.

After a short welcome by EADI Executive Secretary [Thomas Lawo](#), and after the panel chair and Nordic African Institute Director [Carin Norberg](#) had introduced the panellists, [Andy Sumner](#), fellow at IDS, highlighted the fact that "as we move in an era of uncertainty, risk, cross-cutting issues around rights, gender and equity, we need to adapt the MDGs over the next few years in order to meet the change in context. I think a big issue is going to be maintaining the global political momentum around the MDGs in a completely different public expenditure aid environment." In this context Andy Sumner saw three opportunities for action on: (i) global governance, (ii) sheltering the poor: safety nets/cash transfers, and (iii) low carbon development. He also advocated reflecting on the strategic use of development niches (versus harmonisation), upstream policy influencing, norm entrepreneurs and pro-poor coalitions.

[Elisabeth Sandor](#), Senior Policy Advisor, Development Co-operation Directorate, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and

Development, said we should prepare the groundwork "beyond 2015" without losing track of current goals by: (i) recognising the positive dimension of the MDGs framework, (ii) maintaining pressure for more progress, (iii) refining measurement, (iv) meeting ODA commitments, and (v) fostering public-private partnerships. Elisabeth Sandor also said that the development co-operation model needed to adapt from aid to development, from poverty reduction to a "one world approach". What was most urgent for the European Development Co-operation efforts to go beyond 2015 was to plan now and co-ordinate reforms.

[Francesca Mosca](#), Director, Quality of Operations, EuropeAid Co-operation Office, started her presentation by asking whether we were going overboard with harmonisation and alignment. Results in aid effectiveness are lagging behind. The real issue was ownership, she said. Ownership was dependent on many factors such as trust. We needed to make sure that we did not have hidden agendas and that there was a true ownership of development processes. Another key issue, not only in aid recipients but also donor countries, was capacity building. Donor countries had to be able to build expertise and adapt to the changing global environment in order to have a meaningful dialogue on policies at the country level. Francesca Mosca concluded her speech by saying that we must focus on results.



Jean Louis Sarbib, CEO of the Development Gateway, reminded us that a series of successive crises had hampered growth in Africa, the continent which most needed growth in order to make progress on MDGs. The growth rate in Africa before the crisis was 6.7%, which allowed us to hope that "Africa's rarest commodity" would come back to the continent. According to the latest forecasts, growth will fall to about 1.7%, causing even more fragility in Africa. What we had to remember was that "it takes a very short time for growth to go down, but it takes a very long time to recover". We might have missed the opportunity of the financial crisis to redefine the MDGs.

With fewer resources available it becomes more and more challenging to meet the MDGs. How do we know we are effective? We need to increase accountability and transparency to be able to translate this "putting the poor in the driver's seat" adage into reality. The problem of the MDGs is that they focused on the end result

without allowing for monitoring. Jean Louis Sarbib stressed that aid must be aligned to the MDGs as well as to the needs of each country. Furthermore, we should integrate new information technologies in improving monitoring and feedback systems to allow the poor to become masters of their development processes.

The audience was then asked to join in the discussion. Contributors came from, among others, the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of Vietnam, who drew attention to the increasing growth rate in his country, which he said was thanks to government policy and aid coming from the EU, and stressed the need for more support. There were also appeals from the audience to include elderly and disabled people in development policy. One of many interesting questions asked included possible learning outcomes from China, once a poor country which is now challenging the rich world. Is it possible to apply the Asian example to the way in which we deal with development co-operation in Africa?

Andy Sumner responded to this saying that the Chinese model was very difficult to replicate in the African context, but that we could support African governments in negotiating with and benefiting from Asian investors. In response to the appeals, Francesca Mosca also referred to the responsibility of aid recipient countries to get the policies right in order to direct development aid to those in need.

Carin Norberg concluded the session by saying that there were now many new challenges, such as the financial crisis, which we needed to address in development policy. It was also important, she said, to look at the governance structure in international institutions, because "there is an emerging group of countries who have not previously been part of the conventional donor community and we have to engage much more closely with these new partners."

Read more at <http://www.edc2020.eu/76.0.html>

Report by Natalia Werner and Aurélien Lafon

## Overcoming Fragility in Africa: Forging a New European Approach

### Launch Event in Germany of the European Report on Development

The launch event of the European Report on Development (ERD) in Germany was organised jointly by EADI, EDC 2020 and the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) and took place on 10 November 2009 in Bonn. The presentation of the Report was opened by Ingrid Hoven, Director-General at the BMZ.

The European Report on Development is the result of a joint initiative supported by the European Commission and several Member States (Finland, Germany, Luxembourg, Spain, Sweden, UK) with the aim to globally promote a European perspective on development issues, on the basis of knowledge excellence, innovation and building of common ground between the European research community and policy-makers. The European Report on Development will be published on a yearly basis.

This year's European Report on Development was written by the ERD team at the European University Institute in Florence. It deals with the

complex and multidimensional issue of "fragility", with a specific focus on the African continent. Today more than ever, with the succession of crises that have acted as magnifiers of fragility and vulnerability, overcoming fragility is an increasingly important priority in European development policies. It is also a key challenge for a European security strategy.

After a short welcome and introduction of the panellists, Ingrid Hoven handed over to Françoise Moreau, Acting Director for EU Development Policy: Horizontal Issues in DG Development. Ms Moreau introduced the initiative of the ERD and its objectives, which consist in bringing together academics, researchers and policy-makers and harmonising European development research and policy. She also explained the choice of fragility as the main topic of the first ERD, saying that fragility was a major obstacle to development and one of the most pressing issues that needed to be tackled in development and security policy and as such

### About the Report

The European Report on Development is the result of a joint initiative supported by the European Commission and several Member States (Finland, Germany, Luxembourg, Spain, Sweden, UK) with the aim to globally promote a European perspective on development issues, on the basis of knowledge excellence, innovation and building of common ground between the European research community and policy-makers. The European Report on Development will be published on a yearly basis.

This year's European Report on Development was written by the ERD team at the European University Institute in Florence. It deals with the complex and multidimensional issue of "fragility", with a specific focus on the African continent. Today more than ever, with the succession of crises that have acted as magnifiers of fragility and vulnerability, overcoming fragility is an increasingly important priority in European development policies. It is also a key challenge for European security strategy. It can be downloaded at <http://erd.eui.eu/>

it had become a very important point on the EU agenda.

**Giorgia Giovanetti**, Scientific Director of the European Report on Development, spoke about the content of the ERD in the context of the financial crisis, which has affected developing countries despite their low level of financial integration. She also explained the definition of fragility and some common characteristics of fragile states which the ERD team used for operational purposes. Ms Giovanetti also highlighted the importance of building state resilience, which is crucial in overcoming fragility, and stressed that we need to respond to crises in fragile states while solving long-term weaknesses.

A member of the ERD Team, **Simone Bertoli**, explained the structural and historical reasons

for state fragility. He focused on colonialism as one of the principal causes of many difficulties which still prevail in fragile states and suggested that this is another argument in favour of calling for a common European commitment to fragility.

The floor was then opened to the discussants. **Ulrich Hiemenz**, Director of the Centre for Development Research in Bonn, criticised the report for being too general. In his view, there are many different reasons for state fragility, environmental and geographical for example, and the ERD should have addressed the issue by distinguishing different types of fragile states. One of the criticisms made by **Jörn Grävingholt**, from the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), was that the ERD does not provide a detailed evaluation of EU policy. In his opinion, we need

this to make better policy recommendations for the future. Both discussants agreed that more research still needs to be done.

After the presentation there was also time for comments and questions from the audience. Some questions raised included the topic of the next report and the co-operation of the ERD research team. Amongst many comments from the audience, some included calls for more coherence in Europe and more recommendations on better governance for Africa.

Ingrid Hoven thanked all the participants and concluded that we still need more research and more investment in research institutions in Africa.

*Report by Natalia Werner, EADI Secretariat*



## New EADI Books

**The New Presence of China in Africa. The importance of increased Chinese trade, aid and investments for Sub-Saharan Africa**

**Meine Pieter van Dijk (editor), 2009**

The book provides an insight on China's activities in Africa. The first part of the book provides an overview of China's activities in Africa and the background to China's economic success, focusing on a number of countries and sectors. Part 2 deals with the three major instruments China uses in Africa: Chinese aid and investments going to Africa and its trade policy towards the continent. Part 3 provides a number of cases studies and Part 4 the conclusions. The conclusion discusses to what extent social corporate responsibility can be expected from Chinese companies and what lessons can be learned from China's experience in Africa.

Published by Amsterdam University Press,  
www.aup.nl  
September 2009

**Transnational Corporations and Development Policy: Critical Perspectives**

**Rugraff Eric, Sanchez-Ancochea Diego, Sumner Andrew (Eds.), 2009**

Few issues in development raise as much heat as the impact of transnational corporations (TNCs) on the South. However, the exact nature of the relationship between foreign direct investment and development remains unclear both conceptually and empirically. The contributors to this edited volume offer a wide-reaching exploration of these links through a series of case studies from Africa, Asia, Latin America and Central Europe. The book also focuses on the role of 'new players' such as Chinese, Indian and South African TNCs.

Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke.  
www.palgrave.com

## New EADI Project: Chance2sustain

# Urban Chances: City Growth and the Sustainability Challenge - Comparing Fast-growing Cities in Growing Economies

With EADI as co-ordinator, a consortium consisting of eight organisations from around the globe has drafted a successful project proposal within the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7). The project carries the title Chance2Sustain. In this programme we want to examine how governments and citizens in cities with differing patterns of urban economic growth make use of participatory (or integrated) spatial knowledge management to direct urban governance towards more sustainable development. Participatory spatial knowledge management is the main concept we are using to study this issue, as it reflects a strategic resource which all stakeholders can contribute to urban governance processes towards sustainable development. It includes both expert knowledge and several forms of non-expert knowledge, such as knowledge from (working) experience (tacit), embedded sectoral knowledge, and social (or community-based) knowledge at the neighbourhood and city-wide level. Participatory processes of urban planning and management are strategic in eliciting these forms of spatially disaggregated (of specific) knowledge which are usually not acknowledged in top-down, expert-driven models of urban governance and planning. Utilising participatory spatial knowledge can make urban governance and planning more effective and gain wider acceptance, by incorporating both expert and local community knowledge. Although participatory spatial knowledge management is increasingly used in urban planning processes, its success depends on external political and economic conditions. A legal framework providing for fiscal decentralisation and funding, for instance, provides strategic support. The influence of various external conditions has not yet been analysed much locally, and certainly not comparatively across different socio-political contexts, although it is a strategic question, given the inherent trade-offs and potential political

conflicts in combining environmental, social and economic goals (within sustainable development). Therefore, the programme focuses on nine cities with contrasting economic and political conditions, with the main scientific objective of developing a model on participatory spatial knowledge management to direct urban governance to sustainable development. The anticipated start date is January 2010.

### The consortium comprises:

#### The Amsterdam Institute for Metropolitan and International Development Studies (AMIDSt) - The Netherlands

AMIDSt is based at the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences at the University of Amsterdam. It is a major international research institute in the fields of human geography, spatial planning and policies, and international development studies.

#### The French National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS) - France

As the largest fundamental research organisation in Europe, CNRS carries out research in all fields of knowledge through its research units, including joint research units in partnership with universities or other research organisations. Sustainable development and urban governance are two major areas investigated by its researchers.

#### The School of Planning and Architecture (SPA) - India

SPA is an Indian specialised university based in New Delhi which exclusively provides training at various levels in different aspects of human habitat and environment. SPA runs programmes and research projects with a particular focus on urban, regional and environmental planning and other related issues.

#### The Cities for Life Forum (FORO) - Peru

FORO brings together seven universities, 19 municipal authorities, three private-sector associations and 28 civil-society organisations from 18 different Peruvian cities. The main objective of FORO is to improve urban environmental management and quality of life in the participating cities.

#### The Centro Brasileiro de Análise e Planejamento (CEBRAP) - Brazil

CEBRAP is a non-profit, multi-disciplinary research institution focused on the study of the humanities, where sociologists, political scientists, philosophers, anthropologists and demographers develop studies on Brazilian society.

#### The Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research (NIBR) - Norway

NIBR is an interdisciplinary social science centre for urban and regional research. Within an urban and regional research framework, NIBR studies and reports on the following sectors: public administration, governance and democracy; regional development, business environments and demography; planning, land use and urban development; and environmental and development issues.

#### The University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN) - South Africa

The University of KwaZulu-Natal and its Centre for Environmental Management are based in Durban, South Africa. The Centre provides a framework for diverse disciplinary skills to undertake research, training and community outreach in the field of environmental management and sustainability and

#### The European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes (as co-ordinator).

# In Search of New Narratives and Universals in a Changing World - EADI-DSA 2011 Conference

## A 'new normal'?

Looking forward, 'development' faces a very different world and the end of a relatively benign period in terms of growth, aid, stability and public spending at least. In this 'new normal' there is a search for a new development narrative, new 'universals' for human development and human wellbeing, and new ways of doing 'development' that are equitable and pro-poor and responsive to a changing and uncertain context. This is not just a question of the global economic crisis and its aftermath. There are big 'game changers' in terms of climate change, demography shifts and technology. At the same time opportunities are already emerging for major rethinking: of global governance; of social policy to protect/insure the poor; of a low-carbon future; and of new economic policy. Further, there is considerable ferment on the understandings of 'development', 'progress', 'poverty' and 'wellbeing', as illustrated by various initiatives, such as the OECD Measuring the Progress of Societies Project and the Sarkozy Commission.

The DSA-EADI 2011 joint conference seeks to be one convening space among many others for these global debates and to fundamentally revisit and rethink the development paradigm(s) in all its dimensions in an era of plurality, uncertainty and change.

## An opportunity for rethinking international development?

Looking ahead, there are some major 'game changers' beyond the immediate crisis. For example,

- in governance and politics - the decline of US and Western global influence; the rise of China and the BRICs, new donors and policy actors, such as foundations;
- in demographics - population growth, differentiated demographic transitions, evolving age structures and changing labour markets;
- in the environment - climate change leading to greater volatility in the weather and

agriculture production; water scarcity; resource conflicts;

- in technology - the spread of existing technologies such as biotechnology and the development of new(er) technologies, such as industrial biofuel, ICTs and nanotechnology;

The economic crisis itself has also led to more significant and fundamental questions being asked. For example,

- in global governance: The G8 to G20 shift means more representation and power for large developing nations, but changes in the IMF and World Bank will be crucial for wider changes in governance;
- in building a green(er) economy: There is an opportunity to shift to lower carbon development, but political pressure may mitigate this;
- in new economic policies: There is likely to be a greater tendency for developing countries to explore new development models; approaches from non-Western sources are more likely to be taken up than Western prescriptions.

In sum, although the Washington consensus has been declared dead (again), it is, as yet, unclear, what the real change is. If it opens up discussion of a wider range of policy instruments for development, then this has potentially huge implications.

## In search of a new development narrative?

Not surprisingly, there have been numerous calls for a new development narrative/paradigm from developing countries, international civil society organisations and development agencies.

The DSA-EADI 2011 joint conference aims to generate ideas on new narratives and new universals for a changing world. The conference is a chance to take a (semi-)sober look at the pros and cons of the various development models. It is also a chance to ask questions about 'progress' and what constitutes a 'good society'. Debates might include redefining growth

or rethinking redistribution. Discussion might focus on how to put the environment at the centre of development in a low carbon future.

The conference might also ask whether development beyond 'developing countries' shouldn't be about 'global development' or 'one-world'? How is this consistent with a focus on the poorest and 'the bottom billion'? Or how can we work with uncertainty as the norm rather than stability in a complex world of global connectivity, common interests and inter-related crises? Should thinking go beyond the material to be more about relationships, behaviour and the non-material? Further, how do we break the development 'bubble' and get the 'development' actors talking to other actors, beyond simple disciplinary or professional silos.

The DSA-EADI 2011 conference seeks to address these kinds of questions and thus maximise the opportunity of working together and the moment in history post-crisis to revisit and rethink 'development', to generate new ideas, new narratives and new thinking whenever possible globally co-constructed with partners in global-South and to look back to past development concepts and experiences that have led to another impasse. The conference seeks to break such an impasse with inter-cultural, inter-generational and inter-disciplinary forces in order to go forward by rethinking what are new universals in terms of ideas, and narratives that will allow humanity to reach some kind of adaptive and sustainable pathway or pathways.

It is at the level of plenary, parallel and working group sessions that we will deal with the different economic, social, political, cultural and ecological aspects covered by this large, all-encompassing theme.

*Andrew Sumner for the DSA/EADI conference committee.*

These ideas will be further discussed during the coming months, and a final call for papers will be published in summer 2010. Comments are very welcome, please send them to [gc2011@eadi.org](mailto:gc2011@eadi.org).

# Focus on New Members

## Bureau d'economie theorique et appliquee (BETA)

Strasbourg, France

BETA is a research laboratory that is part of the Louis Pasteur University (ULP, Strasbourg), Nancy 2 University and the French National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS). It was founded in 1972 and became an associate member of CNRS in 1985. BETA's activities cover basic as well as applied scientific research in the fields of economics and management.

<http://cournol.u-strasbg.fr/users/beta/index.php>

## Centro Interuniversitario di Ricerca Per lo Sviluppo sostenibile (CIRPS)

Sapienza Università di Roma

The CIRPS is an Interuniversity Research Centre and co-ordinates and participates in networks of excellence, research projects and activities for local development at international level, and carries out its work through collaborations and agreements with universities, research centres, enterprises, as well as national and international institutions. The activities of the CIRPS are aimed at conducting research, developing and disseminating scientific knowledge, technological solutions and working methods, including organisation or social life that can allow sustainable development.

<http://www.cirps.it/>

## Cátedra de Cooperación internacional y con Iberoamérica (COIBA)

Santander, Spain

COIBA aims to achieve excellence in evaluation, training and research in international co-operation and development, establishing itself as a reference for Cantabria in these areas and the principal reference in Spain regarding co-operation

specifically with Iberoamerica.

<http://www.ciberoamericana.unican.es>

## Global Development Research Group (GDRG)

Warsaw, Poland

The GDRG is an association founded by a group of economists, geographers, historians, linguists, political scientists, sociologists and specialists in cultural studies who undertake joint research initiatives aimed at developing and popularising knowledge concerning global development.

In their research the members of the GDRG work on a wide spectrum of topics, with particular emphasis on development issues in Africa and Latin America. The diversity of the GDRG research interests does not prevent the group from achieving its main aim: to build global awareness, based on solid knowledge supported by life experiences and research carried out in the developing countries in these two regions.

<http://www.globaldevelopment.org.pl>

## Istituto per gli Studi di Politica Internazionale (ISPI)

Milan, Italy

Founded in 1934, the ISPI is one of the oldest and most prestigious international relations institutes in Italy, with headquarters in Palazzo Clerici, Milan. It is a private-law association, granted the status of a non-profit-making body in 1972, and operates under the supervision of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. Its management is under the control of the Ministry of Economy and Finance, and the State Auditors' Court. The Institute's activities cover four major areas: research (divided into programs and projects on specific geo-political areas or transversal themes), publications, career training and organisation of events.

<http://www.ispionline.it>

## Instituto de Estudos Estratégicos e Internacionais (IEEI)

Lisbon, Portugal

The Institute of Strategic and International Studies (IEEI) was founded in 1980 as an independent, non-profit organisation dedicated to research and fostering debate on international issues in its various dimensions - political, military, economic, social, cultural and information-related. In its more than 25 years of activity, the IEEI has become a major research centre for international relations in Portugal, helping to create a tradition of study and debate in this area. As a policy-oriented institute, the IEEI has since the beginning sought to bring together experts and policy-makers, the military and diplomats, politicians and journalists, students and business people.

<http://www.ieei.pt>

## Instituto interuniversitario de desarrollo local (IIDL)

Universitat de Valencia, Spain

The IIDL is a centre for research and theoretical and practical expertise in the field of local development in its broadest sense. It comprises researchers at the Universitat Jaume I (UJI) and Universitat de Valencia (UVEG), experts in the various subjects covered by the concept of sustainable development and here especially for policies and strategies of local development.

<http://www.iidl.es>