

N O R R A G N E W S

NORTHERN POLICY RESEARCH REVIEW AND ADVISORY
NETWORK ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING (NORRAG)

NUMBER 28

JULY 2001

SPECIAL THEME ON

KNOWLEDGE, RESEARCH & INTERNATIONAL CO-
OPERATION

Editor

Kenneth King

Editorial Address

Kenneth King, Centre of African Studies, 7 Buccleuch Place, University of
Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH8 9LW, Scotland UK
Telephone (44) 0131 650 3878; Fax: (44) 0131 650 6535
EmailS: Kenneth.King@ed.ac.uk or P.King@ed.ac.uk

Co-ordination Address

Michel Carton, Institut Universitaire d'Etudes du Développement (IUED), Post
Box 136, Rue Rothschild 24, 1211 Geneva 21, Switzerland.
Telephone: (41) 22 906 5900/1; Fax: (41) 22 906 5994
Email: Michel.Carton@iued.unige.ch
<http://www.unige.ch/iued/norrag>

N O R R A G N E W S

Northern Policy Research Review and Advisory Network
on Education and Training (NORRAG)

NUMBER 28

JULY 2001

Editor

Kenneth King

Editorial Address

Kenneth King, Centre of African Studies, 7 Buccleuch Place, University of
Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH8 9LW, Scotland UK
Telephone (44) 0131 650 3878; Fax: (44) 0131 650 6535
Emails: Kenneth.King@ed.ac.uk or P.King@ed.ac.uk

Co-ordination Address

Michel Carton, Institut Universitaire d'Etudes du Développement (IUED), Post
Box 136, Rue Rothschild 24, 1211 Geneva 21, Switzerland.
Telephone: (41) 22 906 5900/1; fax: (41) 22 906 5994
Email: Michel.Carton@iued.unige.ch
<http://www.unige.ch/iued/norrag>

NORRAG NEWS is funded by the Swedish International Development
Authority (Sida) and by UK's
Department of International Cooperation (DFID).
NORRAG Coordination is supported by Swiss Development Cooperation

EDITORIAL

Kenneth King

The first item to note in this brief page is that many of us have lost with Patricio Cariola's death a source of inspiration for our work in educational networking. His life long friends, Beatrice Avalos and Ernesto Schiefelbein, capture aspects of what made him so special in their moving paragraphs after this editorial. But we in NORRAG owe him a very special debt for encouraging us at a time in the late 1980s when he had many more pressing matters in hand.

In his own work he saw the importance of maintaining, during a very lengthy period of authoritarian rule in the Southern Cone, the role of critical commentary on education, and of providing through the REDUC network of documentation centres a key source of up-to-date information and analysis for research and policy.

It is entirely fitting in this issue of NN dedicated to understanding 'knowledge management' and 'knowledge sharing' to recognise that, long before these awkward terms were first used, Patricio was the knowledge and information manager *par excellence*. He had a 'knowledge policy' that was not at all centred only on building up the institution of CIDE and its staff, in Santiago, for whom he was responsible, but, as we have said, he was concerned to create, across Latin America and the Caribbean, an institutional resource for education of extraordinary scale. But it took very considerable longterm fund-raising efforts to maintain this far-flung resource. Fortunately, Patricio was also a fund-raising manager of consummate skill, and when there was a project for which he felt passionately on behalf of the poor of Latin America, or for building local capacity, it was virtually impossible to say no.

Patricio was never 'a recipient' though he secured a great deal of funding for Chile and for Latin America. 'Donors' always felt they were in a genuine partnership relationship rather than giving him aid. There was complete symmetry between himself and those he worked with in the North – whether researchers or funders. He genuinely felt that the knowledge production of his staff, and the range of what was achieved through REDUC was not 'Southern knowledge', but was as relevant as any research in OECD countries. Hence his export of REDUC to North America and to Europe, and in part to Africa.

Thus it was that NORRAG's relations with Patricio and with other leaders in REDUC was not some special link with a 'Southern network'. But a relationship with equals, where it was a real two way knowledge transaction. It was for this reason also that I took part of my own sabbatical in 1984 in CIDE – one of the most memorable months of my academic career.

It is an interesting footnote that it was Patricio and CIDE that first brought two of the current NORRAG folk together, at a meeting in Santiago on apprenticeship. KK found that he had been put into the same room as a young Frenchman called Michel Carton back in 1980. A good bit of social networking amongst Europeans by Patricio and the beginning of a long friendship between Michel and me.

Other Items

A good number of the articles in this issue are linked to an international meeting that NORRAG, DSE and the Centre of African Studies organised with the support of Wolfgang Gmelin in Bonn in April 2001. The expanded version of the arguments presented here can be found in the book to be launched at Oxford in September (see below).

As an expression of the 'New NORRAG', it is symbolic that this will be the first issue of *NORRAG NEWS* to go on the web. We shall try and monitor what this means for the dissemination of NN. In another dimension of dissemination, we have now, through the good work of IUED, managed to put all issues of *NORRAG NEWS* on to a single CD-ROM. Right back to its beginnings in Stockholm and in Edinburgh in 1986. We would appreciate your feedback.

NORRAG is playing a key role in two major meetings in September. One of these is its on-going work with a large number of donors in the Working Group on International Co-operation on Skills Development, which is set alongside a major SDC conference, on the linking of Skills, Work and Knowledge in Interlaken (see the Meetings section).

The other major event that NORRAG has participated in every two years is the UK Forum's 'Oxford' International Conference on Education and Development. It is running from the 19th to the 21st of September, and it too is on a theme that is close to the focus of NN28. The theme is *Knowledge, Values and Policy*. As usual there will be an Annual General Meeting of NORRAG, and a chance for members to meet our new President, Ingemar Gustafsson of Swedish Sida, as well as members from Europe and around the world. Speaking as the Chair of this year's Oxford Conference, I would urge many of you to try and attend. We have a superb list of plenary speakers, including the new Director of the IIEP, and the new Director of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics.

You can of course register on the web, but a copy of the registration form is included with this issue of NN.

On Friday 21st September, we shall launch the book on *Knowledge, Research and International Cooperation* which is the outcome of the DSE/NORRAG/CAS international conference, hosted by DSE in Bonn in April this year.

Geneva July 23rd 2001

FATHER PATRICIO CARIOLA, S.J.

He left us in the afternoon of June 20th after a long struggle with liver cancer and with enough time to say goodbye to almost every one of the friends in Chile and beyond whom he made throughout a lifetime of dedication to the tasks of education.

Patricio as many of us called him was a lover of people and a tremendous pusher for change that could have a meaning in people's lives. I met him as he was returning from doing a Master's at Harvard University and engaged in the struggle to modernise Catholic schools in Chile while at the same time lending a hand in the educational reform that begun its course in 1965. He soon saw that if there was to be educational change in Chile there would be need for institutional work geared to that purpose. And that is how his main creation the Centre for Research and Development of Education (CIDE) came into being. From this Centre he saw the need for networking and linking people and institutions engaged in education, and thus he was at the heart of the Latin American Research Meetings that took place in the late sixties and early seventies. When the Research Review and Advisory Group came into being in the late seventies, Patricio was in a position to link this worldwide network to the local research and documentation activity he had set up in the early 1970s - the Latin American network (REDUC). Because of this rare quality of being the friend of the humblest person in a Santiago or Antofagasta area and at the same time a man of the wider world, Patricio was the only Chilean who was officially invited to be part of the Jomtien Conference on Education for All. Chile recognised him with the National Prize in Education in 1999.

While his contributions to educational change were enormous, Patricio was also a man of courage and tremendous loyalty to the many friends he had. He stood up for those persecuted in Chile during the military dictatorship to the point of going to prison for helping someone in need. At CIDE he harbored some of the best minds in the educational field during the dictatorship period who were able to develop and produce, and later contribute to educational change in democracy. He was there when any of those he knew and cared for needed him. This was my experience and that of so many others in Chile and other parts of the world. We will miss you terribly, Patricio, and we thank God for the gift of knowing you and learning from you.

Beatrice Avalos, Santiago
Email: bavalos@chilesat.net

0-0-0-0

Ernesto Schiefelbein
mcgrossi@rdc.cl

Patricio Cariola was telling us not too long ago, with a complicit smile, that his main contribution was to transform ideas and hopes into "business and products" with the critical support of many people. But he did not realize that his life and work were going to be praised by representatives of all political parties in Chile, thus helping to pave the way for a more congenial national life. He was exceedingly grateful for the many people that helped him to launch and develop the large number of projects promoted during his life. In the final months of his stay in the hospital he tried to say thanks to each one of

his loyal friends, but his weakened condition did finally make this difficult. He offered many people, in Chile and abroad, the chance to engage in one of his programmes (carefully selected for each person among his myriad of activities) for improving opportunities especially for marginal people to share and live a better life.

But one especially remarkable and unexpected outcome was the meeting of the Chilean Senate held in July 10. All political parties (in a country that has been split in sour factions for three decades) voted to mourn his departure. Few people in Chile would have believed that such a meeting could be held, even Patricio himself (in spite of his contagious optimism). Such an optimism helped him to win many up-hill battles, including his 20 years combat with cancer. Looking backward, we must admit that it is almost a miracle that he made CIDE operate in Chile for 40 years, that REDUC was developed to share efforts in more than 20 countries, or that he extracted a consensus from Latin American participants in their regional meeting, to carry with him to help shape the final declaration in the Jomtien World Conference.

But still, I want to highlight this important battle won after his death. Senators of the main four political parties paid homage to his contribution to better understanding of human beings. It was the first time in the last twenty years that such a consensus was reached in Chile. It is a promising sign that a new period of understanding and respect for our neighbours and countrymen is once again developing in Chile.

Santiago, 22nd July 2001.

KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT IN THE AGENCIES

DILEMMAS OF KNOWLEDGE, VALUES AND
POLICY DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION

KNOWLEDGE, POWER AND POLITICS:
THE WORLD BANK AND EDUCATION

MANAGING WHOSE KNOWLEDGE FOR DEVELOPMENT?

KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT IN THE CORPORATE SECTOR:
IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATION

THE RISE OF THE KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT FASHION:
A CONSEQUENCE OF THE DECLINE OF
THE DEVELOPMENT IDEOLOGY?

REVERSING THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT:
ACTION FIRST AND TALKING LAST

THE SOCIAL THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE AND KNOWLEDGE FOR
DEVELOPMENT: IS MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING POSSIBLE?

DILEMMAS OF KNOWLEDGE, VALUES & POLICY
IN DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION

Kenneth King, African Studies, Edinburgh
Email: Kenneth.King@ed.ac.uk

A new discourse and architecture of knowledge are visible in much of this issue of NORRAG NEWS. We have deliberately attempted to look at this discourse in several different contexts – in aid organisations (of all kinds), in universities (North and South), and in networks. But the principal focus of this section of NN28 is the development agency. The implication is that the knowledge revolution is somehow changing the nature of these organisations. In front of our eyes. After all, they have knowledge management (KM) projects, chief knowledge officers, and aspirations towards new forms of knowledge sharing (KS). But has the knowledge discourse really introduced a new way of working? Does knowledge now drive agency policy, or NGO policy?

These questions take us back to some of the most time-honoured questions in the relationship between knowledge and policy. With some of these issues, networks like NORRAG and REDUC have been involved. The original Research Review and Advisory Group (RRAG) was founded on the premise that the synthesis of existing research findings in the South – for policy – was eminently feasible. The mechanism for doing this was termed a State of the Art Review of existing research. REDUC, the Latin American network for the documentation of education whose founder and lifelong supporter, Patricio Cariola we remember in this issue, was also dedicated in the early 1970s to creating the institutional memory on education for the improvement of policy. And just two years ago the Global Development Network claimed at its launch that 'The network's goal is to generate and share knowledge related to development, by sponsoring activities that increase the capacity and effectiveness of policy and research institutes world-wide'.

Overall, I suspect it has been somewhat more common for research to aspire to influence policy, and to be 'policy-oriented' than for policy to claim to be research-based. But it is probably also true to say that research has been obliged by the conditions of much of its funding to claim a policy orientation, especially in recent years.

Equally in the sphere of policy, there has been a very recent interest in the idea of 'evidence-based policy'. But generally during the 40 or so years in which there has been formal development aid, it would be hard to claim that aid priorities have been evidence- or knowledge-based. The main shifts in aid – e.g. towards high level manpower creation, towards basic needs, or towards more aid for the poorest, or towards a greater market orientation – have been principally driven by the politics of the different bilateral donor governments or by the UN's changing priorities, or those of the World Bank, the IMF and the regional banks, and not at all by research knowledge (see also Klees in this section).

This is not to say that there have not been a small number of occasions, notably in the World Bank, where education policy would appear to have been influenced by particular pieces of research (e.g. that 4 years of education 'makes a difference' to agricultural

productivity, or on rates of return to different levels of education investment). But several of these have been notoriously contentious, and it may well have been the case that even these best known examples of apparently knowledge-based policy were in reality situations where research legitimated a policy direction that had already been taken on other than research criteria.

It is probably true to say that the bulk of the really large shifts, both in education sector policy, and in aid policy more generally have been driven by the larger politics of the OECD-DAC countries themselves, or North-South or East-West relations. Thus in the education sector, the agency retreat from support to higher education in the developing world in the late 1970s was not evidence-based; nor was the rise and – later - fall of non-formal education in the early and late 1980s; nor was there good evidence that there should be a retreat from agency support to public sector vocational education and training in the early 1990s.

More generally, the enthusiasm by the West for good governance and multi-party democracy in the South appeared very suddenly after the elimination of the global influence of Russia and the Eastern bloc with the fall of the Berlin Wall. A few years later, and after a cluster of world conferences, there appeared the International Development Targets, sanctioned by the OECD-DAC. But it would be impossible to demonstrate that these targets are in any real sense knowledge-based. [The two education targets – on basic education and on girls' education – are even in contradiction with each other]

The reason for this excursion on knowledge and policy is to raise just a small question mark around the very recent agency pre-occupation with their becoming 'knowledge agencies'. It may well be true of GTZ that it is a 'knowledge-based company' and that it 'intends to use its development knowledge accumulated over 26 years' [See Bergmann in this issue]. But for many bilaterals and multi-laterals, they would need to take a very deep breath to claim that they had been knowledge-based organisations over these almost 40 years.

Whether driven by particular social or moral commitments in the case of NGOs or by a view of their comparative advantage linked to particular sub-sectors for different bilaterals, the history of the last 4 decades of aid would be extremely hard to summarise as evidence-based, even for a single agency, and even for a single sector within any agency, such as Education or Social Development. Who could possibly argue, for example, that the particular choice of partner countries for a bilateral agency is research- or knowledge-based?

Of course, it could be argued, at another level, that the whole enterprise of aid has been knowledge-based from the very beginning. In so far as aid was concerned with the transfer of knowledge and expertise from North to South through technical co-operation, training abroad, and institutional development, aid has been involved with what Tilak, in this issue, calls a one-way knowledge transaction.

But that fundamental and long-standing aid belief in the transfer of knowledge and in the development of knowledge in the South seems much less than what the new discourse about knowledge is about. That initial conviction led directly to the priority for university development and the creation of high level manpower in the 1960s. But the mechanisms for organising the transfer of such expertise North-South (like the Inter-University Council in the UK) were extremely light weight – just a handful of administrators. The same is true for many of the other aid agencies in the 1960s and early 1970s; they were not themselves knowledge-rich or policy rich. Rather they were in the business of facilitating the twinning or partnership between existing expertise in the North and in the developing world. The only exceptions in these early decades were the great foundations, Rockefeller and Ford. They could certainly claim to have been knowledge-based organisations. But, as Aklilu reminds us in this section, even the World Bank had very scarce knowledge resources – at least in the education sector - until the late 1970s. Consequently, the very first ‘policy’ documents and ‘policy’ papers of most aid agencies had little pretension to be knowledge- or evidence-based. By contrast, the aid policy papers of the 1990s and early 2000s are on one level much more knowledge-based and they draw on a rather extensive comparative experience (see Jamil Salmi in this issue).

But the current agency preoccupation with knowledge management and knowledge sharing, and with becoming ‘knowledge agencies’ seems much more ambitious than ensuring that policy is more evidence-based. It is, first of all, about the agency itself becoming more of a ‘learning organisation’. This seems harmless enough though it does mark a shift towards staff development for the agency itself, and may point to the influence of private sector corporations on these organisations (see also Whiffen in this issue).

Second, it seems to imply a synthesis of the potentially enormous knowledge base of the agency accumulated over the past 20 or 30 years. This may seem a sensible objective, and especially when the new information technology may appear to make this more easily do-able. But in reality, the search to synthesise lessons learned over several decades or ‘best practice’ in hundreds – even thousands - of projects may prove elusive. It is especially problematic when it is recalled that the decisions on so many of these projects and programmes were not themselves driven by evidence, but by the rapidly changing politics and policies of the time. The notion that there is a vast data base in all donor agencies – including NGOs - just waiting to be tapped for a series of clear lessons is almost certainly a delusion. The study by the Nordic Africa Institute of learning in development co-operation is not at all optimistic about the quality of what might be synthesised – even including the formal evaluations of aid projects (see Wohlgemuth in this issue). For one thing, much of the analysis sitting in donor files is highly donor-centric, and has paid insufficient attention to what is being learnt by the recipient.

A third challenge is that the synthesising of the most accessible knowledge (the reports, appraisals, reviews etc) would leave untapped the famous ‘tacit’ knowledge that all knowledge management approaches acknowledge to be crucially important (see McGinn), and would almost certainly pay insufficient attention to the specificity of the local context in which the project or programme was implemented.

This is not to say that it would not be invaluable for agencies to be more reflective about what they have been doing in different sectors and sub-sectors. But I suspect that an honest account of changing policies over time in almost any sphere of aid would point up more the messiness of the policy process than the chance to garner a rich harvest of lessons for future application.

Recognition of people-to-people learning as crucial

What is intriguing about the whole edifice of knowledge management in development agencies that has been constructed in the last few years is that almost every institution has come up with some recognition that the absolutely core value in knowledge management is a mechanism for sharing insights amongst like-minded groups. Whether termed 'communities of practice', 'thematic networks', 'professional associations' or 'thematic groups', all knowledge management (KM) seems to have ended up with some system for knowledge sharing (KS). Bellanet, the agency that has spent the most time thinking about knowledge management and knowledge sharing in development organisations, has concluded some of its review of good practice by the rather humbling reminder that 'The best knowledge transfer mechanism is face-to-face contact' (See Song in this issue).

What is so important about this almost trite conclusion is that, if we don't underline this, there is a real danger, given the hype about digital potential, of thinking that ICTs will take care of everything. So it is worth stating again that in all the schemes for knowledge management, networking amongst people remains absolutely crucial. In GTZ there are some 32 such professional groupings; in the World Bank over a hundred, and so on.

But what is insufficiently discussed with the emergence of these communities of practice are fundamental questions about who is a member. There is a natural tendency for agency staff to think of themselves as the first members, and for this then to be extended to a select number of external members. What the extraordinary capacity of ICT really does make possible are a series of fundamentally different approaches to the ownership of the aid process.

The greatest temptation in the brave new world of knowledge management and knowledge sharing is to focus on the core group in agency headquarters and the main field offices. By contrast, in some countries, e.g. in Sida and also in JICA, there is some exciting thinking about how to make a really large part of the domestic constituency feel part of and take ownership of the aid process (See Matsunaga in this issue).

Most important of all, there is the challenge of making key elements amongst the so-called recipients in the developing world, a regular part of these new knowledge sharing professional communities. It is surely a paradox at a time when communication has been easier and potentially more inclusive than ever before that the greatest continuing challenge to the aid community is the lack of 'ownership' of aid processes by the South.

The architect of the World Bank's KM/KS system, Steve Denning's best known 'story' is of the Government of Pakistan asking the World Bank field office for a piece of crucial advice on highways. Through the highways thematic group, an answer is returned to the

Government via the Bank within 48 hours, and it draws on expertise in the Jordan and Argentina WB offices, as well as from the highway authorities of South Africa and New Zealand. It is an interesting illustration of connectivity and commitment both inside and outside the Bank once a network is operational. But it also raises a couple of interesting questions, by implication. The key persons in the Government of Pakistan could themselves have been part of this community of practice. The building of the expert group is itself a valuable step, but clearly, once built, it could be run from outside the World Bank.

It is a model that is suggestive for other expert groups (agency-non-agency, North-South), even if highways expertise is very different from student loans, or modalities of skills development.

The routine incorporation of Southern policy makers and professionals as members is a continuing challenge for all groups, including NORRAG, that aspire to North-South knowledge sharing.

O-O-O-O

**KNOWLEDGE, POWER, AND POLITICS:
THE WORLD BANK AND EDUCATION**

Steven J. Klees,
University of Maryland
Email: sklees@wam.umd.edu

We live in a society obsessed with "knowledge" -- there is endless talk of the knowledge society, the knowledge revolution, knowledge management, etc. Since James Wolfensohn became president of the World Bank ("The Bank" as they call themselves) he has tried to transform it into the global "Knowledge Bank." Admitting that the small amount The Bank lends cannot make a difference in education, poverty, or development, the new sales pitch is that "cutting-edge knowledge" and the dissemination of "best practice" can. But what knowledge is disseminated, what is it based on, whose interests does it serve, and what difference will it make?

Debates about Education Knowledge

In the 1960s and 1970s, The Bank routinely and strongly recommended investing in the expansion and improvement of education, health, and other social services in developing countries. All levels and types of education needed additional resources, from primary to higher to nonformal. Financing could be achieved through progressive income taxes and greater external aid. Then, almost overnight, in the early 1980s, it was decided that countries could not increase taxes to finance social services, that most public monies should go into primary education, and that, at all educational levels, the key problem was not lack of resources but bad management. Improvements could be made at low or no cost by eliminating waste, privatizing, and finding more cost-effective ways of providing education (e.g., distance education).

This turnabout, in the space of a few years, was clearly not a result of new social science knowledge but the result of the election of Reagan and Thatcher. The changes in Bank policy followed the Reagan/Thatcher ideological agenda for education and were put in place because the U.S. has almost complete control of The Bank. The change in leadership at the Bank put their "knowledge" machine in motion to support their new agenda: e.g., to show that taxes should not be raised; that privatization yields better outcomes; that investing in any form of in-service or pre-service teacher education has little payoff; and that low-cost efforts, like supplying more textbooks or requiring more examinations, have the biggest payoffs.(1)

In the U.S. and other wealthy countries, findings like these about the effectiveness of schools and school resources are hotly contested. What is the impact of alternative approaches to bi-lingual education? to testing? to teaching reading? to changes in class size? to governing higher education? While the pretense of "objective" knowledge is maintained everywhere, in wealthy countries the existence of alternative political perspectives that have sufficient power to support alternative research leads to no agreement on these supposedly scientific questions.

Debates about Development Knowledge

Education knowledge, of course, is no more problematic than other knowledge. Where did the knowledge supporting neoliberalism and its structural adjustment programs (SAPs) come from? that small governments are best? that privatisation, unfettered free markets, and export promotion are the best way to growth and poverty reduction? This was not the knowledge that dominated the 1970s. On what basis did this change, again almost overnight, in the early 1980s? Whose knowledge is it that the success of the so-called Asian tigers was due to investment in education and free markets? Why was other research-based knowledge ignored that says the (limited and unstable) successes of these countries was due to a government-led, not market led economy, to repressive regimes giving a stable climate for foreign capital, and to the accident of being geographically situated next to the fastest growing market in the world, China?

Based on what knowledge was it decided that the neoliberal "development" policies of The Bank and The Fund (as the IMF calls itself) must now begin with a jointly prepared "Poverty Reduction Strategy?" Why do the results of this supposed change in policy still look exactly like SAPs, except for the rhetoric in which they are wrapped (Klees, 2001)? Based on what knowledge has the Bush administration now decided that the knowledge underlying the directions of The Bank and The Fund have gone too far to the left?! U.S. Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill has been going after The Bank because, in his view, it is too focused on poverty. The focus should be on growth and that will take care of poverty.(2) The U.S., which in practice also controls The Fund, just appointed Anne Krueger, a Stanford economist, to its No. 2 position. Krueger has said she believes the IMF has been paying too much attention to poverty alleviation and that there is no point in giving debt relief to poor countries because they will mispend it (Blustein, 2001). How can one claim that this political imposition of new "knowledge" is objective?

Debates about the Nature of Knowledge

The issues raised above are clearly not specific to education and development knowledge. In the social arena, the "knowledge paradigm" has been a consistent failure. That is, the idea that knowledge will help us get out, at least in part, of the inherently political nature of making collective choices has actually served to further obscure the politics by which these choices get made. The failure of this knowledge paradigm can be seen clearly in looking at the changes in three fields that underlie it -- policy science, program evaluation, and research methodology.(3) In the 1950s and 1960s, all three fields were put forth as based on the "rigor" of the natural and physical sciences. All were focused on the scientific gathering of objective, quantifiable data that would yield the knowledge essential to policymaking.

The narrowness of the information gathered, the inapplicability of the methods recommended, and the failure of these enterprises to yield any agreed-upon knowledge soon broke the paradigm, certainly in theory and, at least partially, in practice. A good introduction to research methods course once focused exclusively on quantitative experimental and survey research but now examines a whole variety of qualitative methodologies as well as critical alternatives like action, participative, or feminist research methods. Policy science has dropped the "science" label and explicitly recognises the limits of so-called rational models and expertise, often with explicit attention to the need for more democratic, participative approaches to policy analysis and choice. Program evaluation has gone from a field oriented only to testing and measurement to one in which there is considerable attention given to the socially constructed nature of evaluation studies, the need for the evaluator to be a negotiator between different stakeholders, and the need to give voice to those with little power. These fields are not simply saying that decision-making is political. We all believe that. They are all saying that knowledge is political.(4)

Conclusions

There is no "Knowledge Bank, " only an "Opinion Bank," and, worse still, an opinion bank with monopoly power. This Monopoly Opinion Bank (I cannot help myself -- henceforth, The MOB) may not be the only source of knowledge in education in developing countries, but they are the predominant producer and arbiter of what counts as knowledge. If there were applicable anti-trust legislation, their research enterprise would be broken up. The MOB's defence is that their knowledge "management" (George Orwell lives) systems are trying to incorporate all knowledge from all their partners. The MOB explicitly heralds the whole world as its partners -- countries, other aid agencies, NGOs, other civil society organisations, indigenous people, the poor of the world, etc. They claim to be listening to and working with all these partners and distilling best practice from all their experiences (Samoff and Stromquist 2001). This is neither possible nor sensible nor true. Knowledge is contested within and among all these groups, and The MOB distils the knowledge it wants to promulgate.(5)

The idea of a central repository of "best practice" is frightening. Simply the proposition is amazing. This could never be done in the North. Imagine if an institution in the U.S. said it was or wanted to be the central clearinghouse for distilling all ideas about

educational or economic best practice. It would be laughed at. While a belief in the knowledge paradigm is as dominant in the U.S. as it is elsewhere, given the recognition that conflicting views are all supported by research, no one would trust any institution to be a central knowledge manager or broker.

While the metaphor is problematic, we are engaged in knowledge wars. Most critics of dominant ideology and practice feel that they must generate alternative knowledge to have a voice, sometimes even to survive. NGOs are, in effect, forced to do studies to justify their programs or to show the harmful effects of other programs or policies, e.g., user fees. The funding they get to do such studies is often provided by The Bank or institutions with similar ideologies, as part of these institutions' efforts to show that they even partner with their critics. But the resources NGOs get to do these studies are minuscule. The studies must be done under the canons of traditional research, which, aside from being substantively problematic as above, are impossible to carry out with so few resources. Moreover, no matter how "good" the study, if The Bank or other agencies do not like the results, they can easily refute them with their own much more expensive research. Academics with a critical view and alternative research institutions are in much the same position. Against the juggernaut of the politically dominant research establishment, we face a Sisyphean task.

What to do is the subject of another paper. Obviously there are no easy answers. A task of Sisyphus or not, contesting dominant knowledge needs to be done. But we need to do so more collectively and on a much larger scale. Each of us should not be doing research and evaluation in isolation but through networks focusing on key questions. We need to work more with groups and movements that are engaged in critical practice. We need to de-legitimise dominant "science" more loudly and show its ideological bases in public forums. We need institutional action as well. There is no reason for The Bank to do research at all.(6) The Bank can easily lend money without it and base their lending not on some instrumentalist notion of furthering economic efficiency or some promise of future equity but on direct criteria of social justice -- whether grants and loans further human rights, directly benefit the poor, the excluded, and those discriminated against, and stimulate and are governed by meaningful participation. Finally, the struggle at hand is clearly with a much larger mob than The MOB. The knowledge paradigm is breaking, albeit slowly, and we need to help that along where we can.

References

Blustein, P. (2001) Major changes signalled at IMF. *Washington Post*, June 8, p. E10.

Klees, S. (2001) World Bank development policy: A SAP in SWAPs clothing. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (www.tc.columbia.edu/cice).

Samoff, J. and Stromquist, N. (2001) Managing knowledge and storing wisdom? New forms of foreign aid? *Development and Change*, Vol. 32, No. 4, September (forthcoming).

MANAGING WHOSE KNOWLEDGE FOR DEVELOPMENT?

Wolfgang Gmelin, DSE, Bonn
Email: w_gmelin@dse.de

There are striking parallels between the knowledge and the globalisation discourses. The question "which and whose knowledge?" may be put also to globalisation. Undoubtedly the frame conditions of the two discourses have a lot in common. The imperial message "Scan globally – Re-invent locally" is based on the same belief in the superiority of free market forces. Local knowledge based on local actions is used selectively taken from its social contexts to enhance the effectiveness of the global scheme. Local researchers who will be together with the global researchers at the core of the World Bank-initiated Global Development Network are considered valuable because they can combine knowledge of local conditions with the learning derived from global experience. The knowledge management schemes of the development agencies even though they may have missions that differ from the pure market philosophy are ultimately in line with the paradigm: how can operations be run more effectively? And these operations are supported - almost determined - by instruments which are part and parcel of the global market structures as if there were no particular local sites or nations or cultures. The regulations under which GATT, WTO or NAFTA are operating are those which consider the world at large as a freely accessible economic arena protected by manifold rights. 'Development' is relegated to an epiphenomenon of this global process.

Development, however, is a complex dialectical process rooted in the cultures of societies. Meaningful and useful knowledge is produced and reproduced in such social contexts not by re-inventing locally what can be gathered from scanning a central global knowledge bank or by replicating best practices. Local problem perceptions and solutions have to be part of local settings and processes.

Universities and development organisations are indispensable producers of useful knowledge by mediating between local needs and experiences and the general knowledge available. Co-operative networks of such problem-oriented knowledge producers will be capable of challenging the mainstream development and scientific thinking by opening up spaces for pluralistic dialogues across national and cultural boundaries. Development agencies which want to live up to their missions to contributing to a more just and equitable world are called upon to support such spaces.

0-0-0-0

**KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT IN THE CORPORATE SECTOR:
IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATION**

Noel F. McGinn, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Email: nmcginn@igc.org

In the corporate sector as elsewhere, the message today is that our most important resource is not land, labour or capital but knowledge. Self-evident as the

importance of knowledge may seem to be, how best to learn and utilise it is a controversial issue in the corporate world. This paper reviews recent studies and opinion about knowledge management practices in public and private corporations, and then looks briefly at their implications for educational reform.

Although corporations have invested heavily in knowledge, results have often been disappointing and sometimes negative. Despite extensive research, the corporate world still has not solved the problem of knowledge utilisation. A major source of uncertainty in research on knowledge management flows from the complexity of knowledge. Some authors distinguish between explicit knowledge that is codifiable and transferable, and tacit or implied knowledge. The former generally is identified through communication and is called "objective" and "declarative". The possession of tacit knowledge generally is recognised in performance and is called "subjective" and "procedural". Knowledge about individual persons or things is called "component" knowledge, and distinguished from "architectural" knowledge which focuses on linkages among persons and things. Component knowledge can be transferred in discrete units outside of context, while architectural knowledge cannot.

Collective tacit knowledge is touted as the most secure and strategically significant kind of organisational knowledge. The assessment of knowledge use and impact is difficult because process or operational knowledge (most often tacit) is used (and therefore detectable) in multiple sites over time. The designers of knowledge management systems face a daunting task. Tacit knowledge is difficult to transmit and the dialogic processes most helpful in stimulating and sharing tacit knowledge resist systematisation. Tacit knowledge is critical in the success of knowledge management, but is not transferable across organisations. On the other hand, explicit knowledge is of little use to decision makers operating in different contexts.

Explicit and tacit knowledge correspond to the two kinds of learning: acquisitive or imitative, and experiential. In the former the learner attempts to model or copy the symbols and behaviours associated with someone else's knowledge: "best practices" discovered elsewhere are used as an instruction book. Experiential learning, on the other hand, occurs inside the firm or in its interactions with other organisations. Knowledge is transferred (and therefore is explicit) in acquisitive learning; in experiential learning it is produced by the learner and primarily tacit. Knowledge gained through experience is superior, not only for its fit to context, but also because it facilitates further innovation. Shared knowledge is essential for a firm to be able to develop new ways of defining and solving problems, thereby creating new technological knowledge. An effective knowledge management system must therefore be concerned with horizontal as well as vertical processes of knowledge transfer.

Internal Knowledge Management

Firms that do their own research are more innovative than those that use a centrally-located research and development unit. Firms best able to integrate their own knowledge have 1) high levels of internal communication; 2) high levels of common knowledge; and 3) management capability to access and use the special knowledge employees have.

Knowledge Management Amongst Firms

The linking of firms within an industrial sector is referred to as clustering, networking, strategic alliances or joint ventures. Networks allow small and/or isolated firms to increase their technological knowledge not only through their own limited research and development expenditures, but also by absorbing knowledge produced elsewhere.

Learning From External Sources

Networking can include external partners in the process of sharing knowledge, such as universities, research centres or firms in other sectors. The bilateral relationships of the joint venture become trilateral relationships that foster meta-learning. Meta-learning is enhanced by a firm's or network's construction of "webs of meaning" that make sense out of the learning that is occurring. This sense-making links new knowledge with structures and operations consistent with the firm's or network's identity or mission, itself subject to changes through learning. Innovative organisations, that is, those that produce knowledge, see themselves as creating value, and seek to bring tacit and explicit knowledge together despite the tensions that involves.

Knowledge about the best practices and curriculum reforms of other systems can help solve short-term problems and improve learning outcomes. After a one-shot input, however, staff turnover and memory decay result in performance declines. Furthermore, routines built on transfers of explicit knowledge from outside reduce the use of internally-generated knowledge that is contextually appropriate.

Implications of this for other sectors – such as education

The lesson from the corporate sector is that schools require both explicit and tacit knowledge, acquired and learned by doing, but that the integration of that knowledge should occur within the school, and not externally. In practice that means that:

- knowledge "needs" should be determined locally and not externally;
- local knowledge management capacity takes priority over external capacity;
- training in sense-making within communities of practice must accompany training in knowledge assimilation.

Escuela Nueva was an example of such a knowledge management approach in a developing country. Rural Colombian teachers were trained to share with others their tacit knowledge about effective teaching practices. The result, over time, was a significant improvement in competencies and student performance. The experiment ceased to be a learning system, however, when the teachers' knowledge was formalised and codified into an official curriculum.

The lesson to be inferred from advances in the corporate world is that improvement of a national education system requires increasing knowledge capacity in local schools while also pursuing their integration with others. Improvement of education knowledge management capacity in an international agency may improve an agency's competitiveness, but have no benefit for schools and ministries of education. The more an agency develops its own internal coherence and consensus, the more tacit will be its knowledge, and the less able it will be to help others with their own problems. If,

however, an agency defines itself as part of a larger system, then it can work with others in construction of shared knowledge that benefits all. Agencies contribute most to improvement in ministries and schools not by telling them about someone else's best practices, but by enabling them to have and identify effective practices of their own.

O-O-O-O

THE RISE OF THE KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT FASHION: A CONSEQUENCE OF THE DECLINE OF THE DEVELOPMENT IDEOLOGY?

Michel Carton, Graduate Institute of Development Studies, Geneva
Email: Michel.Carton@iued.unige.ch

Knowledge management is very fashionable (for how long?) in the development co-operation agencies. After not even a decade of discourse on learning organisations, knowledge has to be managed so that the Knowledge Economy/Society develops itself as the main engine of the Global World/Village in which we live. Such a vision would be very stimulating, had two dimensions of this new step in the 'progress' of humanity been explored beforehand. Firstly, the so-called Knowledge Economy is totally dependent on the further exploitation of the world's natural resources: computers and satellites' production is using more and more raw mineral materials from Central Africa and Latin America; secondly the very nature of the Knowledge concept being used by the promoters of the Knowledge Society is far from being explicit. We shall not develop the first argument: industrial ecology is providing enough data about the new dimensions of social exploitation, which is embedded in the over-exploitation of nature.

The discussion about Knowledge is more difficult because it is more ambiguous than the recent refusal by G.W. Bush to accept the Kyoto Agreement. Knowledge is an immaterial capital, which can appear as having a single definition. According to P. Drucker (1989) "Knowledge as normally conceived by the "intellectual" is something very different from knowledge in the context of knowledge economy or knowledge work... Knowledge, like electricity or money, is a form of energy that exists only when doing work. The emergence of the knowledge economy is not, in other words, part of "intellectual" history as it is normally conceived. It is part of the history of technology which recounts how man puts tools to work". This vision is quite different from the one of E. Morin (1999) who refers to the necessity of conceiving Knowledge as a component of a world marked by Complexity, i.e. which is different from the one we are still using to analyse reality by referring to four principles: order, specialisation, reduction and linear causality. The type of Knowledge Morin is talking about is then closer to the French term, '*Connaissance*' than to '*Savoir*'.

Our hypothesis is that, when we talk of Development Knowledge, as in the 1999 World Bank Development Report- the title of which in French is *Savoir au service du développement*- we refer to Drucker's definition of Knowledge and to the type of Knowledge Morin is criticising when he proposes *Connaissance Complexe* as an alternative. In the WB vision, Knowledge is a new technology which has to be managed in the framework of a non complex world entirely run by the Market Order. As G. Rist (1997) puts it: "Growth" or "development" are not themselves questioned but there

seemed to be other ways of achieving them - especially through a return to the self regulating market'. Globalisation as a new faith has blankly replaced the ambiguous ideology/belief of development conceived as "a moral duty to help the poor and work for everyone's happiness" in the framework of modernisation.

Development agencies are consequently faced with some contradictory objectives and tend to resemble what Wohlgemuth has termed the "old-fashioned department stores", since they have to deal with poverty, growth, AIDS, environment etc etc. Are they really in a position to learn and to manage Knowledge if they cannot - as state administrations - take a clear stand about the type of society and consequently *Connaissance* and *Savoir* they want to give priority to?

As long as Knowledge is going to be more and more seen as a marketised commodity, the more dynamic approach of Knowledge Sharing (instead of Management) will meet its limits. Calling upon all kinds of Knowledge by using multiple networks is more interesting than the technocratic/anti-democratic banking vision of KM. One can nevertheless wonder whether the non-rivalrous and non-excluding intrinsic characteristics of Knowledge as underlined by the "new" Global Public Goods approach are compatible with Knowledge Sharing.

One may finally wonder whether the Global Public Goods perspective itself is compatible with today's dominant socio-economic perspective: a "free" access and distribution of Knowledge is in contradiction with the necessity to keep in the private domain of firms the knowledge which allows them to gain some new markets by continually launching some "new" products. Some people think that such a way of doing is in fact preventing creativity and innovation. An assessment of Knowledge Sharing in ten years time will allow us to say whether it was an ideological feature or a scientific step.

O-O-O-O

**REVERSING THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT:
ACTION FIRST & TALKING LAST**

Aklilu Habte (formerly World Bank & UNICEF) Washington
Email: Swolde@aol.com

The importance of knowledge has been fully acknowledged in rhetoric through World Bank documents stretching at least as far back as the Bell Report of 1978 (for the Education Sector). This report was a landmark in making the Bank more aware of its own in-house need to build education research capacity in education. However, the Bank's attention to this issue has been disappointing and desultory in reality. The reasons for this need to be considered and their implications for the future of development co-operation. Not just for the Bank but for other agencies. The wider context of these challenges is as follows. They need to be addressed before they can deal sensitively with the new attractions of becoming 'knowledge agencies'.

Development co-operation faces a number of crises:

- A crisis of vision. A serious and honest reflection on the past two or three decades of existence does not present a useful or exciting road map for the development of education.
- A policy framework crisis. The literature is replete with segmented priorities, distorted priorities, priorities that appear and disappear as fashions do in the West.
- A leadership crisis at the donor agency level. There is an absence of people with competence and compassion, with a broad experience in political economy and exposure in the realities of poverty and impoverishment.
- A crisis of regular agency staff - a most serious and pervasive issue. Here lies the question of experience; competence; commitment; duration of service; and the prevalence of the wrong incentives to staff, etc.

How can they be addressed? Here are some pointers:

- The focus of development should be on the people.
- Development workers should come primarily from the indigenous people.
- There should be no support to any country whose leadership, style of government, preoccupation is not to help its own people.
- Prioritise on strengthening the networking of local, regional and national research and management capacities including the revitalisation of higher education institutions.
- **Then** strengthen the policy and practice of sharing knowledge information and communication technology at all levels.

Finally, are the current multilateral institutions capable of reforming themselves to provide and accommodate the ever-changing world conditions and meet the needs of poor people? If international institutions are being questioned based on their past track record; and if local institutions persist in being weak and fragile; if the political scenario continues its usual one-sided dominant behavior, then we need to ask which kinds of institutions both at national and international levels would better serve the people? What kinds of institutions and combinations of national and international institutions might better fit and provide effective service to those that need the help? Answers to these kinds of questions should precede the rush to become knowledge agencies.

0-0-0-0

THE SOCIAL THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE AND KNOWLEDGE FOR DEVELOPMENT: IS MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING POSSIBLE?

Simon McGrath, Centre of African Studies, University of Edinburgh
Email: S.McGrath@ed.ac.uk

Knowledge has recently become one of buzzwords of development. Indeed, its emergence onto centre stage in development thinking has been so rapid that many meetings have been convened to seek to understand better the relationship between knowledge and development. As development co-operation agencies are practical organisations at their core, such meetings, and wider discussions, have tended to focus primarily on how to use knowledge more effectively for development. However, the agencies' shift to thinking about knowledge also highlights their crucial role in knowledge

production, analysis and dissemination. It is in this light in particular that it may be significant that there seem to be major differences in the ways that knowledge is understood between agencies' accounts and those of social theory. Social theory has always had the concept of knowledge as an important element of its activities. However, it can be argued that a series of new accounts in particular areas of social theory, in combination with overall trends at the epistemological and ontological levels, amount to a new theory of knowledge.

This paper is not an attempt to provide an authoritative literature review of this new theory. In particular, it is predominantly based in a Northern literature and lacks a detailed reading of the Southern literature in this area. Rather, it is an attempt to reflect on accounts from areas of study that have focused on knowledge theories and practices as a way of informing debates about agencies' use of knowledge as concept, practice and product. From this examination, a number of dissonances between these two broad sets of accounts emerge that might merit further agency thinking, given the importance of knowledge to their current model of development. In any such further thinking, there would be a need for greater reflection of Southern voices than has been attempted in this paper.

A first set of issues is clustered around the gap between understandings of knowledge and development at the macro level. There are apparent theoretical differences between an implicit emphasis on linearity and universality, on the agency side, and context and complexity, on the side of social theory. The current emphasis on targets is closely related to this point, as is the widespread agency use of the logical framework approach. Whilst agencies may understandably prefer single narratives and predictability for planning purposes, there is a strong case to answer regarding the failures of aid projects as a result of poor mapping of problems and solutions.

A second set of issues is to do with policy and power. There is very great divergence between policy sociology and agencies' theories-in-use of how policy works. This may be particularly significant as the policy focus of agencies continues to grow. Putting so much emphasis on policy could be very counter-productive when it often appears that policies have very little to do with subsequent practices. Part of the problem here lies with some agencies' assumptions about consensus and the role of stakeholders and civil society in policymaking. Such assumptions clash very strongly, for instance, with the accounts produced by many scholars of African political systems and processes. For the greater plausibility of agencies' claims to have a preferential option for the poor, a more sophisticated reading of power would also be vital. Again, this is heightened by the new knowledge focus, given the close relationship of knowledge and power in contemporary social theory.

A third set of issues is grouped around the specifics of the shift towards the knowledge agency and knowledge for development. Given the arguments about the knowledge-power relationship, there is a widespread, almost primordial, reaction from social theorists (and the many NGOs whose staff have some background in the social disciplines) that attempts to increase the impact of the knowledge of powerful organisations are likely to reinforce their power further. In particular, there is concern that agency views of what constitutes development will increase in their influence,

notwithstanding the strong agency emphasis on partnership. There are also concerns that the growing interest in knowledge for development is a diversion from a more grounded approach to the developmental needs of the South. The existing literatures on aid effectiveness and on learning in agencies also point to the likelihood of major practical constraints on the ability of agencies to develop their own internal knowledge use as far as they desire. In particular, tensions between disbursement and learning; and between the need for time for learning and the ever-greater work loads will be difficult to reconcile. Moreover, the growing decentralisation of agencies also may have serious impacts on knowledge and learning strategies. Agencies have begun to be more vocal in their commitment to supporting Southern knowledge capacity after their failings of the past two decades. However, they face a challenge here in dealing with an issue that has strong ideological and political components existing alongside the technical aspects. Finally, there may be merits in an improved relationship between 'Knowledge Agencies' and 'Knowledge NGOs', that ends the latter group's suspicions of agency strategies of co-option or marginalisation.

0-0-0-0

KNOWLEDGE SHARING: INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION

'KNOWLEDGE AGENCIES':
MAKING GLOBALISATION OF KNOWLEDGE WORK FOR
THE NORTH OR THE SOUTH?

KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT/KNOWLEDGE SHARING FOR SOCIAL
JUSTICE – THE SOUTH AFRICAN CASE

THE WORLD BANK AND KNOWLEDGE

KNOWLEDGE SHARING:
INSIDE IN, INSIDE OUT, OUTSIDE IN, OUTSIDE OUT

'KNOWLEDGE BASED' INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION:
DO WE WANT IT? DO WE NEED IT?

KNOWLEDGE: A CORE RESOURCE FOR DEVELOPMENT

SHARING WHOSE KNOWLEDGE? THE GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT
NETWORK AND THE DIFFUSION OF DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH

REFLECTION ON GNet AS GDN BECOMES INDEPENDENT

**'KNOWLEDGE AGENCIES':
MAKING GLOBALISATION OF KNOWLEDGE WORK FOR THE NORTH OR THE
SOUTH?**

Kenneth King, African Studies, Edinburgh
Email: Kenneth.King@ed.ac.uk

The intriguing world of knowledge management or knowledge sharing in the agencies offers a number of issues for further research, and a few challenges to those directly involved in the area of agency knowledge sharing, whether in multi-laterals, bi-laterals or NGOs.

By far the largest intellectual hurdle, as the agencies scramble to become learning organisations, is the agency-centricity of their knowledge preoccupations. With just a very few exceptions, we would argue that these initiatives appear to be being carried on for the immediate advantage of the agencies and their own staff development, and only down the line might they incorporate the natural partners of aid organisations in the developing world.

We have hinted that the reason for this misplaced focus on the agency has been the temptation to regard the development agency as just another multinational firm rather than as a unique organisation mandated to help develop something other than itself.

The result has been that the agencies have not started on knowledge management with the dramatic knowledge deficits of the South, nor with the key question of how knowledge management could assist knowledge development in the South. A continuation along their present trajectory will arguably be counter-productive; it could make agencies even more certain of what they themselves have learnt, and more enthusiastic that others should share these insights, once they have been systematised in the North.

The agencies' current knowledge focus has not been systematically evaluated, nor have the various assumptions underpinning their knowledge management (KM) and knowledge sharing (KS) strategies been seriously interrogated.

An alternative approach is still eminently possible, since the exercises in knowledge management are still very much at the exploratory stage in most agencies. But it really consists of turning the present approach to the 'knowledge agency' on its head.

Instead of asking yet more questions about how lessons learned by the agency could be further synthesised, we could start at the other end and ask how joint involvement in agency knowledge projects could better build knowledge in the South. To do this effectively, it would be essential to have a much more elaborate account of knowledge bases and knowledge systems in the South.

Instead of wondering how to ensure that Northern research and policy directories, databases, training systems could be placed more conspicuously on agency webs, or even on the Development Gateway, agencies, with their unique mandate to develop the South, could ask many more conditioning questions about how Northern expertise could be obliged much more symmetrically to partner the South.

This is a question that has not been systematically applied to the enormously rich Northern knowledge resources on the South. And these are not just the agency databases and knowledge networks but also the very considerable Northern NGO resources of knowledge on the South. How can they be leveraged more effectively so that knowledge development occurs somewhat more symmetrically in the South?

The new preoccupation with knowledge management in the North must be situated in the context of the brave new world of the internationalisation of the trade in educational services. It must also take account of the aggressive internationalisation of higher education in the North, and the continuing challenges to the sustainability of research knowledge in the South. Knowledge management in the agencies happens to coincide with a continuing reduction in overall aid to the developing world, and not least with massive reductions in the aid-supported opportunities for the poorer countries of the South to have access to research training in the North (see NN27 passim).

The value of the new knowledge management and knowledge sharing concerns is that they should require organisations to rethink their working assumptions about North-South networking, North-South partnership, and North-South knowledge solidarity.

0-0-0-0

KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT/KNOWLEDGE SHARING FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE: THE SOUTH AFRICAN CASE*

Mala Singh, Interim Higher Education Quality Committee, Pretoria
Email: Singh.M@doe.gov.za

As an African country, South Africa faces a number of challenges in common with other countries on the continent. However, in contrast to many of its neighbours, South Africa has a relatively well-developed industrial and technological infrastructure and a reasonably functioning higher education and science system supported by the state. This makes it difficult to generalise about knowledge management/knowledge sharing on the continent on the basis of developments in South Africa. Nevertheless, some of the trends emerging in South Africa, especially since 1994, have resonance for knowledge management/knowledge sharing on the continent.

Knowledge management/knowledge sharing in South Africa has evolved along different trajectories linked, on the one hand, to the preservation or modification of apartheid and, on the other, to the struggle to resist and overcome it and replace it with a democratic alternative. There are two distinct traditions of knowledge generation and capacity development for policy purposes in the country.

In the apartheid era, the state sought to use the public architecture of higher education and research systems as well as a range of in-house research initiatives and special projects of government departments to provide it with policy relevant data and know how and post facto legitimations of apartheid policy. Part of the process of building a strategic knowledge infrastructure included research capacity development support for Afrikaner academics and Afrikaans universities. The liberation movement both abroad

and in South Africa also invoked knowledge resources to mobilise against apartheid and to investigate policy options to replace it. Many initiatives to explore alternative policy frameworks were supported by aid from foreign government and foundation sources.

Following the first democratic elections in 1994, the South African government embarked on a process of policy restructuring, producing White Papers and numerous other policy documents with the assistance of local and international experts, the participation of stakeholders in varying degrees, and with financial and technical assistance from foreign governments, aid agencies and foundations (e.g. USAID, CIDA, Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation to mention a few).

An enormous amount of policy support activity (especially research and training) is taking place in many of South Africa's 36 public higher education institutions, 9 science councils, 5 national research facilities and numerous research institutes linked to universities, non-governmental organisations, the labour movement, etc. Apart from research and development supported by the private sector, foundations and foreign aid, the government spends 0.75% of GDP on research and development and has sought to redirect knowledge development to national priorities through new statutory frameworks and steering mechanisms.

All of Government's new regulatory frameworks for higher education, research and training signal the commitment to move beyond the north/south divide created within the country by apartheid, largely along race and gender lines. The new policies seek to create a new trajectory for knowledge development, knowledge sharing, knowledge management and knowledge utilisation away from the preservation of privilege for a racially defined minority to social justice for the majority of the population.

Higher education and the science and technology system have seen the publication of White papers which require greater responsiveness to development priorities on the part of knowledge systems, institutions and organisations as well as greater efficiency and accountability with regard to the expenditure of public funds. The connection between knowledge resources, knowledge capabilities and national social and economic development is made strongly and often in government's position. The challenge to higher education and the science system is explicitly identified in the White Papers - to ensure South Africa's successful entry into a globalised knowledge economy on the basis of increasing capacity to produce, access and apply knowledge which is both technical and social. This may very well result in the further marginalisation of large numbers of low skilled and impoverished black people unless balanced by appropriate access and training opportunities. At the level of policy frameworks, however, the commitment to hold together the often conflicting imperatives of equity and social justice, efficiency and competitiveness is still evident. This balancing act is becoming more precarious and the social justice priorities more ambivalent in the implementation phase of those very same policy frameworks.

Since the mid nineties a number of interventions have been put in place by government-funded research support organisations like the Human Sciences Research Council and the Foundation for Research Development to enhance knowledge generation, build individual and institutional research capacity in order to increase the number of black and women researchers and develop sustainable institutional environments, build research teams with

experienced and new researchers, facilitate more multidisciplinary, problem-solving research which cuts across disciplinary and institutional boundaries, promote knowledge diffusion and dissemination, and link academics and researchers with industry, government and civil society.

A number of bilateral agreements between South Africa and other countries as well as foundation supported collaborations between local and foreign higher education institutions have also made funding available for collaborative research and training activities. These interventions are not even a decade old and their full impact is still to be evaluated but some trends may be useful to note for South Africa and for the GDN as well.

- Both government and the aid community have signalled a preference for more applied research linked to development themes. The shift to applied research and to knowledge for policy development has led to a decline in funding and capacity for basic research. The shift to multidisciplinary focus areas is weakening the maintenance of disciplinary competencies. Both these shifts are threatening in the long term to sustainable and continuing capacity for knowledge generation, diffusion and innovation. Short term gains in forging a stronger knowledge/policy nexus may be detrimental over time to a more comprehensive and sustainable notion of knowledge based development
- In a policy hungry conjuncture, government and other organisations have involved experienced academics and researchers in policy development, usually operating within tight time frames and in specialised areas of expertise. This has not been conducive to capacity development to grow new layers of expertise which is more representative in race and gender terms. There are also perceptions of too many foreign experts involved in policy development processes. Capacity development gains in a very busy policy landscape in the last few years have probably not been as significant as expected and policy processes have probably over-burdened and over-stretched the small number of black and women participants who find themselves recycled onto multiple policy and restructuring treadmills. Capacity development programmes for individuals which really build sustainable quality are labour intensive and take time to show results beyond the purely quantitative increase in race and gender involvement. They also need to be linked to the building of institutional and systems capacity.
- In a context where research collaboration and teamwork are strongly punted, the participation of foreign and local knowledge producers in joint projects has not always proceeded on the basis of a clear understanding of how intellectual property rights are to be decided, especially in contexts where the bulk of the funding comes from the country of origin of the foreign scientists. South Africa is taking steps to better regulate intellectual property rights issues, particularly in relation to indigenous knowledge systems and research on the country's biodiversity resources. This will in turn require monitoring and protective capacity at local and international levels to be meaningful.
- Refocusing the higher education and research architecture in South Africa for emancipatory ends required an approach to capacity building that did not

compromise on quality. The initiative to link quality and equity remains an ongoing challenge, requiring a balance between race and gender linked capacity development with building new capacities in the entire system (including those of historically advantaged researchers). It soon became clear that a deficit model of capacity development was not sufficient and that the new knowledge and development environment required in new and experienced researchers and in the system as a whole, some of the following competencies – sound training in basic and applied research, ability to test knowledge options from other country/system contexts and assess their relevance and applicability to local needs, ability to draw on and integrate the work of professional science communities and other non-professional communities of practice, ability to work and innovate in a multidisciplinary environment, ability to do and use quantitative and qualitative research, and perhaps most importantly for those involved in policy research - to perform enough critical social science to enable citizens to judge and engage with chosen development trajectories.

- The second term of office of the ANC led government has put enormous emphasis on delivery and the speedier implementation of policy. The arena of acute need is no longer research for policy development but information and capacity to implement and monitor policy frameworks and take corrective action where necessary. This raises the question of what kinds of knowledges and skills are necessary for effective policy implementation. The broader question is what kind of knowledges and knowledge uses do we have in mind when we use the expressions Knowledge Management/Knowledge Sharing. Knowledge management and knowledge sharing in an era of policy implementation will clearly have to involve the reconciliation of expert knowledges underpinning national policies with local community knowledges in contexts of implementation. The success of policy implementation will clearly depend on the creative and confident use of the new knowledges which flow from such a reconciliation.

By way of conclusion, I want to ask four questions which the GDN must address:

- what are the necessary and sufficient conditions for effective knowledge management/knowledge sharing in the South? (which goes beyond new discourses from the North obscuring old practices).
- knowledge development and research and policy capacity may provide the necessary conditions for development in the South but what are the sufficient conditions for knowledge based development to succeed?
- will/can the GDN engage with the sufficient conditions that pertain to power relations within a global political economy!
- how does the GDN plan to connect to and build on the many decades of work on knowledge generation and capacity development by south based organisations like CODESRIA? (beyond the inclusion of individuals associated with such organisations).

* [This is a shorter version of a paper written for the panel on 'Building Policy Research Capacity in the New Era of Knowledge Sharing', GDN Tokyo, December 2000- Ed.]

O-O-O-O

THE WORLD BANK AND KNOWLEDGE*

Stephen Denning, World Bank, Washington

Email:Sdenning@worldbank.org

*[Excerpted from longer paper by Steve Denning for NORRAG/DSE/CAS conference. Ed.]

• The scene before knowledge management: the early 90s

1. The World Bank supposedly owned development knowledge

For the first 50 years of its existence, the World Bank was devoted to lending for development projects. There was a widespread perception that the World Bank itself was the place in which most development knowledge was located. World Bank staff did their best within the constraints to maximize client ownership of development projects, but in reality, as in science, there was practically no possibility of pursuing a project that did not comply with the existing World Bank paradigms. As Kuhn might say, "No alternative is available to him while he remains in the field".

2. The paradigms were sometimes of questionable reliability

Projects were developed within existing paradigms even in situations where the staff and the client knew that the prevailing paradigm was highly unreliable, if not downright wrong. Notorious instances of the phenomenon occurred in the field of economic adjustment where operations containing a few important measures were expected within a miraculously short timeframe to return whole economies to a strong growth path, despite a backlog of decades of economic mismanagement. When as expected the operation failed to achieve the promised economic growth, reports would be written trying to find the reasons for the shortfall. Ironically, the one cause that the evaluation report was not allowed to discover was frequently the real reason – namely a faulty paradigm. Such activities often seemed to be less about knowledge, and more about complying with a certain accepted theology. It is usual to criticize the World Bank for these practices, but in fact, the scene was little different from modern science, or what occurs in any large modern corporation, as described above.

3. The paradigm hassles the borrower

In this environment, each project had to comply with the relevant paradigm. When a problem appeared, the paradigm generally required that there be a study or a covenant to show how the problem was being addressed. Staff couldn't just say that there was no time or real possibility of resolving the problem in the context of that particular project. In practical terms, as in Kuhn's scientific environments, no alternative was available to staff "while they remained within the field". In these situations, World Bank staff would have to explain to borrowers that making an operation seem to comply with a given paradigm was part of the price of doing business with the World Bank. Frequently, the borrowers came to see this process as a significant hassle. Those borrowers who could

find financing elsewhere without complying with the intrusive theological requirements implied in the paradigms often went elsewhere. Those borrowers who had no other options were obliged to submit to the hassle of complying with them.

4. Sharing knowledge within the World Bank: self deception:

In all of this, there was a striking unwillingness to be brutally honest about what was going on. One obvious area was that of risk: There was a great deal of criticism of the Africa Region in the early 1990s about the failure rate of projects in Africa. It was no answer to these critiques to say that the environment in Africa was inherently risky. The inevitable reply was that the failure rate was too high: all projects were expected to succeed, reflecting the fact that the risk sections of project appraisals were all written so as to imply that all risks associated with the project were being in some way dealt with. Multi-year efforts were undertaken to persuade the management to change these risk sections so as to quantify the actual risk of the project failing but these efforts failed, in large part because such an explicit discussion of real risk would destroy the illusion of a risk-free operation that was implicit in the prevailing paradigm.

B. The Bank: The scene after knowledge management: the late 90s

1.Explaining the idea of knowledge sharing

It has been described elsewhere how difficult it was to communicate the idea of knowledge sharing to an organization focused essentially on lending.¹ In practice, the organization was only able to understand the change by referring to examples from outside the organization. If a health worker in a tiny town in Zambia could get the answer to a question on how to treat malaria from the website for the Center for Disease Control in Atlanta, Georgia, then why couldn't the World Bank share its knowledge with the world? This type of example sparked the imagination of managers and staff, and in October 1996, President Wolfensohn publicly announced a commitment to sharing knowledge.

2.The basis of knowledge sharing: community

Like other organizations, the World Bank discovered that knowledge sharing only happens on a significant scale when communities of practice are brought into existence. Over the period 1996-2000, over a hundred such communities were fostered in the World Bank, covering virtually every aspect of the organization's activities. These communities, known as thematic groups, helped practitioners **connect** with other practitioners and find answers to questions. They also provided the basis for the practitioners to **collect** relevant knowledge and display it on the World Wide Web.

3. External members of communities

A striking aspect of these knowledge-sharing communities was the growth in the number of external members. Many communities had more than a hundred external members, some as many as several hundred. The benefit was that someone in South Africa could

¹ See Stephen Denning, *The Springboard: How Storytelling Ignites Action in Knowledge-Era Organizations* (Butterworth Heinemann, 2000, Boston).

help solve the problems of someone in Pakistan, and vice versa, with a huge net increase in the knowledge available to solve problems.

4. Learning from clients:

The presence of external members in the communities of practice has meant that a great deal of learning from borrowers and between borrowers has occurred, in ways that were unthinkable in the early 1990s when the Bank itself was perceived as the repository of knowledge. The extent to which this happened varied somewhat between communities, but the phenomenon is widespread.

- **The use of knowledge collections**

As the Bank's knowledge collections became available on the Bank's external website, it was increasingly possible for outsiders to get some access to knowledge resources that World Bank staff themselves had access to. Some of these collections were high quality. Others less so. The challenge continues to upgrade the quality of the collections.

6. Research at the World Bank

The research group at the World Bank, known as DEC, hasn't changed much under successive Chief Economists. The group is academic and intellectual in orientation, with objectives and incentives largely related to the production and publication of learned papers. Individuals are involved in operations, but overall, the management of DEC has kept itself separate from operations. From the outset, DEC did not take much interest in knowledge management, as it regarded itself as the owner of true development knowledge, and it didn't seem to want to dirty its hands with anything so operational. DEC remains dominated by economists: There is still only one sociologist on the entire research staff, with significant risks to the distortion of knowledge generated, which is obviously multidisciplinary in nature. One can imagine what would happen to a piece of research showing that the problems of development are non-economic in origin and that a wider array of disciplines are needed: it is barely conceivable that such a piece of work would be proposed (who would propose it?), or carried out (who would do it?), or if carried out, that it would be regarded seriously by economists whose careers are linked to preserving the economic orientation of the research department.

C. The World Bank and knowledge: The challenges ahead

1. Completing the transition to knowledge sharing

It was only gradually apparent to World Bank management as to how large a challenge they had undertaken in turning a large bureaucracy into an agile knowledge-sharing organization. Initially, it was thought that it might be complete in months, then years, and finally, it was realized that it might take a decade or more to complete the transition. Even after four years of effort, only just over half World Bank staff are active members of communities of practice. And some of the communities of practice function much less effectively than others. So a considerable challenge entails simply completing the transition and making knowledge sharing second nature of every staff member at all times.

- **Fostering local knowledge-sharing communities**

Many of the communities of practice that have emerged have grown quite large with several hundred World Bank staff and several hundred external members. Further growth of these communities is likely to be counter-productive, and so attention is now shifting

to fostering local knowledge-sharing communities that can be linked to and networked with the global knowledge communities.

- **Integrating knowledge activities in the World Bank**

Given the multiple activities and actors in the knowledge arena, without any central integration, attention is being given to coordinating the various initiatives to ensure that there is more synergy than competition between knowledge sharing in operations, learning programs in the World Bank Institute, research in DEC, the global development gateway in ISG, research in the Global Knowledge Network, distance learning in the Global Learning Network and so on.

0-0-0-0

**KNOWLEDGE SHARING:
INSIDE IN, INSIDE OUT, OUTSIDE IN, OUTSIDE OUT**

Charles Clift, DFID, London
Email: c-clift@dfid.gov.uk

This paper sets out a classification of different knowledge flows from, to and without development agencies. The first two categories essentially relate to what has become known as “knowledge management” within and between development agencies, derived from the private sector model of knowledge management. The third is a hybrid category, relating to the flow from development agencies to others, but also the flow from the outside world, particularly the world of development research, to development agencies. The fourth is about how the development community should promote knowledge sharing for development from and to those with relevant knowledge. In particular, it is about how we should go about providing what have become known as global public goods (of the knowledge variety).

As regards “knowledge management” of the IN-IN/IN-OUT variety, I am not sure it is helpful to label it in this way. Many “knowledge management” activities, for instance the cultural change in DFID with respect to learning from researchers (or at least entering into meaningful interaction with them), have happened without an explicit “knowledge management” programme. At least in DFID, senior management is rather ambivalent about the explicit introduction of knowledge management as a programme, or more importantly as a key organisational priority as seems to have occurred in some other agencies (e.g. UNDP, CIDA, World Bank). The term can be off-putting, suggesting the latest management fad, and thus using it promiscuously may be counter-productive. Rather the attitude of management is pragmatic and outcome oriented. What is the organisation going to gain in effectiveness by doing “knowledge management” things? Given that manpower resources are constrained, could we not achieve more by putting our effort elsewhere? In particular, it is likely that demonstrating concrete results through facilitating constructive dialogue across organisational divides will be seen as most productive in generating positive outcomes for the organisation e.g. through promoting multidisciplinary approaches or through reconciling central policy priorities with the operational imperatives of country programmes. The evangelical thrust of knowledge management purists is not very appealing to management, although many of the cultural changes in the organisation that are claimed by knowledge management

advocates are certainly desired at the coal face. Thus, knowledge management is important, but we need to be clearly focused on ends rather than means if it is to thrive in the development agency environment (as, one supposes, in the private sector).

Related, we do not really have evidence of the success of knowledge management in development agencies. Rather it is, as in much of management theory, a question of the advocates claiming a particular approach is the secret of success. For instance in the World Bank, who has seriously tried to evaluate the impact of the knowledge management initiative? There was a report a couple of years back, but this was by the high priests of knowledge management private sector style. How could we attempt to learn from the World Bank's experience? We certainly should because it would be instructive for others embarking on this road.

As regards the OUT-OUT models of knowledge management, the key question relates to the priority that should be assigned to the provision of global public goods (in this context the generation of knowledge and the mechanisms for sharing it equitably) and then how the burden of that provision should be financed. The imbalance is that the global players are on the whole not well positioned to provide the grant resources required for this purpose, while the bilateral players, who have grant funds available, do not necessarily see this role as a high priority. Moreover, there are tensions between the multilateral and bilateral players as to the nature, orientation and mechanisms for providing them. Sorting out these dilemmas seems to me a high priority. The possibilities opened up by the use of the Internet, and the rapid advances in science in areas relevant to development, mean that this kind of global knowledge provision could be critical in helping achieve targets for poverty reduction in developing countries.

O-O-O-O

**'KNOWLEDGE-BASED' INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION:
DO WE WANT IT? DO WE NEED IT?**

Rosa-María Torres, Instituto Fronesis, Buenos Aires
Email: rmtorres@fibertel.com.ar

"Knowledge-based aid" is *in vogue* today within the international cooperation community, led by the World Bank (WB). WB's decision, in 1996, to become a "*Knowledge Bank*" made explicit the evolution of its role over the past few years into an institution that provides both expert advice and loans – in that order of importance, as the WB explicitly states.

North-South international cooperation has always been "knowledge-based". Knowing, and transferring such knowledge to "developing countries" under the form of technical assistance have been the core mission and the *raison d'être* of international agencies. (It may be new, however, from a bank perspective, since banks are supposed to provide money, not ideas). What is also new is the increased global concentration of economic and symbolic power (information and knowledge) and of the means and resources to access, synthesize and disseminate such information and knowledge.

However, without fundamental changes in North-South relationships and international co-operation patterns, as well as in knowledge and learning paradigms, there is little hope that the announced "knowledge society" and "lifelong learning" will bring the expected learning revolution and a more equitable distribution of knowledge. On the contrary, we are experiencing a major epochal paradox: never before have there been so much information and knowledge available, so varied and powerful means to democratize them, and so much emphasis on the importance of knowledge, education and learning. But never before has the *banking* education model been so alive and widespread on a global scale: *education* understood as a one-way transfer of information and knowledge, and *learning* understood as the passive digestion of such transfer. Many enthusiastic global promoters of "knowledge societies", "new networking" and "lifelong learning" dream today of a world converted into a giant classroom with a few powerful global teachers, and millions of passive assimilators of information and knowledge packages via telecentres, computers and the Internet.

Why would "developing countries" continue to *want* "knowledge-based aid"? It has been ineffective and costly, it has increased dependency and foreign debt, it has not allowed these countries to develop their own human resources and to identify their own ideas, research, thinking, alternatives, models. And it has not allowed them to learn along the way about their mistakes.

Does the South really *need* such aid? Most, if not all, countries in the South have the competent professionals and knowledgeable people needed to engage in meaningful and effective education policies, programmes and reforms. Moreover, if qualified and committed nationals (and non-nationals who end up sharing these characteristics and ideals as their own) have two important advantages over non-nationals: they know the language and share the local history and culture, and they love their country. Motivation, empathy, ownership, a sense of identity and of pride, a sense of being part of a collective-building project, all these are key ingredients of effective and sustainable policy making and social action. There is an important difference between living in a country, and visiting it on technical missions. External advisors and consultants may leave ideas, documents and recommendations, but it is those facing everyday realities who finally do the job. Separating and differentiating the roles of those who think and recommend, and those who implement and try to follow recommendations, remains the key formula for non-ownership (or for fake ownership) and thus for failure.

If the North and international agencies really want to assist the South, they must be ready to accept the need for major shifts in their own thinking and doing. It is not just a matter of more of the same, or even of improving cooperation mechanisms and relationships. What is needed is a *different kind of international cooperation*, operating under different assumptions and rules, to be discussed and devised together with the South, in professional dialogue. "*Partnership*" yes, but not for business as usual.

O-O-O-O

KNOWLEDGE: A CORE RESOURCE FOR DEVELOPMENT

Katharina Thurnheer, Helvetas, Zurich

Email: katharina.thurnheer@helvetas.ch

Recently, *knowledge* has become a popular term. Its usage is closely linked with new economic trends and the rapid developments in the field of information and communication technologies (ICTs). By connecting the term knowledge with new technologies an additional divide emerges between Northern and Southern societies, urban and rural areas, wealthy and poorer social groups. According to the criterion of access to ICTs, societies worldwide are perceived as being separated into "information-haves" and "information-have-nots".

Working to overcome inequalities is the basic aim of international co-operation. The relevance of knowledge to that end has been recognised for a long time. It is therefore a logical consequence for development agencies to consider whether (and in what ways) applying ICTs within projects may yield greater benefits to the local population. Helvetas and the Swiss Agency for Development (SDC) wished to stimulate a discussion among development organisations in Switzerland and jointly launched the meeting on "Knowledge – a core resource for development". Held in Berne in March 2001, some 100 participants explored the usefulness of ICTs for development endeavours and learned from the experiences gained in other countries.

In discussing knowledge and the role of ICTs, the meeting concentrated on three dimensions:

- The Socio-political Dimension of Knowledge, the Impact of ICTs and the Digital Divide
- Harnessing Knowledge in the South and for the South
- Knowledge as an Organisational Resource – Managing Knowledge.

The event began with a plenary session dealing with the *Socio-political Dimension of Knowledge, the Impact of ICTs and the Digital Divide*. The four guest speakers pointed out a discrepancy between a high demand for ICTs expressed by various NGOs and the reluctance of some donors to accept these wishes as priorities in development schemes. Thus, discussing the relevance of new ICTs for the development of societies touches upon old, well-known questions in development discourses: Who is in control of the resources? Who actually defines the needs of the would-be beneficiaries? If the people concerned have their say, what do they consider as relevant? What conditions need to be guaranteed so that any technology introduced meets the requirements of an appropriate technology?

Entitled *Harnessing Knowledge in the South and for the South*, the second part of the meeting took a closer look at two projects in which ICTs play a prominent role. First, an initiative in South India provided ample illustration of the opportunities for local residents if ICTs are applied to meet their needs. Another example was given of a project in Cameroon in which Helvetas gained valuable experience from utilising the Geographical Information System (GIS) to analyse complex data. Both presentations described ICTs' congruency with participatory processes and the concept of appropriate technologies.

Finally, the meeting dealt with *Knowledge as an Organisational Resource – Managing Knowledge*. Knowledge has become a crucial resource for organisations, demanding as comprehensive a cultivation system as possible. Here, ICTs were discussed as instruments to organise expertise and insights gained by members of development agencies. These technologies provide new options promising more efficient operations, yet when applied in small organisations, specific limitations must be considered.

[Helvetas, the Swiss Association for International Co-operation, and the Swiss Agency for Development and Co-operation (SDC) jointly organised a Swiss Meeting on Global Knowledge Sharing and Information and Communication Technologies in Berne, Switzerland, March 20, 2001. The documentation on this meeting is now available. Download from the Internet at www.helvetas.ch/km/workshop or order a print-version from Helvetas, St. Moritzstrasse 15, P.O. Box 181, CH-8042 Zurich.]

0-0-0-0

**SHARING WHOSE KNOWLEDGE?
THE GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT NETWORK AND THE DIFFUSION OF
DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH**

Diane Stone, University of Warwick
posaz@dredd.csv.warwick.ac.uk

There are many research and analysis networks in existence but none so grand in design as the Global Development Network – a global coalition of institutes, think tanks and development researchers. The GDN motto is: ‘world-class local knowledge for world-class local solutions’. The GDN is designed to allow greater scope for ‘home-grown’ policy, information-sharing and enhanced research capacity in and between developing countries (www.gdnet.org).

The main sponsor of the Network is the World Bank. Although there are other supporting agencies, the GDN is an example of how the World Bank is recreating itself as the ‘Knowledge Bank’. The GDN is founded on seven regional research networks, again sponsored by the World Bank, and largely composed of economic policy institutes.

More generally, the GDN is one manifestation of the ‘globalisation of development knowledge’ where research is spread internationally. Through think tanks, research institutes and universities, societies adapt or synthesise ‘global forms’ of knowledge to suit local circumstances. There is also a promising reverse effect in the extent to which these organisations are able to feed ‘grass-roots knowledge’ back into international organisations and donor agencies. Former World Bank Chief Economist, Joseph Stiglitz (2000) advised the GDN partner institutes:

Prudent counsel is to scan globally for best practices but to test them locally since local adaptation often amounts to reinventing the 'best practice' in the new context. The Knowledge Bank can 'scan globally'; the GDN partners have to 'reinvent locally'.

This objective is one of the clearest global policy aspirations for the GDN whereby the research community has the intellectual infrastructure to construct channels of communication between the political and the research worlds thus facilitating the flow of knowledge into policy. The transfer of knowledge itself is equated as a mode of development.

One important platform of thinking behind the GDN is that it is a vehicle for a 'global public good'. Knowledge is a public good but so also is the dissemination of that knowledge. That is, diffusing knowledge about successful (and failed) policy experiments and innovations of one country may be of benefit to many other countries. Placing 'knowledge' as central to the development process is a profound re-conceptualisation of development not only in the World Bank but in other multilateral aid agencies that adopt similar language. One implication is that the creation, management and transfer of knowledge becomes the primary axis for international co-operation on development. While the importance of knowledge in development is not to be denied, it is necessary to clarify:

1. How knowledge is conceptualised or what constitutes knowledge;
2. The social and political context in which knowledge is produced, evaluated and transferred.

The public good approach is an apolitical view of knowledge where issues of power and hegemony are not considered. The spread of ideas and policy can be coercive. Conditionality is the most obvious example of the compulsion to conform to a set of internationally determined standards and 'best practice'. Moreover, the simple exchange of knowledge does not confront or circumvent deep-rooted asymmetries of power that exist in developing countries that may confound effective or appropriate utilisation of knowledge.

Within the GDN, the dominant conceptualisation of what constitutes knowledge is research undertaken by suitably qualified experts in recognised institutional contexts - that is, in research institutes. Institute structure itself is often of a secular Westernised character. Local knowledge is reproduced in a western format. It is a 'codified' form of knowledge that results in 'sharing' almost exclusively between intellectual, political and economic elites who share a common professional language. Moreover, the dominant character of the current network participants entails that knowledge is framed predominantly by the methods and models, professional norms and standards of economists.

The GDN presents itself as a technically and politically neutral, non-state actor. However, the knowledge that is generated and transferred - research results, data, information about 'best practice', etc. - is strongly flavoured by the values of the post Washington Consensus. This policy paradigm involves political choices in favour of certain policies such as privatisation, liberalisation, deregulation and public sector reform overlain with new concerns about transparency, engagement with civil society and local ownership of

development policy. Presented as civil society organisations (sometimes inappropriately given close connection to government in many countries), institutes are 'partners' with which World Bank officials can interact to meet these goals.

A local institute, or a regional network, acts as amplifier of World Bank values, perspectives and priorities. Political themes and policy approaches are reinforced by the multiplication of institutes at a domestic level and through building regional networks to share information, spread policy lessons and consolidate international consensus. The GDN is primarily an initiative allowing the World Bank to meet its own agendas regarding 'home-grown policy', civic engagement and partnership, and top-down knowledge sharing.

Reference

Stiglitz, Joseph. (2000) 'Scan Globally, Reinvent Locally: Knowledge Infrastructure and the Localisation of Knowledge' in Diane Stone (ed.) *Banking on Knowledge: The Genesis of the Global Development Network*, London, Routledge.

O-O-O-O

REFLECTING ON GDNET AS GDN BECOMES INDEPENDENT

Erik Johnson, World Bank Institute, World Bank, Washington
Email: ejohnson1@worldbank.org

On July 25, 2001, the doors to the newly independent Global Development Network (GDN) opened. After two years of gestation inside the World Bank, the GDN is now officially registered as an international nonprofit organization located outside of the World Bank buildings in Washington, DC.

This is an exciting time for the GDN, but it is also filled with anxiety about what the future might hold. Is the GDN prepared for a life of its own, away from the comfortable trappings of the Bank? As the former manager of the GDN's Internet initiative, GDNet, I would like to briefly reflect upon what we have built over the past year and how it positions GDNet for the future.

New Leadership

When the GDN moves outside of the World Bank, it will also take with it the GDNet project which has, up until now, been managed by the World Bank Institute. This is why I am writing as a "past" manager. Soon there will be a new manager for the GDNet initiative, and newly engaged leadership in the form of GDN's Director, Lyn Squire.

With new leadership for GDNet also comes the uncertainty of the project's future direction. However, there are positive signs that the momentum will continue. The GDN Board, at its recent meeting in May voiced overwhelming support for GDNet. A small committee of the Board was formed to provide support and guidance to the initiative. It also looks quite likely that the GDN will continue working with the Institute for Development Studies, UK (IDS), a key partner in placing GDNet where it is today. Both of these developments bid well for the future of GDNet.

Strategic Directions

GNet's ongoing consultative process has generated a number of key strategic directions. These directions were recently discussed and generally supported by a small group of web managers (the core of GNet's community) gathered in Brighton, England in March.

A few major themes emerged from the discussions. First, the GNet web site (currently managed by IDS) should become a "shop window" for featuring the latest and greatest work of research institutes in developing countries. Second, in order for these institutes to actively contribute their materials to GNet, they would need capacity building support – especially for their Internet activities. Third, the work of this community of institutes would best be featured through "regional windows," managed by a leading institute within each region.

This ambitious agenda has the potential for making a major contribution in making developing country knowledge accessible to a global audience. There are related initiatives already on the playing field, so it will be up to GNet future management to carve out the most effective niche and engage community members in ways that are most beneficial to them.

Community Engagement and Promising Partnerships

The piloting phase of GNet has revealed a high level of enthusiasm for the project within its core constituency, research institute web managers. These individuals have used the prototype system actively, provided feedback, engaged their colleagues and contributed to the strategic direction of the initiative. This participation is quite encouraging, but the continuation of this momentum is key to the future of GNet.

In order to test the waters in some areas which have emerged as priorities for GNet, a number of pilot partnerships have been developed. The Community of Science (access to funding opportunities), International Network for the Availability of Scientific Publications (access to peer reviewed journals), International Institute for Sustainable Development (web management capacity building) and European Association of Research and Training Institutes (integrating web databases) have all been engaged in the GNet process and their resources can contribute much to GNet's success in its next phase of operation.

In Conclusion

The potential of cyber technologies is just beginning to be tapped as a means of sharing knowledge about development. Developing countries are still quite limited in their ability to reap the benefits of this new medium, but they are actively exploring all options and pushing the frontier whenever possible. GNet offers a promising avenue for research institutes to make the Internet work for them. I'm hopeful that they will recognize this opportunity, and the new GNet will deliver to the best of its abilities.

FITTING KNOWLEDGE TOOLS FOR DEVELOPMENT?

NETWORKING KNOWLEDGE WITH THE SOUTH:
THE ESSENTIAL ART OF PURSUING
KNOWLEDGE PARTNERSHIPS

CHOOSING THE RIGHT TOOLS FOR KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

TEAR FUND AND KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT:
WHERE WE ARE IN JULY 2001

FROM ACCESS TO ICTs TO
KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND EMPOWERMENT

OXFAM GREAT BRITAIN'S
KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME

COMMENTS ON KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND THE
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DONORS AND THE SOUTH

PUTTING UNTAPPED KNOWLEDGE TO USE
IN INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION

ICT ENABLED KNOWLEDGE NETWORKING IN
THE SOUTH FOR EMPOWERMENT AND GOVERNANCE

KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT FOR DEVELOPMENT ORGANISATIONS

**NETWORKING KNOWLEDGE WITH THE SOUTH:
THE ESSENTIAL ART OF PURSUING KNOWLEDGE PARTNERSHIPS**

Phyllis Johnson, Southern African Research and Documentation Centre (SARDC), Harare
Email: pjohnson@sardc.net

Poised as we are on the brink of another chasm of underdevelopment, the gaping "digital divide", it is high time for a moment of reflection on the method of bridging the gap without plunging into the abyss. Perched on one side is the North with a proliferation of tools, building the knowledge bridge according to its own methodology, linked to satellite tracking but talking only to itself; and the South on the other brink, with a pirated model because it cannot afford Bill Gates' licensing fees or the high cost of online telecommunications, possessing the innovative knowledge but not the access or resources to construct its own model, and unable to breach local telecommunications policies. The only way to communicate effectively is to build from both sides, managing from both sides to create an integrated knowledge network.

Creation of knowledge and making of policy take place at many levels: local and national, sub-regional and regional, global. If we are to harness these processes effectively we must actively involve all levels in both the process and ownership of the process. This is no longer a cliché about democratic development, but a necessity to global development. Globalization is, first and foremost, about global access to information, and second, the means of using that information to generate opportunities.

The continued investment in Northern tools development, although important, is not the only way forward, without an equitable response to supporting Southern innovation and knowledge sharing. Knowledge is about opening up, about seeing, stretching, building linkages between ideas and practice, to bridge knowledge, policy and development.

The potential for equitable partnerships has never been better. Technology is crossing borders and continents, offering an unprecedented opportunity to pool our knowledge resources for sustainable global development. Together we can build bridges across chasms of underdevelopment, but there are many rocky places and slippery stones, and this requires tolerance, patience and well-targeted resources for capacity building, connectivity and access, to broaden participation and awareness.

Due to the rising costs of all other forms of communication, and ease of usage, the email and internet access are rapidly becoming an appropriate technology for knowledge networking. Though still inaccessible to most people, the connectivity rate is rising rapidly and a number of organizations are strengthening skills, access and awareness for partners, including NGOs, university departments, parliamentarians and media.

The major challenge now is to ensure that local, national and regional knowledge is accessible, that Southern as well as Northern knowledge perspectives are available; and that together, these components form the basis of global knowledge. If that is to occur within a reasonable timeframe, South-North knowledge partnerships are the key. The nurturing of these partnerships requires a balance of commitment, vision and resources.

An emerging example still to be assessed is the World Bank's Global Development Network (GDN) and associated website GNet, which is attempting to build a global network of researchers and research institutes, and provide knowledge networking tools for researchers. GDN and GNet are in many ways opposite forces in the democratization of development knowledge. The structure for GDN is uni-polar and centralized in the North, and its predetermined approach risks exclusion of the independent thinkers of the South. GNet, through the World Bank Institute, has been trying to initiate a more inclusive process that generates credibility and enthusiasm in the South as well as the North, while facilitating encounters that carefully encourage a broad range of perspectives. This nascent partnership if nurtured carefully could provide a model for equitable knowledge networking at global level. But there are many rivers to cross.

There continues to be little consideration among Northern modellers for the reality of the Southern institutions, which have little staff time or resources to divert to re-inputting material into new data bases to conform to the format of tools developed and implemented by one Northern agency. This must be a more inclusive process, and for the South where human and technical resources are in short supply, it must build on existing work toward the massive and priority task of facilitating access to Southern knowledge resources. The Northern agencies seem unable to see that they are creating a diversion of limited skills to cope with their model of a global network, through access "incentives" that require duplication of work through re-inputting existing information in their format. This means extra staff time and effort in creating entries and abstracts, with no clear indication on how the service will be sustained as members from the South will find it difficult to maintain the updating of the GNet database unless it is value-added to their normal work. If we are forced to channel limited staff time through duplication of work, we will have to choose national or regional over global objectives. A global network will not be a service if it becomes a burden, and if only those regional institutions developed and resourced by the World Bank are able to participate.

There is a real danger again of underdeveloping the South in much the same manner as before, and suppressing Southern initiative. The challenge is to consider the needs and knowledge of the South when offering technology tools developed by the North to share Northern knowledge resources, and when seeking a definition for "quality". This has been difficult to pursue, with development funds supporting one Northern agency to offer and adapt its own model, with little consideration for Southern (or even other Northern) innovation. That agency is funded, while others are expected to donate their time. This will not be resolved through one-off training workshops introducing Northern tools hastily put online, but by a concerted and serious effort at working together, supported with adequate resources, to develop an suitable, sustainable methodology and model.

Information and communications technology is so very appropriate to the South, where knowledge that is being generated is not easily disseminated, and where access to knowledge is more possible now than ever before. But networks and gateways designed in the North are not taking account of Southern innovation, which we've seen for example from Chile on workspaces and Brazil on data bases; and often relevant Northern innovation is not given appropriate attention, support and Southern exposure. An example of the latter is [EL@ND](#), the European Library Network for Development, created by a network of development institutes, which has developed a mechanism for access and searching of multiple electronic libraries existing in different countries and languages.

One bridge generated in the South but unable to build at present is the African Development Policy Network (ADPN), envisaged as a loose network of think tanks and policy institutes committed to sharing knowledge resources, but currently lacking resources of any other kind to nurture its own development. Constructed to date only to the level of interim executive, this is one Southern response that has emerged to meet the challenge of globalization of knowledge and should be nurtured. It has the potential to become what Kofi Annan advocates as a "loose creative coalition".

Knowledge networking should take account of building and strengthening these South-South and South-North linkages, and sharing skills that will enable knowledge sharing. Our homepages and websites in the South are chasing too few skills, and even fewer design skills for smart access. So users often prefer to access the Northern sites which may be prettier and easier to navigate but don't contain Southern information, thus ever-widening the "digital divide".

We need more skills-sharing opportunities but also support for innovation, of the type strengthened through links with One World Europe and Bellanet in Canada. The latter has offered to place a technology specialist in a southern institution for at least a year and hopefully more, to work with other partners and networks in southern Africa. This method of skills-sharing will be more effective, not taking one person to the north for a workshop but bringing expertise to the South that we need to accelerate the process of accessibility of knowledge resources. That is a partnership model that should be nurtured, supported and expanded. Knowledge will be shared in both directions, the Southern partner gaining skills for technology access, while the Northern partner gains insights and knowledge access. We very much need to create a critical mass of technical expertise in the South because at present, the limited expertise is being swallowed by international institutions even in their local operations.

A technology problem to overshadow all others in the South of course, is access, with unstable telephone lines, and the high cost of online time and of software licenses. This prohibits access for a number of smaller organizations and individuals unless they become "pirates". Internet is easily accessible and cheap, virtually free, in North America, while elsewhere we are hampered by high online telephone charges. New solutions need to be found, and are already available to be found, for example through alternatives to the telephone such as the microwave technology that is being used to link refugee camps through small radio towers, which is also what SARDC uses to link its four locations, and by direct satellite links which, though still prohibitively expensive, are growing less costly.

Instead of wringing our hands about lack of electronic access in rural areas, we should work together, North and South, to organize broader access. This is not insurmountable and not necessarily resource heavy, but requires innovative solutions and vision to accompany resource flows.

Herbert Bergmann, GTZ, Eschborn, Germany
Email:Herbert.Bergmann@gtz.de

Introduction

GTZ is at the beginning of its work concerning knowledge management. Knowledge management belongs to the tool kit of the modern company in a globalised economic setting. It is meant to enhance business results.

Knowledge is defined as information to which a clear-cut meaning in a given context is attached – **What Works Why In What Situations?** Data and Information are not yet knowledge but constitute indispensable elements.

Knowledge management means to manage (1) the sources of knowledge and information, (2) the knowledge bearers and knowledge resources, (3) the supply of knowledge, (4) the demand for knowledge, and (5) the infrastructure for knowledge processing, storage and communication.

Knowledge Management in GTZ

Very early, GTZ produced manuals in most sectors of activity that documented and synthesised successful approaches. Findings were disseminated through seminars.

The current working definition of knowledge management in GTZ is a process definition:

- To define knowledge objectives,
- to identify and process knowledge generated by the projects,
- to store it so that it is easily available in the field and at Head Office,
- to synthesise and to assemble it as technical co-operation packages or products,
- to bring it to bear on the international discussion and on new projects,
- to be aware of current issues in the international discussion on development,
- to know how the demand of major clients for technical co-operation develops,
- to use all this knowledge for the development of GTZ's portfolio.

Knowledge Management as a Strategic Project

GTZ runs five strategic projects. One of them is knowledge management; the others are personnel human management, strategic marketing, quality management and innovative projects. Through knowledge management, GTZ intends to use its development knowledge accumulated over 26 years. GTZ' is a knowledge-based company. Its sole assets are (1) knowledge about development and successful technical co-operation, and (2) the people who possess it.

The Use of Knowledge in GTZ's Work

There is a marked contrast to the mode of operation of the Development Banks. The Banks' knowledge requirements are greatest during loan preparation and appraisal. In GTZ's work, most knowledge is needed, acquired and generated during project implementation.

GTZ combines features of a centralised hierarchy and an inverted organisation. The centralised element is GTZ's PuE-department (Planung und Entwicklung – Planning and

Development) where about 110 long-term sector specialists work. Here is the locus of GTZ's long-term, accumulated professional knowledge. The inverted-organisation feature is the fact that most of the work is done by highly qualified professionals. In 1999, a total of 10,800 staff, both nationals (86%) and expatriates (14%), worked in about 4,300 projects. They are given a lot of autonomy in project work, encouraged not to use blueprints. The concept of "best practice" is not a GTZ-concept. **Each project is a potential site of knowledge generation.**

GTZ's activities can be summarised by the following categories:

- Conceptual work (project concepts, new products, new advisory services in technical co-operation, sector and country development concepts, etc.)
- Planning (programme or project planning),
- Implementation,
- Quality assurance (quality management, project monitoring),
- Marketing.

They are linked to certain kinds of knowledge as shown in the table below:

Kind of Knowledge	Conceptual Work	Planning	Implementation	Quality Assurance	Marketing
Demand for advisory services	X				X
(objective) need for advisory services	X				X
Innovations in a given sector	X				
New developments in projects	X				
Resource requirements and costs		X			X
Sustainability of a given approach		X			
Structure and duration of a process of TC		X			
Effects and impact and their main factors	X	X			X
Detailed technical know-how			X		
Examples of products and services			X		
Quality norms			X	X	
Context factors of successful advisory work			X		
Sources of knowledge	X	X	X		

Weak Points in the Previous Use of Knowledge

1. There are no in-built mechanisms that ensure that **existing knowledge** is considered before a new project starts nor that such knowledge is looked up and used during project implementation. Use of such knowledge relies on individual initiatives. In addition, existing knowledge is hard to retrieve.
2. **Local developments, experiences and innovations** are not systematically documented. There is no compelling reason for staff to do so, and so far, there is no mechanism that ensures that the existing documentation is collected.

Actual Priorities

GTZ's approach to knowledge management addresses these shortcomings. At the moment, it focuses on the first steps of the knowledge management process.

Tools

In order to define knowledge objectives, the tool of choice is a **professional portfolio analysis**. It portrays in detail the professional aspects covered by a given group of projects. It is a tool for "knowing what one knows".

The main emphasis has been to develop **tools for identifying, acquiring and processing relevant knowledge** generated "in the field". The approach to identify and acquire knowledge is "debriefing", a structured discussion between project staff and sector specialists at Head Office. It is meant to be brief and cannot go into much depth but would provide hints on where to "dig deeper". A number of instruments have been developed in draft form for various debriefing occasions in the form of guidelines for discussions.

- **Knowledge maps,**
- **SWOT analysis (Strengths – Weaknesses – Opportunities – Threats),**
- **The advisor's diary,**
- **A project's learning history,**
- **Methods to capture detailed knowledge,**

Other instruments are guidelines on how to use **Project Progress Reviews for institutional learning** and the **Comparative analysis of similar projects**.

The main instruments for knowledge management are **professional associations** grouping professional staff working in similar projects in a given region. GTZ's policy has defined knowledge management as their main function. There are 32 such associations covering nine broad sectors.

Tools for **storing and retrieving knowledge** do not yet exist in a systematic way. There are a certain number of differently structured electronic databases that will enter a master knowledge base. This knowledge base will be user-friendly and accessible through GTZ's Intranet, but partly also through the Internet.

Conclusion

There is an enormous wealth of information and knowledge that is constantly being generated in technical co-operation projects. It could be of use to our partner countries and institutions and could improve our own work if used to the full.

Managing this wealth is a huge challenge. This challenge will have to be met through the creative use of the resources that we can muster both in the field and at Head Office.

There are no universally recognised approaches, methods, instruments and procedures for knowledge management. Knowledge management in development co-operation presents opportunities for initiative and inventiveness. These opportunities need to be fully used.

TEARFUND AND KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT:
WHERE WE ARE IN JULY 2001

Paul Whiffen, Tearfund, London
Paul.Whiffen@tearfund.org

The following is a potted history of Knowledge Management (KM) at Tearfund. This approach has been adopted from that of British Petroleum and then it's just been a case of seeing what works and what doesn't and being prepared to learn as we go! We are very keen to share thoughts, ideas, insights, successes and failures with people – all of these have contributed to where we are now.

Knowledge Management (KM) arrived at Tearfund as a conscious concept in the Spring of 1999. Following early discussions with a handful of key players, a 'Learning Review' (Tearfund jargon for 'Learning After') was tried in the early Summer within the International Group of the organisation. This was well received and so several more were delivered in the following weeks, though still in an ad-hoc manner where opportunities presented themselves.

There was an initial focus on disaster response since this generally took the form of discrete and well known projects involving players from different teams. However, other areas of activity also started to be reviewed in the same way, though still with a focus on the International Group. This was helped by the fact that KM was included as a feature of the ongoing, and organisationally accepted, IRP (International Research Project) project which was about bringing change to the International Group of Tearfund. It definitely helped to piggy-back on to a change project already established in this way.

By spring 2000, it was clear to many key players in the organisation that the approach (adopted from BP) had potential and there was talk about formalising the process into a 'corporate project' and assigning dedicated resource to lead it. This translated into a full time KM project leader in post from 1st September 2000.

It was also recognised that the project requires a small and agile KM project team consisting of the critical elements: Knowledge Management Specialist; Information Management Specialist; Information Technology Support; Leadership Team Champion.

In addition, it is also recognised that this team requires a larger Steering Group to provide accountability, challenge, support and advocacy across the wider organisation. At the time of writing, this Steering Group has met three times.

TORs for the project as a whole are in place, as are TORs for the Steering Group.

There is an initial emphasis on understanding and applying the concepts in the corporate Tearfund first, and then working with our Partners to become a wider learning network. We also wish to include Tearfund's Supporters and the Poor in the process too. In fact, some Partners are already linking up into Communities of Practice and identifying lessons for conscious re-application, though this is far from widespread at the moment.

The KM Project Team has so far met with all 30 teams across the organisation. This has been done to understand what their perceptions of KM are, and, based on those, to hear what their expectations are too (these expectations are recorded and summarised – this way it can be demonstrated back to the organisation how the same issues frequently come up). Having heard the expectations, the KM project team then introduces the team to the main KM models and concepts and also asks for a team member to act as single point of contact for later KM communication with the team. The intent is to meet with the remainder of the teams within the next couple of months. Every 6 or 8 weeks, the KM specialist sends round an informal newsletter to all the team KM contacts to let them know key developments.

A simple spreadsheet has been put in place to track the number of learning processes taking place around the different parts of the organisation. This is showing that the rate of activity is typically 1-3 per week. This doesn't sound much but it soon adds up (we are presently at 110). Initially, all such processes were being facilitated largely by one person and hence it was easy to track even if less desirable from the development of the organisation's point of view. As learning processes start to occur around the organisation, which is a good thing, it is becoming harder to keep track of them all. This is ok provided the lessons themselves are always stored in one place by everyone. This process in any case only measures simple activities – that's not a bad thing but it's not sufficient. We have recently used the INTRAC questionnaire approach to measuring the extent of KM embedding via 8 key dimensions.

We are also trying out the concept of 'Learning Exit Interviews' with people who are leaving the organisation. We've done a few of these now and they seem to work quite well. It has also proved popular with people who, intuitively, can see that large amounts of very valuable knowledge leave with people when they walk out of the door on their last day.

Tearfund does not have an Intranet, though one is intended to be in place within the next year or so. Whilst the absence of this technology has helped the organisation to focus on KM as being very much a people and process (not technology) led initiative, there is no doubt that the availability of web technology would better enable and facilitate the processes, storage of lessons and connecting of people and their knowledge. In the meantime, we are using a basic folder system on a server. It's less than ideal, but is the technology that is presently available and with which the organisation is familiar.

We have recognised that Information Management (IM) and professional Librarianship is a big issue with a long and valued tradition in the sector, and the arrival of KM has needed to recognise this. In Tearfund, we have spent a great deal of time and energy debating this and we believe we have a clear distinction between the two areas in a manner that shows both are required to energise the other.

It is quite important that KM is not seen as a separate and distinct function performed by a specific team or 'those folk over there'. Instead it is critical that the set of outlooks, behaviours and processes that make up KM are applied by all teams, projects, groups in the organisation as part of their Business as Usual.

We are aware that KM is much more than just capturing and re-using lessons and communities of practice. In fact, its application leads to implications and influence all over

the organisation both in terms of teams / departments and topic / subject areas. For example, it links to performance measurement, change management, personnel management, values and vision, training, strategic planning. We are still grasping with the enormity of all this and how to manage it.

We have gained a lot of support from BP, and also from a small consultancy (Knowledge Transformation International or KTI largely made up of former BP KM folk). The KTI website is at www.ktransform.com and much useful help can be found there.

WE CAN OFFER

Reflections around what we have done so far in getting early traction / buy-in for KM into the organisation in terms of culture, process and technology etc. Most of this has gone ok but we've had the odd upset too!

WE NEED HELP WITH (PLEASE!)

Thoughts from others on how to use an Intranet to really help foster and drive a learning culture;

Implementing Communities of Practice in a single office.

If you wish to help us or ask us any questions, please contact:

Astrid Foxen
Tel 020 8943 7914
Email arf@tearfund.org

Paul Whiffen
Tel 020 8943 7960
Email prw@tearfund.org

0-0-0-0

FROM ACCESS TO ICTS TO KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND EMPOWERMENT

Barbara Phillip, Arlington, Virginia
Email: bfillip@juno.com

Though the international development community is putting the spotlight on the "digital divide", working hard to find ways to ensure that everyone in the world will soon have access to information and communication technologies (ICTs), and though a growing number of development agencies are adopting Knowledge Management (KM) practices within and working on knowledge sharing across organizational boundaries, a true knowledge revolution is still far away on the horizon.

While knowledge management approaches streamline knowledge sharing processes, they also tend to smooth over the question of what is being managed, and to what end. The risk of advancing a corporate KM approach within development organizations is that it will spread without sufficient consideration of its impact on poor and isolated target communities in developing countries. Another danger is that existing communication approaches which offer significant potential for knowledge sharing that is adapted to their real needs and circumstances of poor communities in developing countries will be displaced by the new modes that are not necessarily participatory or empowering.

The key challenge for the future is not so much to retreat and abandon KM, but rather to look at the role of knowledge from the ground up and see where KM tools and practices fit, don't fit, or can be adapted to local needs. There is a need to refocus on the knowledge needs of developing country communities. At the moment, the focus of KM initiatives seems to be development agencies. While the knowledge needs of development agencies are certainly important, the impact of such KM initiatives will remain limited if the knowledge and knowledge needs of developing country communities are neglected. Empowerment may come, not so much when a community has access to ICTs, not when development agencies manage knowledge more effectively, but rather when a community is able to handle its own knowledge more effectively and to access outside knowledge for its own benefit.

The themes highlighted in this short piece are further developed in a paper entitled "New Technologies and Knowledge for Sustainable Development: The Empowerment Challenge," to be published in the forthcoming volume of *Knowledge and Society* (Summer 2001).

0-0-0-0

OXFAM GREAT BRITAIN'S KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME:

June Stephen and Margaret Pickering, Oxfam, Oxford
Emails: jstephen@oxfam.org.uk; mpickering@oxfam.org.uk

The purpose of this paper is to brief non-Oxfam people about what Oxfam GB are doing and planning in the Knowledge Management field. Please contact Margaret Pickering with any queries or comments.

Background

Knowledge Management is one of a series of strategic initiatives now incorporated and phased within Oxfam GB's Strategic plans (2000-2005). Excellent Knowledge Management is essential to maximising the effectiveness of the organisation and Knowledge itself is a powerful resource that Oxfam can create, structure, apply and make available externally. The Oxfam GB approach is pragmatic. The programme has been broken down into sub-projects that can deliver demonstrable benefit and generate case studies and techniques that can be scaled up for the whole organisation.

We are looking for a permanent and pervasive transformation in our behaviours that will be seen in:

- The way we apply knowledge in making decisions and choices.
- The value we place on creating, managing, disseminating and using knowledge.
- The attention we give to 'packaging' knowledge so that it can and will be used, analysing who, when, how and for what that knowledge is intended.
- The expectations we have of one another, both in terms of preparedness to seek and use knowledge (maintaining a learning posture) and our willingness to collaborate and to share.

Knowledge Management is about creating, managing, applying and sharing both explicit knowledge (that exists typically in documents, databases and as part of processes) and

tacit knowledge (embedded in people and their experience) in order to 'make a difference' in overcoming poverty and suffering. Strategic Change Objectives (our framework for achieving change) will help us to organise knowledge and ensure there is real alignment between our Knowledge Management investment and our organisational purpose. The role of technology is to support effective knowledge management by;

- facilitating communication,
- embedding expected practice (our knowledge about 'how to') into systems,
- enabling managers to abstract information from data through use of reporting and other tools.

Technology can support, but not deliver, effective Knowledge Management.

We have recently completed Phase 1 of a study to look at our overseas partners' use of electronic communications technologies - specifically the use of email and internet. This is to inform our strategy on mechanisms for sharing and delivering knowledge with our partners throughout the world. While over 85% of our partners have phone lines, less than 50% have an email address and fewer currently have access to internet, although access to internet is expected to increase significantly over the next 18 months.

Summary of progress on Oxfam KM project to date:

The Oxfam GB Corporate Management Team approved a three-year plan in May 2000. A core group, accountable for the programme has been appointed.

For planning purposes the work has been split into a number of strands of activity;

Activity	Progress to November 2000
Building a body of expertise about best practice Knowledge Management and building links with other NGOs in the north and south and businesses with whom we may learn.	On-going. Relationship with communications and monitoring and evaluation work is strong. Communities of Practice seen as key.
Designing ways to develop the Knowledge Management competency of managers (Knowledge Management is already a 'core competence' in our competency framework)	Workshops will be piloted in the new year. (Schedule for delivery and further training interventions are not yet decided)
Exploring what our involvement should be in sponsoring or contributing to Internet Portal sites (most notably the World Bank's Global Development Gateway).	Oxfam are discussing with Oxfam International a letter to the World Bank expressing interest and concern. We continue to explore role of Portals in our communications strategy.
Sponsoring one or several 'Knowledge Management Initiatives' within Oxfam that will yield benefit in their own right and provide useful learning experience.	Work has started, looking at KM (and barriers to it) in our Humanitarian Work. We are planning to look at effectiveness and scalability of our Landrights site: http://www.oxfam.org.uk/landrights/index.htm and of e-mail facilitated networks with partners around the world.

Activity	Progress to November 2000
Developing Communities of Practice	CoP are seen as very important. We are looking at ways to strengthen the informal CoPs that exist and to develop new ones, particularly in area where we feel we have a lack of Knowledge. Various ideas under consideration
Publishing Team Strategy	Incorporating initiatives within our publishing area to facilitate learning, knowledge sharing and develop channels for publishing southern research in variety of formats.

0-0-0-0

COMMENTS ON KM AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DONORS AND THE SOUTH

Tony Pryor, International Resources Group
Email: TPryor@irgltd.com

In principle, knowledge management addresses key problems facing most of the Third World: the effective use of knowledge is key if scarce human resources are to be optimized. And the generation, management and sharing of knowledge can be one of the most important developmental objectives for almost any country, and for any donor.

However, there are some issues that arise in the way knowledge management is discussed, particularly among the donor community that should be raised and addressed:

1. KM is a highly democratic concept, but to be most effective it needs to be defined by, driven by and geared towards users. This takes planning and a deep understanding of what is needed by different users, in terms of speed, timeliness, accuracy and comprehensiveness. What is needed by a senior planner may be quite different from what an extension officer or a researcher may require.
2. Time matters; the correct answer that is late is no answer. But the definition of time, and of correctness, is quite variable. Again, what a researcher needs to know versus a senior policy maker can vary extraordinarily. The trick for KM systems is to figure out how to build upon economies of scale in terms of technology while maintaining the differentiation that is required at the level of the user. "Cost effectiveness" can mean quite different things to different users; not every knowledge user needs material in real time, or on the web.
3. KM is NOT the same thing as new and improved information systems; at its heart KM is about the quality of the information, not quantity. Being able to access all of the world's web sites is not in itself knowledge management; being able to craft a definition of what one needs to know, and then being able to find the 2 or 3 best fits for the answer, is most more important.

4. This implies that analysis - and the sifting of knowledge from information - may be far more valuable to invest in than simply improving the flow of unsifted information.
5. KM among the donor and academic communities is usually discussed in terms of its impact on development. However, KM's impact internally on the ability of organizations to meet their targets should not be downplayed; KM can help the success of parliaments, factories, agricultural marketing coops, donors, contractors etc.
6. Donors clearly need KM to get their own internal work done, but KM as a developmental engine must reside, almost by definition, in the hands of the users. These users are not just in the South, but what links them is not the hierarchical perspective generated by the donor-recipient, grantor-grantee relationship, but rather the peer to peer relationship defined by the subject at hand.
7. Donors and countries SHOULD be able to argue that programs that try to upgrade KM as it is used by the public and private sectors are powerful developmental objectives in their own right, and not just internal processes.
8. To be most effective, KM must be driven by the issues and sectors being addressed, not primarily by IT or telecommunications specialists. It might be instructive to look at the makeup of the participants at various KM meetings to see if in fact there is the type of mix that would adequately capture the users' perspectives).
9. That implies that the KM community both among the donors and in the South should embrace, and be integrated with, sectoral specialists or other user needs.
10. Knowledge management is essentially a "flow" and not a "stock" concept, but it's essential that there is also some learning over time. Given the sector focus, this implies that organizations within these sectors maintain an ability to keep, generate and weed knowledge.
11. The public sector, NGOs and donors should embrace the experiences of the corporate world in terms of KM, even if the scale is not necessarily correct.

0-0-0-0

PUTTING UNTAPPED KNOWLEDGE TO USE IN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Masaei Matsunaga, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), Tokyo
Email: massiei@jica.go.jp

1. Japan's international cooperation program can be characterized by two themes: significant involvement of the "domestic sector" of society, and the relatively limited role of those who specialize in foreign aid, such as consultants, expatriates, or NGOs. Government ministries, local governments, and various private organizations primarily engaged in domestic affairs are mobilized on a non-profit and temporal basis to work with Japan's international cooperation program. These organizations are able to offer the knowledge they have gained through the process of modernization and post-war recovery.

They are also able to share their valuable knowledge on current issues with their counterparts in partner countries while also learning from them. Naturally, under Japan's international cooperation program, demand-driven two-way knowledge sharing has a better chance of succeeding than does supply-driven knowledge transfer.

2. Rapid progress in ICT will enable Japan's "domestic sector" to be a more active participant in international cooperation programs. To facilitate this process, JICA has started two major initiatives, namely a knowledge management program and a distance learning program. Both are currently in the final stage of preparation. The former is designed to accumulate knowledge dispersed throughout the "domestic sector". Although the program will start as a closed system to boost the productivity of JICA's operations, at a later stage it might cover several hundreds of partner organizations in developing countries. The latter, tentatively called the "J-net" program, is to introduce distance learning as a serious tool of Japan's technical cooperation. As a part of a comprehensive ICT package announced by the Japanese government at last year's G-8 summit in Okinawa, six distance learning centers—the first batch of thirty such centers—will be put into operation by next spring.

3. It is possible that these two programs will be combined in due course, and that they will transform the modalities of Japan's international cooperation program profoundly. Some expected changes are as follows:

Through the process of developing the content of distance learning, the currently dispersed and underutilized knowledge of society could be systematically researched, compiled, and digitized for international cooperation. The capacity of "domestic-sector" organizations to share their knowledge with foreign counterparts could also be greatly enhanced through this process.

The best resource persons of society, who are simply too busy to travel abroad, could be mobilized to participate in technical cooperation through the distance learning program.

Consequently, the focus of Japan's international cooperation program could be shifted toward the areas of policy and institutions. It could activate knowledge sharing and co-creation between Japan and its partner countries.

Access to Japan's knowledge, which is presently limited to a relatively small number of people (such as project counterparts), could be opened up to a wider circle of people in partner countries. A possible consequence of this may be that old-fashioned trainer training or the "through-the-government" approach might become obsolete.

4. As one of the few societies that have adapted foreign systems and institutions skillfully in the modern era, Japan has a huge store of knowledge that can be shared with developing partners that are struggling to find their own way in this era of globalization. Fortunately, a large part of Japan's international cooperation program is supported by the "domestic sector", which is the primary source of knowledge in society. JICA is committed to making their still largely untapped knowledge available to developing partners so that they can go on to gain further knowledge on their own.

ICT-ENABLED KNOWLEDGE NETWORKING IN THE SOUTH:
FOR EMPOWERMENT AND GOVERNANCE

Vikas Nath, KnowNet Initiative, London School of Economics
Email: V.Nath@lse.ac.uk

The advances in information and communication technology are re-structuring the global social economic equation - shifting from income divide to knowledge divide. By definition, Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) are a diverse set of technological tools to create, disseminate, store, bring value-addition and manage information. Interestingly, ICT, when used as a tool for amalgamating local knowledge incubated by communities with information existing in remote databases and in public domains, heralds the formation of a new class of society – the *Knowledge Society*. Knowledge thereby becomes the fundamental resource for all economic and developmental activities in the knowledge society. The process of synthesis of local knowledge with the global pool of knowledge, with the scope for enrichment, lays the genesis for *Knowledge Networking*.

Knowledge Networking breaks the conventional barriers to the flow of information and knowledge across geographical barriers, between rich and poor, between men and women. It opens up a new way of interactive communication between government bodies, NGOs, academic and corporate institutions, and the civil society. This process enables communities to take appropriate steps to recognise and document the knowledge they possess, and in focusing this knowledge in a wider social domain to bring directed change.

Individuals and communities in developing countries stand to benefit tremendously from the inroads laid by ICT in the domain of knowledge networking. The comparative advantage for developing countries, especially those in the South Asia region, is its richness and diversity of the human resource capital. Creation of knowledge societies starts with the incubation of knowledge in human minds - a process dependent both on the individual and the external environment.

Developing countries need to recognise and value their human resources capital and capitalise on it to the task of amassing wealth of knowledge which works for the poor and promotes social equality. The wealth of knowledge, in turn, will create opportunities for developing countries to emerge from dependence on low-cost labour as a source of comparative advantage, increasing productivity and incomes. Avenues therefore need to be created for knowledge incubation to be supplemented by capacity-building support and enabling policy frameworks which provide opportunities to people to use the power of knowledge for propelling their growth. See KnowNet Initiative at <http://www.knownet.org> which aims to create the capacities of developing countries to benefit from ICT-enabled Knowledge Management and tries to recognise the value of knowledge possessed by them.

The pertinent question is therefore not whether they stand to benefit but how do they benefit and what are the mechanisms to ensure that the benefits accrued in the developing countries do not remain restricted to mere trickle-down effects? At the very conceptual level, ICT enabled knowledge networking has the potential to link each and every individual around the globe in a star topology digital network. This mechanism opens up endless possibilities for knowledge-sharing and could be used by people in creative ways, both to communicate with other people who are online, and also to disseminate

information to people in the outside world who are not online through the use of convergence and hybrid technologies such as community emails, community radio broadcast, tele-centres, newsletters, videos etc. Essentially, this mechanism creates spaces in which communities could overcome the constraints of social seclusion, mobilise resources and support, reach out to new markets, and open up avenues for life-long learning. We could broadly classify the spaces in which knowledge models function or impact under the spheres of Empowerment and Governance.

The empowerment sphere centres around the intrinsic nature of knowledge networking models to be based on the principle of inclusion and participation rather than on the principle of exclusion. Information hosted on the knowledge networks is meant to be in the public domain for open access to all. Knowledge networking leads to distribution of knowledge which in effect leads to redistribution of power in the society. A small shop-owner in Africa has as much right to act over information available on the digital space as a big conglomerate in Europe. There is a free-flow of information. It allows individuals and communities to assimilate knowledge products by collating information from different and alternative sources and adding a local value to it. Knowledge therefore no longer remains confined but gets distributed for concerned action through a continuous process of value-addition and customisation.

The governance sphere is an outcome of the potential of knowledge networking models to function beyond the confines of information flows and emerge as alternate institutional models for developmental promotion. See Digital Governance website at <http://www.digitalgovernance.org> which aims to explore innovative ICT enabled Governance models. By focusing on innovative Knowledge Networking Models, people can broaden the scope of their actions and address issues which were previously beyond their capacity. For example, knowledge networking for influencing decision-making strengthens the democratic processes and brings recognition of the power held by each individual as it enables the decision-making mechanism to be provided to every individual without being confined to the bureaucratic straitjacketed approach of the more formal institutions. These models change the very nature of government–public interface by forcing greater accountability and transparency in the governance processes. Alternative mechanisms to carry out these tasks would take a lot more time, resources and effort.

Knowledge networking models designed for the South thrive on innovations, customisation and people's participation. The stress in the design of these models has so far remained restricted to mere digitisation of available information and automation of processes earlier done manually. This is certainly a welcome step but there is also a need to explore the specific tasks which can only be performed through such models. If an agency takes up innovative approaches to knowledge networking in the area of local governance, e-commerce, e-advocacy, e-income generation activities etc. then there is no limit to the benefits that would accrue to communities in the developing countries. Innovation rather than re-invention is the approach that needs to be followed for setting up knowledge networking models.

KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT FOR DEVELOPMENT ORGANISATIONS

Steve Song, Bellanet International Secretariat, Ottawa
Email: ssong@bellanet.org

The rapid proliferation of information and communication technologies in the last 10 years has dramatically increased our ability to access, share, and disseminate information and to communicate with almost anyone we choose. In the industrialised world, this increased ability has contributed toward an escalation of the pace of change in general. Faster responses and global access have meant that deals can be struck or broken in the time that it once took to send a single letter. Demand for faster reactions was not long in following this emerging potential.

Large corporations were the first to feel this need for more flexibility and faster adaptation to changing markets and situations and, it is from large corporations that the 'practice' of Knowledge Management or KM emerged in the early 1990's. While there are many definitions of KM, we choose to define it as a body of practices and approaches that assists organisations (especially large organisations) in dealing with the increasing pace of change.

In 1999, Bellanet (an organisation whose mission is to promote collaboration and knowledge-sharing within the international development community) began to investigate Knowledge Management as an issue that might have some relevance for international development organisations. In 2000, in collaboration with a number of bilateral and multilateral agencies, Bellanet organised two international workshops on Knowledge Management for Development Organisations (<http://www.bellanet.org/km>). The goal in setting up these workshops was two-fold: to discover the level of interest in and current use of KM by development organisations; and, to see whether lessons learned from applying KM in the corporate world could be germane in a development context.

It emerged from those workshops that:

- most bilateral and multilateral institutions have some sort of Knowledge Management exploration underway;
- most people don't have the same definition for the 'knowledge' let alone 'knowledge management';
- the language of *corporate* KM often doesn't translate well into the development world;
- development organisations that embrace KM see it as having an impact beyond their organisations and are keen to explore how KM may be integrated into development programming;
- development organisations that embrace KM see Communities of Practice as the most effective KM approach.

Because KM refers to such a wide body of approaches and because large software companies have sought to exploit interest in KM by renaming many of their products "Knowledge Management Tools", some people have interpreted KM as yet another technological hammer in search of a nail. This is exacerbated by the fact that (as mentioned above) KM is in some degree a response to technological change.

On the contrary, success stories from organisations implementing KM are mostly to do with changing organisational culture, about valuing individuals, about improving communications. Successful KM strategies emphasise that:

- Knowledge is largely in people's heads;
- Knowledge is largely socially constructed and often highly contextual;
- Knowledge doesn't lend itself easily (if at all) to brute force extraction and codification;
- In attempting to improve knowledge sharing, it is equally important to focus on how knowledge moves within an organisation as opposed to focusing on what knowledge to share; and,
- The best knowledge transfer mechanism is face-to-face contact.

Based on the above, it is easy to see how lessons from the KM world might inform development practice. At Bellanet, it has helped us shift focus away from developing large repositories of knowledge (or what we once called knowledge) to building communities of development practitioners and developing the skills to facilitate knowledge-sharing within those communities. It has helped us to understand that communities themselves are living knowledge repositories that are far more relevant and sustainable than any database.

If widely taken up, this focus on community and on empowering communities of "knowers" could have a significant impact on how development work is carried out. Creating communities where development decisions evolve from broad social interaction would be a positive step towards more balanced decision-making and more effective learning.

CHALLENGES OF SHARING KNOWLEDGE BETWEEN SOUTH AND NORTH

DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION IN EDUCATION AND INFORMATION
SHARING: THE POOR RECORD OF DONORS

KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL AID

A BRIEF HISTORY OF KNOWLEDGE PERSPECTIVES IN JICA

KNOWLEDGE SKILLS, CRAFT AND TRAINING:
THE NORTH-SOUTH CHALLENGE

KNOWLEDGE CAPACITY BUILDING IN SOUTH AFRICA:
GLOBAL AND LOCAL STRATEGIES

BUILDING NORTH-SOUTH KNOWLEDGE CAPACITY

LEARNING IN DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION AS PART OF THE
DEVELOPMENT OF KNOWLEDGE

DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION IN EDUCATION AND INFORMATION SHARING:
THE POOR RECORD OF DONORS

Kilemi Mwiria, KimKam Development Associates, Nairobi
Email: kilemi@aol.net

Now more than ever there is increased expressed interest by donors in involving recipients of their support in the making of decisions related to the design, implementation and evaluation of donor-supported projects. However, it is not clear that donors are any more serious in promoting consultative decision-making than they were before advances in information technology made such processes even more possible. Many of the factors militating against information sharing can be traced to the donor countries and the organizations that represent them in the recipient countries, although African countries do bear some of the blame for this state of affairs. Whether one is looking at the activities of donors at the home country or the national recipient country level, there are enough reasons for one to question the genuineness of their commitment to learning from the recipients of their philanthropy.

May be because most donor agencies are largely staffed by large numbers of career bureaucrats who have limited experience with recipient countries or because these pen pushers are merely following their governments' orders, the home office of the donor country more or less decides what has to be supported. The views of the respective organizations' regional, national and field staff are often of little consequence. In most cases, visiting donor missions call on their field offices and ministries of education almost as a formality. Most consultations that take place are in the form of persuasion. This is the case because most missions only aim at legitimizing donor ideas. In addition to the headquarters' staff, these missions are largely comprised of teams of consultants many of whom are relatively young and inexperienced on third world realities. Some of these individuals portray themselves as brilliant whiz kids, notwithstanding the fact that they often "steal" many local ideas. Because of their condescending attitude in front of their hosts, their ability to access the centers of power in the recipient countries, their mastery of the spoken and written English word and their general projection of an image full of confidence, they tend to be easily convincing to a majority of often polite, sometimes submissive and agreeable government employees. They waste no opportunity to remind their counterparts of "*what we agreed with the Minister*", "*during our meeting with the Cabinet*" "*as the Permanent Secretary for Education agreed with us*", etc. which tactics are meant to get their quick approval of their ideas. Sometimes they are actually not boasting given the well-known fact that some mission leaders and consultants can meet even Heads of State, let alone Cabinet Ministers and Permanent Secretaries, without prior appointments. Unfortunately, such a high level consultative process may have limited effect in situations where middle level personnel are the real movers of government policy.

This approach by donor missions, plus the fact that these teams are in recipient countries for rather brief periods of time contribute to limiting the extent of any informed, two way consultation processes. Thus some very critical decisions, even on local situations are frequently made at Capital cities following an average of two-week consultancy missions. Some are however, made in expensive sea and lakeside resorts,

again rather hastily since these venues have other attractions for visiting and local counterparts. Interestingly, even when those about whom decisions are being made happen to be residing in areas where these meetings are held, they are rarely represented. Even more significant in this era of democratization is the fact that these missions tend to have little or no time for non-governmental stakeholder groups, including religious organizations, NGOs or private educational providers and members of the opposition. What others may be doing is regarded as irrelevant to their own agenda.

In addition to the ministry officials, visiting missions sound out relevant project implementation units' (PIUs) personnel. However, not much frankness could be expected from these donor creations due to the advantaged position of their employees. PIU officials take home several times the salaries paid to their counterparts in the mainstream government departments. PIU employees however, represent only one group of "*compromised*" government employees. Others include upper and mid-echelon leaders and participants in ongoing relatively well-paying donor projects or those promised overseas scholarships or visits. Even the possibility of attending one more workshop is a good enough incentive for some government employees in view of the fact that a one-week per diem can equal their month's salary. Fear of being left out of the next workshop therefore leads to a situation of there being few, if any "*trouble makers*". Sadly, given that many of these officials represent the cream of their respective government departments, their honest views on issues are a big loss to informed project designs and implementation. Even more critical during this era of Information Technology (IT) which donors are constantly reminding governments about, few donors are putting any money into strengthening the IT capacity of government ministries, and/or regional and local level offices. Yet interlinked government departments are more likely to promote enhanced capacity for implementing relevant development projects.

Effective consultation is further limited by the absence of donor coordination in the area of information sharing. And although they have the capacity to do so, they do not do much networking either. Many donor representatives tend to communicate little with their counterparts. This explains why donor coordination remains a major problem more than two decades since it became part of their agenda. Also important is the lack of harmonization of donor funding and reporting procedures. For example, while donors are investing a lot of resources toward the promotion of sector wide approaches (SWAPS) and other sectoral type initiatives having agreed on the need for basket funding, some eventually backtrack on such agreements ostensibly because it is not in keeping with their reporting procedures. Again, little coordination of effort can be expected in these kinds of situations. But duplication of efforts is often compounded by the generally poor institutional memory among the donor groups. The inability of donor representatives to locate even their own past reports is a very well known fact, never mind the kinds of resources spent to support donor documentation systems. Where such reports exist, such as those generated at the conclusion of visiting missions, they are mainly circulated among the donor organizations and rarely to the relevant government departments. The extreme situation is where donor organizations do not get back in touch at all with relevant government officials regarding the likely action to be taken by the supporting donor organization.

Finally, it is now common knowledge that many of the "blueprints" emanating from organizations such as the World Bank are not subjected to any serious scrutiny by governments for whom they are written or targeted. Instead, a network of international civil servants, consultants and scholars are asked to comment on drafts prepared by donor agency staff or consultants they are subjected to commentary through international conferences and journals, all of which are not accessible to those constituencies most affected by the proposed reforms. Nevertheless, one has to come to terms with the fact that discussions with stakeholder groups can be quite resource and time consuming. However, some minimum level of such meetings cannot be avoided.

Donor representation in the recipient countries does not necessarily promote a better climate for consulting with the recipient government and other officials. This is because many of these representatives will take little, if any initiative, perceiving their role more as that of supportive staff to the home office bosses, to which most owe their appointments. Despite the fact that in some cases, field staff are not necessarily answerable to headquarter staff, they often treat the latter with reverence because they can negatively influence perceptions of the programs over which field staff preside as well as themselves personally and professionally in the headquarter circles. Few field staff are willing to risk such an eventuality because of the many privileges they enjoy in the recipient countries. The same insecurity may explain their tending to flatter the ruling elites in the countries where they are based and explains somewhat what appears to be lack of courage to challenge these elites even when they are clearly in the wrong with regard to their actions or pronouncements on donor supported projects. For example, few donor representatives are willing to make a case for cost sharing openly, if they believe that those in power in the recipient countries are not supportive of such reforms, this stance is more for political survival reasons rather than professional considerations. Likewise, few if any field donor staff will dare interact with those seen to be opponents of those in power even when such opponents are in agreement with donor stands on say transparency in governance. There is simply too much to be lost.

Enhanced consultations with locals by donor field staff is limited by the fact that field staff are tied to administrative responsibilities revolving around preparing for visiting missions, including scheduling their meetings with governments, organizing hotel accommodation and field trips, and their own routine meetings with senior government officials. This leaves them with little time to understand the local situation outside the center especially given that there is always a supply of local consultants to gather some of the information they need. Even the more interested field staff, however, are handicapped by their inability to communicate in local languages. This greatly proscribes their capacity to seek the views of the most disadvantaged groups for whom they claim to be speaking. The presence in some field offices of local professional staff does not appear to make much difference, as many such officers have been made more or less assistants to the international staff. In many cases, the views of these staff are regularly overlooked, so much so that many such staff resign from their jobs out of frustration. An additional barrier to improved consultation is that meetings in field offices are frequently conducted in the languages of the donor countries to the utter neglect of the locals who may have limited or no capacity to communicate in the language of the donor countries. This is particularly the case where the donor is not from English or French speaking countries.

The commercialization of development aid has placed additional obstacles in the way of information sharing. This is particularly the case where donor organizations work through contracting private, profit-making companies to implement their development projects. Sometimes these companies use their prior experience and contacts with donors and recipient countries to initiate projects for which they stand to gain a higher profit despite their not being priorities in the countries for which they are to be implemented. In their search for profits, many of these consulting companies go directly to potential donors and promote projects, which they then come to sell to governments. The consultation processes, which take place under these circumstances, are much less than the formalized ones, which can result in insider deals, even where there was supposed to be an "open" bidding process.

Knowledge sharing is further restricted by the unwillingness of missions and local donor staff to benefit from research conducted by universities and NGOs that are not supported by them. Reference to university research outputs and gray literature from NGOs and the use of university staff as resource persons for donor work is much less common than that of international consultants and donor literature. In fact, some donor personnel tend to be distrustful of locally generated data even where they happen to be the ones who have supported its information system design and its collection or when there is really no more reliable database. Even where there are research-coordinating committees in ministries of education, these are rarely consulted by donors and often dismissed as incompetent, even in cases where the locals manning these committees may have been recipients of advanced degrees from the donor countries. Where they need research data, donors are quick to sponsor their own projects irrespective of the availability of similar data elsewhere. They often see this as an opportunity to contract for duplicate research to be done by donors or contract agency researchers. In situations where donors are looking for quick fix type solutions, there is not much effort put in state of the art reviews of available literature and sometimes it looks like "*the problem is one of spending money and not how much money is available for the task*". Regrettably, universities and smaller NGOs do not themselves do enough to get their research efforts and capacities known to potential users including governments, despite the income generation potential of some of these initiatives.

National workshops have traditionally been important avenues for promoting information sharing on new and completed donor initiatives. Unfortunately, workshops have sometimes been turned into personal income generation opportunities by civil servants and university academics that have also "*to alleviate their own poverty*". As a result, some donors are shying away from using them for introducing or disseminating findings on project successes or failures. Regrettably, fewer workshops also mean less consultation especially because they are one of the few ways of having a captive audience of key government officials. In any case, the average cost of \$5000 to \$10,000 for most such gatherings pales in comparison to the hundreds of thousands expended on often poorly informed international, and all too often second class consultants. It is mainly due to limited consultation that many proposed policies, especially the more sensitive ones such those relating to cost sharing initiatives, have failed to win the support of the majority of those directly affected by their implementation, including students and their parents. Similarly, teacher reform efforts also fail largely because there is little attempt made to organize consensus-building

meetings with those likely to be affected by these reforms. A major oversight on the part of donors promoting fiscal austerity programs therefore is working only through governments as if these are the only (or even more important) ones with a vested interest in their implementation or lack of it.

0-0-0-0

KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL AID

Jandhyala B G Tilak, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration,
New Delhi

E-mail: jtilak@vsnl.com [or] j_Tilak@hotmail.com

International aid is not a new phenomenon. Aid for education is also not new. Many developed countries, international organisations, and developing countries have been involved in the 'education aid-business' for several decades. The recent interest in 'knowledge-based aid' presupposes that most aid policies until now have been not necessarily knowledge-based. One may get rightly such a feeling, noting the adoption of same kind of methodologies, framework, terms, conditions, aide memoires, reviews, appraisals, reappraisals, pre-determined policy prescriptions, etc., in the aid programmes, whether the programmes are in Sub-Saharan Africa, or in South East Asia or South Asia or Latin America and whether they refer to energy, power, infrastructure or education, health or poverty. . So while aid is not new, *knowledge based aid* may sound new. The realization of the need for knowledge-based aid is new and important.

The base of the knowledge of various aid organisations is highly uneven. Some of the international aid organizations are not necessarily knowledge-building or learning institutions. For example, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the African Development Bank, etc., are primarily lending organizations. For them lending is not an instrument of learning; in fact, it is the other way round. It may be too much to expect these lending organisations to become 'Knowledge Banks' or 'learning organisations.' On the other hand, there are some organizations, which are not primarily lending organizations. They may provide various types of assistance – monetary or technical, including research -- to developing countries. For example, UNICEF, UNDP, UNESCO etc. are those that can be considered as having more interest in learning and building a knowledge base. The third group of organisations such as CIDA, SIDA, SDC, JICA, ODA/DFID, and DSE, may try to balance their interests in aid and learning. Sometimes they may take more interest in lending, and sometimes more in research and development and thereby in learning.

On the whole, developing countries might judge that many of these aid (more particularly lending) organizations rarely learn from their experiences; they know very little about developing countries; and refuse to learn much from developing countries. This may be because of the familiar arrogance of the aid organizations that knowledge transfer is necessarily a one-way transaction – from the aid organizations or developed countries to developing countries. The aid organisations are thus viewed as "anti-learning" in nature

and culture. Similarly aid organisations may think that there is no knowledge base existing in developing countries, or if there is, it is insignificant and not much useful.

A good and sound knowledge base is important not just for aid organizations, but also for the aid receiving developing countries. It is critically important for both. The costs of having no strong knowledge base could be serious for aid organizations in terms of inefficient, uneconomic or unviable investments of monetary resources. But the costs for the developing countries could be far more serious in terms of social, economic and political dimensions. Hence developing countries should be more concerned about building up their knowledge base on aid policies, mechanisms and their impact.

Therefore, governments may have to assume a more important role in building a critical, sound and sustainable knowledge base, as the risks involved are higher for them. International organizations may supplement, and can only supplement, the efforts of the domestic governments. Developing countries may be in a better position to develop critical, useful and relevant knowledge bases than foreign countries or international aid organizations. As the World Bank also admitted in the *World Development Report* (1999), "it is knowledge created in developing countries themselves that usually is most important."

International cooperation in the area of research takes several forms, important ones of which can be noted as: (a) research by the international organisations, (b) funding of research to be conducted by native researchers and research organisations; and (c) joint or collaborative research. Research of type (a) is largely conducted by the international organisations themselves, and/or through consultants hired by the international organizations. International cooperation in research, particularly in the area of education development and policy, which largely takes the form of research by consultants may actually displace public funding of research. It also sets new research agendas. The short term needs and compulsions of international research also contribute to negating the value of long-term research on the one hand, and to the building of sustainable capacities of the universities and research institutions, on the other. As a corollary to research conducted or sponsored by international organisations, domestic research generally gets devalued. The devaluation of local research is influence not only by the international organisations, but also by the local governments and research community in the country. There can also be a great shift in the research paradigm: research may no longer mean the creation of knowledge or a search for absolute truths, as espoused by long traditions in research in sciences --social and physical sciences; it may be more concerned with pragmatic aspects of feasibility. Research on how to do (know-how) replaces intellectual and academic research. The distinction between information and research becomes very thin. A large part of research conducted under the framework of evaluations has contributed to this phenomenon. Despite all this, international organisations can play an important and positive role in helping developing countries to build a strong and sustainable knowledge base.

While international cooperation is very important, developing countries should make serious efforts in developing and strengthening their own research. They can stimulate more critical, objective and socially relevant research, promoting research in universities

and institutions of higher education, developing networks of universities and research institutions within countries and outside, and through sound and meaningful policies of funding research. In short, based on the principle of comparative advantage, it can be suggested that knowledge development should be the main responsibility of governments in developing countries, while knowledge management could be the task of the international aid organisations.

O-O-O-O

A BRIEF HISTORY OF KNOWLEDGE PERSPECTIVES IN JICA

Keiichi Kato, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) Tokyo
Email: k-kato@jica.go.jp

- In the process of national modernization after the Meiji Restoration in 1868, Japan invited 850 foreigners who made a tremendous contribution, developing legal systems, training human resources in various sectors for the purpose of catching up with the European countries. Japan has also had the experience of receiving humanitarian aid such as food and other basic necessities after World War II. And with loans from World Bank, Japan developed the vital part of economic infrastructures. Japan's ODA has deep roots in such past experiences.
- JICA, as the implementing organization of Technical Cooperation of Japan's ODA programs, has been consistently supporting human resources development, creation of social and economic infrastructure, and national development to permit the autonomous and sustainable development of developing countries. This has gone along with the basis of support, with the encouragement of self-help, and with contribution to human resources development. Aid has had a real use to people as well as strengthening the country-specific approach. Our motto is human development, national development, and bringing people together, - thus people have center stage in JICA's cooperation.
- Technical training in Japan is the basis of JICA's operation and this aims to transfer specialized knowledge and technology. Fields of training cover a very broad spectrum, ranging from know-how such as business administration, quality control, and environmental administration, to technologies such as construction engineering. Training in all these fields is provided at JICA's International Centers throughout Japan. Through the cooperation of national and regional public bodies, private research/training centers, universities and other institutions, it has proved possible to support more than 100,000 people. This has really become a nation-wide network, working and thinking together.
- Since JICA has many programs as tools of technical cooperation, it has sought to implement those which are carefully designed and related with each other. The intention is that all the roads to reaching human resources development of partner countries should be explored and be coordinated.

Taking a general view of the world today, the rapidly changing international situation has resulted in the emergence of new aid requirements involving peace building, transfer to the market economy, environment, HIV/AIDS, poverty and so forth. Globalization which is leading with the support of Information and Communication Technology is going on but at the same time there are new planning approaches such as sector wide approaches, the comprehensive development framework/ poverty reduction strategy papers which are another feature of the aid community. In order to meet with the current requirements, JICA has implemented organizational reforms to deal with each of the problems peculiar to specific countries and regions by finding the appropriate path of development applicable in each case.

Furthermore, as a part of knowledge management, JICA is expecting to commence very soon the sector and issue-wise network to integrate necessary knowledge and information to cover not only JICA itself but also communities outside of JICA, including overseas experts and volunteers. We have also organized working groups for the purpose of operational and organizational reforms. This should further strengthen the country and region specific approaches, result-oriented operation, integration of all available knowledge and information, recruitment of qualified personnel, decentralization and efficiency. It should speed up people's participation. There are 7 taskforces consisting of JICA staff involved, and new ideas and suggestions have been forthcoming. All these efforts are still continuing.

0-0-0-0

**KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, CRAFT AND TRAINING:
THE NORTH-SOUTH CHALLENGE**

Pravina Khilnani King, African Studies, Edinburgh
Email: P.King@ed.ac.uk

Looking at a different sphere of knowledge and skill than that which is covered in the usual accounts of knowledge-and-skill-for-development may provide us with a different lens on the issues. The examples are drawn from the world of the crafts/arts.

Unlike knowledge-and-skills-for-development programmes – whose starting assumptions are that the South has a deficit of knowledge and skills – in the world of the crafts/arts, the South cannot be characterised as waiting for Northern assistance in order to become 'developed'. The South clearly does not have a skills deficit in the arts/crafts sphere.

Nevertheless, despite an essential symmetry in crafts/arts expertise between practitioners in the North and the South, the return on the skills and finished products of the South suffers the same negative terms of trade as if they were unprocessed raw materials. Despite fair trade initiatives, Southern arts/crafts go for a song, while Northern arts/crafts are generally marketed in specialist boutiques/galleries.

The pathways to crafts/arts expertise are diverse, whether in the North or the South. They can encompass combinations of the formal and the informal, family-based and college-based approaches. The role of the formal school, however, in both supporting and eroding skills and crafts is worth underlining.

ICTs offer dramatic opportunities to market and even exhibit crafts/arts at a distance. But there is potentially a major digital divide here, since the Northern crafts/arts can utilise the existing IT facilities of museums, exhibitions and e-commerce, while the Southern crafts/arts sphere remains largely unconnected.

O-O-O-O

**KNOWLEDGE CAPACITY BUILDING IN SOUTH AFRICA:
BOTH GLOBAL AND LOCAL STRATEGIES**

Adrienne Bird, Department of Labour, Pretoria, South Africa
Email:Adrienne.Bird@labour.gov.za

One of the challenges faced by the newly democratic South Africa was to bring new staff into government departments, especially those who had been involved in the struggle against Apartheid. Such people did not, by definition, bring years of experience to the work of government administration. Hence new, often intelligent and committed, but inexperienced people found themselves working with procedures and systems that were far from second nature. This would have been difficult enough, but this situation was overlaid with a complete overhaul of the legislative architecture of the society. There is barely a single area of government policy that has not been changed since 1994.

At the same time the country as a whole was experiencing a massive brain drain. In an article published in the South African *Sunday Times* newspaper, on 25 March 2001, the Central Bureau of Statistics was quoted as saying: "as many as 1.6 million people in skilled, professional and managerial professions have left the country since 1994, and at least one in every five South Africans with a tertiary education now lives abroad. The cost of this mass exodus is believed to be about R2.5-billion a year." There is little point in trying to put obstacles in the way of skilled and professional people from selling their "human capital" to the highest bidder - as there are likely to be unintended consequences such as a net increase in their exodus or a lower private investment in education and training. Rather, there are other ways in which the state can intervene to achieve outcomes which enhance the position of the poor.

Indeed, the South African government has undertaken a range of measures on both the supply-side and the demand-side to try to address the problem of skills shortage, for example:

- A strong focus on general education for all;
- Doctors are now required to complete a period of compulsory community training in the rural areas following their training, an expansion of this programme to other areas of professional training is being explored;
- Immigration Laws are currently being changed to make it easier for companies to import scarce skills into the country;
- A Skills Development levy / grant system has been introduced to stimulate the demand for skills, promote and resource the upgrading of the current workforce and increase levels of training for new entrants and re-entrants in the private sector. The public sector is required to spend no less than the private sector on its staff upgrading;
- A changed university funding formula is being introduced to promote education and training in disciplines where skills are scarce;
- Restructuring of the university landscape - through mergers and collaborative arrangements as well as a promotion of distance and open learning strategies.
- A new bursary scheme is being designed to further promote scarce skills training and partnerships with leading multinational corporations will be promoted.
- An increased focus on research and innovation support for economic growth and social development.
- The South African Network of Skills Abroad (see *NORRAG News* December 2000).

In addition to these measures the government has recently announced a national Human Resources Development Strategy with clear targets and timeframes. There are five strategic objectives each with a set of indicators. The strategic objectives are:

- Improving the foundations for human development (early childhood development, general schooling, adult basic education and maths and science are the focus)
- Improving the supply of high-quality skills (particularly scarce skills) which are more responsive to societal and economic needs
- Increasing employer participation in lifelong learning
- Supporting employment growth through industrial policies, innovation, research and development
- Ensuring that the four pillars of the HRD strategy are linked.

In addition to these objectives, there are five priority areas which have been identified for immediate action. These are: promotion of scarce skills (immigration strategies as well as increased education and training in these areas); public sector skills for service delivery; adult basic education and training; learnerships (new apprenticeship system) across a wider range of intermediate skills) and promotion of small businesses. The achievement of the stated objectives will require extensive co-ordination across government departments. And these initiatives need to be seen in the context of broader social and economic initiatives for growth which go beyond the purposes of this discussion.

President Mbeki has also launched the Millennium African Renaissance Programme - known as MAP. If this initiative is successful it holds the promise of stemming the reduction of aid to Africa and beginning a new world discourse on the relationship between aid and trade - for surely the central argument is that it is in the North's best

commercial interests to see Africa emerge from the post-colonial and neo-colonial periods and grow into a meaningful market for manufactured goods and valuable services from the North - and to do this it must be helped to overcome the digital, disease, demand and debt divides and grow a viable economic base of its own.

The support the Department of Labour has received over the last two years from the European Union for its Labour Market Skills Development Programme (LMSDP), is an illustration of how such a partnership could be structured. The LMSDP seeks to simultaneously put in place new structures, systems and procedures to implement the new skills development strategy as well as develop the capacity of staff to manage and monitor these as they unfold. This process, based on a longer term partnership, is one which takes time but which promises to greatly enrich capacity.

0-0-0-0

BUILDING NORTH-SOUTH KNOWLEDGE CAPACITY

Ingemar Gustafsson, Sida, Stockholm
Email: Ingemar.Gustafsson@sida.se

This paper provides some personal reflections on the issue of capacity building, based mainly on a review made within Sida that resulted in a new policy for capacity development.⁽¹⁾ The first lesson from the review is that capacity development means different things to different people, inside and outside Sida. This is hardly surprising but has made it necessary to develop a simple conceptual framework. It was found that Sida's work could be grouped under three broad headings that represent different phases.

The notion that capacity development is about knowledge and about learning has been there since the 1960s. This was the original concept on which a lot of technical assistance has been based over the years. Within Sida there was a gradual shift in the late 1970s towards capacity development as organisational development. The concept of twinning replaced recruitment and financing of individual experts. There is evidence now to suggest that wonderful things may happen as a result of such partnerships but also that twins are often twins only by name. When Sida was beginning to see that twinning is not a panacea, the analytical perspective shifted towards institutional frameworks, such as laws and policies. Were they supportive of the kind of capacity that Sida tried to develop? This trend came in the beginning of the 1990s in the aftermath of the structural adjustment programmes. In practice all these concepts and approaches coexist. Sida's current understanding is that the question of knowledge capacity has to be understood in a broad sense. The building of a a critical mass of professional educators and researchers is not enough.

Systematic and long term support to national systems of education and research are the necessary base for knowledge capacity. Only then can individuals, institutions and countries benefit from the international knowledge base. In practice this implies that the

balance between short term and project-related training programmes and long term systemic change should be redressed.

Learning is still at the heart of knowledge capacity. Experience shows that the analysis has to start from what exists and strengthen it. Learning should be looked at more as an exchange process than a simple transfer of knowledge from those who have to those who have not. In this situation, the role of outside agencies like Sida changes from being providers of expertise to that of dialogue partners and facilitators of mutual learning and exchange of experience.

1. Sida's policy: Capacity development as a strategic question in development co-operation

0-0-0-0

LEARNING IN DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION AS PART OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF KNOWLEDGE

Lennart Wohlgemuth, Nordic Africa Institute, Uppsala
Email: Lennart.Wohlgemuth@nai.uu.se

Knowledge is created in many ways such as through formal and informal education and practical experience. But, is this knowledge actually used, and in what way? This is the question discussed in this paper. The discussion is, in part, based on the anthology *Learning in Development Co-operation* edited by Jerker Carlsson and Lennart Wohlgemuth (2000).

Background

The discussion on aid effectiveness is closely related to the issue of learning in development co-operation. Do aid agencies and their counterparts learn from their experiences and, if they do, is this knowledge fed back into improved practices? A range of studies published in the late 1980s and 1990s about aid effectiveness came to different conclusions as to whether aid worked or not. There seemed, however, to be at least one consensus: that there was little solid knowledge about the impact of aid and the extent to which the organisations involved on both sides of development co-operation learned from their experience. Learning in development co-operation is more or less virgin territory for organisational research, in contrast to the significant body of research on organisational learning in general.

The above mentioned anthology approaches the issue of learning from the perspective of the aid practitioners themselves. Therefore, a number of people with long experience of working with development aid, inside and outside donor and recipient agencies were asked to present their personal reflections and ideas about learning. They were free to approach the subject the way they felt most relevant, but focus on some of the basic learning issues: How do we learn? What do we learn? From which sources do we learn? What do we do with our knowledge? The results of their efforts are collected in the

volume, consisting of 16 cases, ranging from rural China to the World Bank machinery and one introduction/summary by the editors. Inevitably, there is a wide variation between the contributions as to approach and way of writing. It is hoped that such a personal and narrative approach will make the topic more accessible to a wider audience.

What is learning?

Learning is commonly associated with a change in how we understand and interpret the reality that surrounds us. From the perspective of development co-operation, learning is not a purely intellectual phenomenon, but a process that is linked to a change of practice. It is not enough to identify a problem and propose a solution. The solution must be put into practice before learning can occur. This raises the interesting issue about the relationship between organisational and individual learning. Organisations can be said to learn if knowledge based on past experience is incorporated in organisational skills, procedures and cultures. Such processes reflect organisational interests, structures, functions and decision-making contexts.

The focus of the book is both on the learning of individuals and how structures, processes and cultures of aid agencies and their counterparts in developing countries fail or succeed in creating conditions that are conducive to individual learning.

Major constraints to learning in development co-operation

Development co-operation has changed considerably in terms of policy and practice over the last 15 years. In some cases change is a result of lessons learned and in other cases it is a result of agencies reacting to external changes to the best of their ability. It emerges from the case studies in the book, that learning in the field of development co-operation takes place and is indeed possible, but clearly not always to the extent that could be hoped. Five factors are singled out as particularly prominent constraints:

- Political constraints. Political objectives and guidelines are frequently changed. Aid agencies are constantly approached by various interest groups. There is incompatibility between aid and other interests. Broad-based political support of aid policies and procedures is necessary. Equally important is coherence between different government policies. The mixed signals that the staff of aid agencies sometimes receives are confusing and reduce the scope for effective learning.
- The unequal nature of the aid relationship, which, among other things, makes it difficult for the recipient party to challenge views and analyses of the donor, and reduces the chance of developing and incorporating local knowledge.
- Problems internal to the organisation of the aid agency. Sometimes aid agencies have no clear and focussed sense of mission. When staff members are uncertain of objectives, mandates and missions, learning becomes weak. Another aspect is the multi-faceted nature of development aid. An aid agency today resembles the old-fashioned department store, catering to every human need imaginable. Learning also becomes difficult when there is a high centralisation of management and when feedback systems are weak. A psychological constraint is many people's reluctance to take in information that challenges their basic assumptions. "It worked in Peru"-syndrome, as one of the contributors calls it. Resistance to change is also fuelled by

the existence of vested interests by influential stakeholders, inside and outside aid agencies.

- Weaknesses in the organisations and capacities on the recipient side. Local stakeholders are often organisationally weak and so is the communication between various organisations and parts of agencies. This reduces the prospects for effective learning. Another constraining factor is the bias towards using foreign experts, not only by aid agencies, but also by decision-makers on the receiving side. In some countries, this tendency has grown into becoming a systemic problem. Low remuneration levels and unattractive working conditions make it difficult to retain qualified people. Weak education systems in many countries make the creation of new qualified staff difficult.
- Sources of knowledge and the low quality of information. Evaluations are often "donor-centric", difficult to access, particularly for local stakeholders, they rarely provide information about impact and aid effectiveness, and their recommendations are often too general and lack concreteness.

Suggestions for improvement

Possible actions that could improve learning, according to the authors of the book, would be to avoid too frequent changes of aid objectives and guidelines, as well as micro-management of the aid relationship by politicians. Furthermore, there has to be coherence between various government policies, otherwise the result is confusion about the purpose of aid, which in turn makes effective learning difficult.

The unequal nature of the aid relationship is an issue, which runs through most of the chapters of the book and emerges as one of the major constraints for learning in developing co-operation. Therefore, a major re-thinking of the current mode of operation of aid is necessary.

The organisation of the aid agencies needs to be modified in several important aspects. The staff must understand clearly the objectives, mandate and mission. The incentive structure should be changed to, as much as possible, reflect the objectives of the projects and programmes they are handling. Learning across the organisation would also be facilitated with a decentralised management structure. There are no quick fixes in development co-operation, but a need for flexibility, humility and a long-term perspective.

The organisations and capacities on the recipient side possess several weaknesses. They need to consider the impact of aid interventions on institution and capacity building more carefully. One important factor is to retain the services of the qualified staff that is already available.

The quality of the information has to be improved. Evaluations must be more "recipient-centric" and local knowledge better recognised. Evaluations analysing impact and aid effectiveness should be made more frequently. In general, a stronger emphasis should be placed on the evaluation process as a source of learning, rather than on the final product - the evaluation report.

Conclusions

One factor running through the discussion above and which should be emphasised and taken into account is the question of ownership of the entire development process to which development co-operation is related and should be only an auxiliary phenomenon. Ownership is an expression of power in a relationship and cannot be "given" to one of the parties. It must be "taken", and it is therefore an active process and a dynamic concept. It requires that learning and knowledge take place in the locality where development is supposed to occur and the role of donors and/or funders should at best be to assist in developing that active localised learning.

Experience from more than 40 years of development co-operation does, however, not offer much optimism when it comes to the translation of these evident conclusions into practice. "Help" very quickly leads to "concerned participation" by donors followed by active involvement, too often taking over the process without really being responsible in a political sense for either the process or the outcome. Years of crises and the remedies to these crises have strengthened the donors' involvement in activities that really should be the responsibility of the recipients. This has in turn led to diminished self-confidence in many of the worst affected countries, a fact making it even more difficult for them to "grab" the ownership.

However difficult, this question has to be tackled head on if any real development is going to take place. As regards the recipients it will require considerable effort to get their act together. There will need to be continuity and the creation of incentives for local available skills and in particular there will need to be time given and opportunities to take over initiatives and processes on all levels. For donors it will require considerable change in attitude allowing the development of local knowledge as well as allowing recipients to take over initiatives and processes on all levels, all requiring patience and humility.

RETHINKING THE KNOWLEDGE UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITIES AS SITES OF LOCAL AND
GLOBAL KNOWLEDGE (RE)PRODUCTION

TERTIARY EDUCATION IN THE 21 CENTURY –
NEW CHALLENGES

RECONSTRUCTING A VISION FOR
HIGHER EDUCATION IN AFRICA

RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT IN THE “SOUTH” IN THE ERA OF THE
INTERNATIONALISATION IN EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

UNIVERSITIES AND NATIONAL KNOWLEDGE-BASED DEVELOPMENT
AN ALTERNATIVE TO A GLOBAL KNOWLEDGE BANK

José-Luis Coraggio, Universidad Nacional de General Sarmiento, Buenos Aires
Email: jlcoraggio@fibertel.com.ar

The paper is critical of the new World Bank vision: to become a global Knowledge Bank. This initiative to centralize the main resource for development is considered inconsistent with endogenous development processes, where conceptualization, information gathering and dialectical practice must go hand in hand and take place in the field itself. The way "best practices" had been selected and presented, to "synthesize" and disseminate development knowledge throughout the "developing world" is seen as wrong and doomed to failure. Complex dialectical processes cannot be represented as information bits to suggest universal formulas for replicable action.

The relationship between knowledge/information control and asymmetric power relationships is also brought to the discussion. The Bank initiative appears functional to the ongoing process of primitive accumulation of local knowledge by global capital. This initiative is considered to be coherent with the free market ideology that sees privatization, commodification and competition as the most efficient arrangement for the management of every human activity -development included.

Knowledge societies are mainly learning-by-doing societies. This reinforces the need of local knowledge-based development actors, culturally rooted and directly involved in endogenous development processes, with learning/teaching and communicating abilities so as to ensure proper action-reflection-action collective processes.

The author argues that, instead of a central knowledge bank, alienated from concrete local processes, universities and other centers of development based in the South can play a meaningful and unsubstitutable role in this endeavor. But this would require that most of those institutions undergo important internal changes and that they network and work cooperatively, taking advantage of the conditions and opportunities created by the new knowledge-based technological paradigm.

Such networks would play a number of functions: generate systematic and critical knowledge, mediate between different local experiences, bring general knowledge about social and natural processes to bear in specific situations, provide methodologies to facilitate learning-by-doing in the local and national public sphere. They can also introduce new generations into the complex practice of becoming aware of social realities and changing them for the better. Another key role for universities should be to foresee different long-term scenarios for development, help social and political actors to set a proper agenda, and provide a pluralistic space for strategic dialogue detached from sheer interest and immediate conflict.

All this requires that universities and intellectuals assume general interests as their own interest, beyond their own corporate, self-reproductive goals, transforming themselves as part of the development process, establishing new proactive relations with old and new social actors.

**TERTIARY EDUCATION REFORM IN THE TWENTY FIRST CENTURY:
CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES**

Jamil Salmi, World Bank, Washington
Email: Jsalmi@worldbank.org

Imagine a university without buildings or classrooms or even a library. Imagine a university ten thousand miles away from its students, delivering on-line programs or offering its courses through franchise institutions overseas. Imagine a university without academic departments, without required courses or majors or grades. Imagine a college proposing a bachelor's degree in Individualized Studies or in Interdisciplinary Studies. Imagine a degree valid only for five years after graduation. Imagine a higher education system where institutions are ranked not by the quality of their teachers, but by the intensity of electronic wiring and the degree of Internet connectivity. Imagine a country whose main export earnings come from the sale of higher education services. Imagine a socialist country that charges tuition fees to obtain full cost recovery in public higher education.

These evocations are not images of science fiction, but actual stories of a revolution in the world of higher education on the eve of the twenty first century. The higher education sector around the world has become increasingly dynamic in its delivery of services, management and administration.

Indeed, in the past few years, many countries have witnessed significant transformations and reforms. But the tertiary education landscape is not changing as fast everywhere. At Oxford University, New College is a venerable sixteenth century institution. The oldest university of the American continent, the Autonomous University of Santo Domingo in the Dominican Republic, is about to collapse under the pressure of its 80,000 students crowding facilities originally designed to accommodate only 6,000 students. The largest university in the world, the National Autonomous University of Mexico, has been paralyzed since April 1999 by a strike over the Rector's decision to increase tuition fees by the equivalent of 140 US dollars. In this rapidly evolving world, what is likely to happen to those higher education institutions which are not willing or able to change?

There are three major, intertwined new challenges which bear heavily on the role and functions of higher education: (i) economic globalization, which forces countries and firms to compete in the international economy, (ii) the growing importance of knowledge as a factor of economic growth, and (iii) the information and communication revolution, which has radically transformed the capacity to store, transmit and use information. In this context, developing economies have tremendous opportunities for catching up with the industrialized nations. But only a handful --particularly East Asian countries-- are succeeding in significantly narrowing the gap. These countries' positive experience with respect to technological and economic development appears to be linked to the ability to acquire and apply new knowledge. The basic components of these capabilities are skilled people, knowledge institutions, knowledge networks, and well-developed information and communication infrastructures. Tertiary education institutions, as knowledge institutions, play a critical role in the creation and transmission of knowledge, and the

training of a competitive workforce and of political and business leaders. Also, university research and development (R&D) activities translate into technical support to and product innovation for the private and public sectors.

What are the implications of the new challenges for tertiary education? They herald (i) radical changes in training needs, (ii) new forms of competition, and (iii) new configurations and modes of operation for higher education institutions. As for training needs, a trend towards higher and different skills has been observed in OECD countries and in the most advanced developing economies. There is also the growing importance of continuing education because of the necessity to update knowledge and skills on a regular basis. The traditional approach of studying once for all before moving on to one's professional life is being progressively replaced by practices of lifelong education. The primary clientele of universities will not be anymore young high school graduates. Universities will have to organize themselves to accommodate the learning and training needs of a very diverse clientele: working students, mature students, part-time students, day students, night students, weekend students, leading to a significant change in the demographic shape of tertiary education institutions.

The acceleration of scientific and technological progress is resulting in the diminished emphasis, in tertiary education programs, on the acquisition of knowledge of facts and basic data *per se* and the growing importance of methodological knowledge and skills. In this new paradigm, where learning to learn is more important than memorizing specific information, primacy is given to information search and analytical skills and to reasoning and problem-solving skills. Competencies such as learning to work in teams, peer teaching, creativity, resourcefulness and the ability to adjust to change are also among the new skills to which employers seem to put worth in the knowledge economy.

The third dimension of new training needs is the growing attractiveness of university degrees with an international application. In a global economy where firms produce for overseas markets and compete with foreign firms in their own domestic markets, there is a rising demand for internationally recognized qualifications, especially in management-related fields. In the US, a rapidly growing number of online universities are reaching out to students in foreign countries. Jones International University, for instance, which already serves students in 38 countries, is the first online university in the world that has been formally accredited by the same agency that accredits traditional universities like the University of Michigan or the University of Chicago. The Mexican equivalent of MIT, the Technology Institute of Monterey, has established a Virtual University with 26 campuses throughout Mexico and 20 branches all over Latin America. In Asia and Eastern Europe, there has been a proliferation of so-called overseas validated courses offered by franchise institutions on behalf of British and Australian universities.

More generally, the decreased importance of physical distance means that the best universities of any country can open a branch anywhere in the world or reach out across borders using the Internet, effectively competing with any national university on its own territory. The University of Phoenix, one of the most dynamic new distance universities in the US, already boasts an enrollment of 60,000 students. In the US alone, there are already more than 3,800 institutions offering online training.

The emergence of these new forms of competition is likely to change the nature of quality assurance mechanisms and criteria. At the level of individual institutions, for example, it is doubtful that the principles and standards routinely applied to evaluate or accredit campus-based programs can be used to assess the quality and effectiveness of online courses without significant adjustments. At the national level, countries need to develop information systems and participate in international networks to be able to evaluate the quality of the foreign programs offered to their students through franchise institutions or online.

Faced with the new training needs and the new competitive challenges, many universities need to undertake drastic transformations in terms of governance, structure and modes of operation. A key aspect is the ability to organize traditional disciplines differently, accommodating the emergence of new fields like molecular biology and biotechnology, advanced materials science, microelectronics, information systems, robotics, intelligent systems and neuroscience, and environmental science. Training for these fields requires the integration of a number of disciplines across traditional institutional barriers. For example, the study of molecular devices and sensors brings together specialists in electronics, materials science, chemistry and biology.

The use of modern technology has just begun to revolutionize the way teaching and learning occur. The concurrent use of multimedia and computers permits the development of pedagogical approaches involving active and interactive learning. Frontal teaching can be replaced by asynchronous teaching through scheduled or self-paced online classes. In Australia, the University of Newcastle has been a pioneer in the use of a problem-learning approach in medical school.

The information and communication revolution will have far-reaching implications for how universities are organized. Already in the United States a new university was built without a library because all students are expected to use computers to access online libraries and data bases. Wiring is becoming an important determinant of the attractiveness of a tertiary education institution. This is reflected by the recent publication, for the second consecutive year, of the results of a ranking survey which assesses US universities on the basis of their computer and communication infrastructure and level of internet use for pedagogical and administrative purposes. Case Western Reserve University and MIT are the 1999 leaders in applying online services on campus. But university leaders must keep in mind the high cost of information technology including not only the initial capital investment but also the recurrent budget outlays for future expenditures on infrastructure maintenance.

To be sure, tertiary education is facing unprecedented challenges on the eve of the 21st century. Globalization, knowledge-based economic growth, and the information and communication revolution are challenges that can be viewed as either terrible threats or tremendous opportunities. Countries and higher education institutions willing to take advantage of these new opportunities must be proactive in launching meaningful reforms and innovations based on a clear vision of how the tertiary education system can effectively contribute to the development of each country and how each institution elects to evolve within that system.

Each country needs to choose appropriate strategies to raise tertiary enrollment and move from an elite to an expanded, more differentiated system, given the prevailing constraints on public resources. To achieve the objective of quantitative expansion, countries should seek to diversify further the provision of higher learning through a variety of institutions: public or private, large or small, universities or non-university institutions, short or medium term duration programs, liberal arts or technological, research based institutions and institutions that sustain scholarship, etc. Establishing or strengthening quality enhancement mechanisms is another important step that countries should take. With increased institutional and academic diversification, students and employers need to be informed on the quality and relevance of programs and degrees. Strengthening the financial viability of tertiary education institutions is equally important to sustain the quantitative growth and quality enhancement efforts of the system. This involves three complementary dimensions: the introduction of more effective resource allocations mechanisms, the mobilization of alternative sources of funding, and the establishment of appropriate student aid mechanisms to improve access and equity. Finally, the successful implementation of any reform or innovation is conditioned by the ability of decision-makers to build a consensus among the various constituents of the academic community. Involving potential opponents in the policy discussion process carries risks, but ignoring this dimension altogether is a recipe for failure.

0-0-0-0

NEW HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY OF AFRICA

David Court, Rockefeller Foundation

Email: Dcourt@worldbank.org

INTRODUCTION

The centrality of ICT in the globalization process leads us to a focus on the *means* of transmission, and takes as given the *content* of what is being transmitted, along with the *supportive conditions* which make for transmission through higher education. This note wonders about the relevance of the dominant paradigm for poor countries. It suggests that in some African countries a “new” higher education is emerging which is creating novel, locally relevant knowledge, and beginning to build the conditions which will support its teaching, dissemination and application.

AN ILL FITTING PARADIGM

Facing the tidal wave of globalization, with its competitive proliferation of different types of knowledge producer, universities the world over are being admonished to change if they want to remain central in the promotion of the knowledge economy. Change is necessitated by the competition. Knowledge is the major factor of comparative advantage in that competition, and producing, it sharing it and applying it offer the route to development through which higher education can retain a valued role. The dominant paradigm is provided by the experience of the OECD countries where the economies are boosted through the application of the best brains and latest information technology, in a fevered responsiveness to the demands of industry, science and the economy. The experience is transforming the landscape of knowledge provision and the role of higher education in it.

In the poorer countries of the world higher education is ill equipped to compete in this international market on terms defined by the most competitive systems. Fortunately however, slavish emulation from an uncompetitive starting point may not be the best approach anyway for these countries. The role of higher education, in furthering the advancement and application of knowledge on behalf of economic and social development, may have a different meaning and significance than suggested by the experience of the richest nations. Insight into this meaning can be gained by posing several related questions: What does the concept of a relevant knowledge-based economy mean for development in the poorest countries? What is the specific benefit that higher education can bring to the fulfillment of this concept? Why is higher education not contributing what it might? What characteristics of higher education are needed to bring about a more useful contribution?

Answers to these questions are not best sought in the fact that higher education lacks the capacity or resources to keep up with the pace and style of technology-based knowledge production exemplified in the richer countries, although they do. Neither can it be attributed to sheer conservatism or reluctance to change. Many African universities, for example, are displaying a radical propensity to change in the face of internal and external pressures.

Instead, perhaps illumination resides in two broad factors which differentiate higher education in rich and poor countries. First, there is a difference in the type and content of knowledge which are contextually relevant. The second refers to features of the context that affect the ability of higher education to produce and disseminate knowledge. These are the institutional, cultural, political and incentive systems in which higher education is located.

RELEVANT KNOWLEDGE

Certainly the task of development in Africa and the work of institutions of higher education have to be knowledge based, but the most relevant knowledge is that which is tailored to the national context. In this regard poverty is the paramount feature, and the most needed kind of knowledge is that which enables individuals, households and communities to acquire awareness of available resources, and the skills for their

utilization, as well as heightened sensitivity to specific risks and practical information on how to address them. To be useful in this situation, institutions of higher education need likewise to know not only about local resources, but about the process by which individuals and communities become empowered to utilize them in solving problems. They also need to know about the working of the governmental framework which impedes or advances this process. This is practical knowledge, but its application requires research, reflection, analysis and imagination which universities are ostensibly well equipped to provide. Ironically universities in Africa are often short of this contextually relevant knowledge, as so much of what is available is still of imported origin and design. (The African Virtual University, while now possessing great potential, went through its whole pilot phase with programme content designed in Ireland and Canada!)

SUPPORTIVE CONDITIONS

A Culture of shared knowledge

Development in Africa, as elsewhere, requires that relevant knowledge be shared and communicated and that there be a consensus around the value of dispersing knowledge. Until recently a major characteristic of higher education in Africa was an elitist quality which was not only about excluding from physical access the disadvantaged and unqualified, but also about withholding knowledge and restricting its dispensation. The inclination, as well as the capacity, of university systems to communicate knowledge throughout their own society was often weak. Universities tended to be inward-looking, provided little service to the community and rarely served as centers of broad knowledge dissemination and knowledge sharing in the national society.

Open governance

In putting limits on the culture of shared knowledge, universities in Africa often reflected the elitist hierarchical, authoritarian knowledge-containing nature of their governments. Conversely, the fact that tertiary education contributed little to improved governance was brought about by the absence of open government and democratic practice. Both are among the elements which create a hospitable environment for a higher education that is willing and anxious to share relevant knowledge. This in turn underscores the importance of addressing issues of governance in tandem with the reform of higher education.

Diversified institutions and programs

Another feature of elitism was demonstrated in the prevalence of a single dominating national institution, containing highly specialized, fixed year degree programs and a rigid curriculum. There was, until recently, a marked absence of diversified institutions or programs which could serve the variety of functions demanded by the multiple skill-needs of a community-based development process.

Incentives to knowledge production and service

While there have been outstanding individual contributions to research in Africa, a powerful autonomous institutionalized research culture and community remains fragile, if not absent on the continent, outside South Africa. This will remain the case as long as research is dependent upon external funding, is looked upon as an essentially "foreign" activity and lacks channels for expressing demand from central and local government and

local NGOs. The increase of fee paying students in universities across the continent has put a premium on teaching and correspondingly reduced the incentive for research. At the same time neither state funded universities nor private institutions provide much incentive to community service or linkages to local government.

In the OECD countries knowledge is contextualized, albeit to the needs of industry and commerce, while higher education functions in a situation characterized by a supportive culture of sharing, diversified institutions, democratic governance, and incentives to knowledge production. In Africa a new relevance is being defined and the supportive context (consisting of similar elements) is gradually being created.

GOVERNANCE AS AN ORGANIZING PRINCIPLE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

In promoting the application of ICT to tertiary education in Africa, governments and agencies need to be sensitive to the risk of preserving non-sustainable university enclaves, that are integrated into international global technological and knowledge networks but non responsive to comprehensive developmental needs on the continent itself. By avoiding the application of a template which assumes that economic and educational development can only follow the path of the OECD countries, aid agencies can assist higher education in the poorest countries to develop autonomous forms which are built around the production and communication of relevant knowledge. Because such efforts must be linked to the issue of governance, educational teams need to work with those concerned with public administration, decentralization and local government reform. Instructive in this regard is a program being developed in Uganda which involves collaboration between the Uganda government, Makerere University, the Rockefeller Foundation and the World Bank.

Uganda has committed itself to the serious decentralization of political and financial authority. However, effective implementation requires the development of an array of practical skills on the part of district officials, through the provision of a major set of training programs. The kind of understanding of resources and process which needs to inform relevant training programs has never been the forte of universities. Yet, responding to the challenge, Makerere University is reorganizing itself to provide the bulk of these programs and, in so doing, has acknowledged the need, and established the programs, to carry through a total re-orientation as well as re-training of its staff. Recognizing that the issue of relevance extends beyond the substance of study, to the development of productive approaches to learning, the university is encouraging faculty to revise curriculum and introduce courses covering public administration, ethics and professional motivation as well as re-orient research around decentralization. Through field internships and exchanges, students, faculty, and district officials will be led to understand not only developmental processes and tasks but the local professional culture.

In this there are echoes of the “developmental University “ of the 1980s. However the approach to “development” in this case is through exchanges of practical experience, responsiveness to district demands, and a built in incentive structure. This contrasts with a reliance on curriculum, and an ill conceived course in development studies, and abstract appeals to the social conscience of students which characterized the earlier ideal.

THE NEW HIGHER EDUCATION IN AFRICA

The “new” tertiary education is likely to include many non-university educational institutions, a variety of short term and flexible programs and degrees and the development of knowledge and skills relevant to the needs and processes of the local economy and community. Significant public investments are likely in building the capacity of tertiary education to train cadres of municipal and local public administration officials and getting universities and other higher educational institutions involved in the design implementation and support of governance reforms. It will play an important role in combating the HIV/Aids epidemic through involvement in nation wide prevention campaigns and public health interventions. The expansion of non-state institutions and the diversification of sources of financing, accompanied by decentralized student aid schemes, will also facilitate much needed expansion of tertiary education and contribute to the increased responsiveness of educational institutions to local and community concerns.

0-0-0-0

KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT IN THE “SOUTH” IN THE ERA OF THE INTERNATIONALISATION OF THE TRADE IN EDUCATIONAL SERVICES*

Kenneth King, Centre of African Studies, Edinburgh, Scotland

Email: Kenneth.King@ed.ac.uk

[Earlier, longer versions of this paper were given in the March conferences on higher education in Muscat and in Tilburg. KK]

Background

One of the current challenges in many OECD countries is the so-called internationalisation of higher education. Although some universities’ international mandates are very narrowly concerned with the recruitment of ‘international’ students, the larger ambition of others is with making higher education more responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalisation of societies, economy and labour markets. Implicit also in the use of the term ‘internationalisation’ is the notion that the particular university or university system has a truly global appeal, and can draw on a world-wide student and teaching staff demand, whether for access to its main national campuses or to its overseas branches and various franchise schemes.

In the case of research knowledge, there is a widespread aspiration to participate in the kind of 'world-class' research which is often mentioned by the World Bank. What is not clear is whether the increased global competitiveness (of which the internationalisation of higher education is one manifestation) will facilitate non-OECD countries becoming significant research producers, or whether this intensified international trade in educational services will actually serve to hinder the development of national research capacity.

In seeking an answer to this challenge, we shall look particularly at the recent publication from the Task Force on Higher Education and Society – *Higher education in developing countries: peril and promise* (Task Force 2000). At the same time, there is the issue of whether the massive increase in the scale of knowledge accumulation via ICTs and the internet can work to the advantage of countries that aspire to become significant research producers, or whether the present digital divide is set to widen (See Salmi and Court's papers in this section).

One of the major conceptual problems in approaching research capacity building in the developing world is that there are substantial differences in human development and in educational performance across non-OECD countries (just as there are within OECD countries). There is also an important change over time to be considered in the case of many countries.

Thus, it is sadly the case that the research promise of the 1960s and 1970s of some of the great names in African higher education – Ibadan, Legon, Makerere and Nairobi – looks very bleak in the 1990s and 2000s. Other countries which did not even have an institution of higher education in the early 1980s have made extraordinarily rapid progress in building the infrastructure for national research capacity in just 15 years or less. In other situations again, e.g. in the UK, a whole segment of higher education has been mandated to aspire to being 'research-active' as the result of a change in its status.

Research development in an era of global competition: peril or promise

What is the message from the Task Force on Higher Education and Society when it comes to assessing whether these times are currently propitious for research development ambitions? Is there a major risk in seeking to build a degree of autonomous research capacity in the "South" when a whole series of "Northern" nations are aggressively analysing the scope for attracting a larger market share of the world's potentially mobile students, including the world's brightest students.

In brief the Task Force argues that despite notable exceptions the majority of higher education institutions in developing countries have severe deficiencies in high quality staff, committed, well-prepared students, and sufficient resources (Task Force 2000: 23). The political pressure to expand universities, in the face of massive private demand, has taken place at the expense of research infrastructure, maintenance of journal subscriptions, book purchases and scientific supplies. In particular, the fall in the value of academic salaries has meant that the search for additional sources of income, through external teaching, tuition and consultancy has been privileged in many countries over the obligations to prosecute long-term research or encourage research supervision. Even in one of the most innovative initiatives to recreate staff morale and staff salaries in what

David Court calls Makerere's 'quiet revolution', there are large questions about the parlous state of research.

Although it is not clear what exactly is the range of developing country universities being discussed in the Task Force inquiry, it is implied that it is from the public universities of Africa and Asia that there been no less serious an outcome than 'the disappearance of a research agenda from these universities' (Task Force 2000: 25)

There are always problems with picking out particular examples of the case you are trying to make. But this Task Force Report has very little illustration of the good practices or 'notable exceptions' in higher education with which it is principally concerned.

More than this, it is difficult to see from the Report alone, how the Task Force actually went about its business. In particular there is the lack of any evidence, in the Report, of testing the preliminary conclusions or early drafts of the Report. This can be extremely valuable, and it also can give a large number of key commentators a sense of having participated in the improvement of a policy paper.

Developing country research in an era of global knowledge acceleration

A central question must be whether the dramatic and very recent changes in the character and dynamic of the knowledge economy can be turned to the advantage of universities in the developing world. At first glance, this might seem unlikely. Even though the fully networked university (with total staff and student access to the internet and email) is scarcely some 7 to 10 years old in many OECD country campuses, this is still a long way off in many developing countries, and is certain to be aid-dependent in the poorest countries if it is to happen at all in the short to medium term.

Part of the problem is that the metaphors of leapfrogging that are common to the discourse of the knowledge revolution are somewhat misleading. They can sometimes give the impression that even the poorest learner can, via a hand-held device, access the world's store of development knowledge. But access to the internet can only in part compensate for the absence of scientific texts that can be studied at leisure off-line. Not to mention laboratories, chemicals, software to run advanced statistical programmes and much else. But the largest drawback of all is that despite the availability of increasingly cheap computers and / or mobile phones with internet access, these devices are still relatively expensive in many if not most developing countries.

Moreover, whatever the quite staggering incremental growth of web-based information and knowledge, the greatest obstacle of all is the sheer cost of logging on in much of the developing world. The 2000 White Paper on International Development of the UK has identified the key constraint in most developing countries as 'the lack of a legal and regulatory framework for a competitive telecommunications sector' (DFID 2000: 40). It continues with an argument that sees the breaking of national phone monopolies as an indispensable element in cheap international access to the Net.

Thus, it would appear that the rather romantic dream of leap-frogging by developing countries (or their higher education systems) may itself be inseparable from the removal of protection for national telecommunications. In other words, the notion that internet access is an uncontroversial global public good is clearly flawed. Access may well be effectively controlled by companies with much greater leverage and global power than any developing country phone company.

The Task Force looks at a series of large issues in higher education and society, and it undoubtedly makes its reputation by two major themes. First, it recalls the 'public-interest perspective' of higher education, arguing that higher education 'offers a number of public benefits – basic knowledge, cultural and moral leadership, international linkages, broad access to numerous population groups, liberal education, basic science – that have far-reaching positive consequences for the whole society'. Second it revisits the relevance of general education and argues that each country has the obligation to develop its own version of a liberal education. It claims that the more extensive general education programmes – so far from being the refuge of those not able to enter the more vocationally-oriented science, engineering or business studies, 'should be aimed at the brightest and most highly motivated in any cohort'. It is aware that such a priority runs the risk of being criticised as elitist, but it boldly takes the view that 'not all individuals are qualified for the same training or the same tasks, given that some tasks are more difficult than others'. It concludes with an open declaration in favour of education formerit-based leadership even if this means some educational inequality on the way.

Research as a public good

A subset of the Task Force's first great theme of higher education as a public good is "Research and the Public Interest" (Task Force 2000: 42). Indeed, it retains for this theme some of its strongest claims for the university's role in civil society, declaring that 'One of the most powerful arguments for a public interest in higher education is the value to a country of a well-developed system for research and generation of knowledge' (ibid). Despite having argued earlier that research is actually in a parlous state in many of the poorer countries of Asia and Africa, it urges that 'Public support of knowledge generation is essential in developing countries' (ibid).

While accepting Gibbons' position that basic, non-proprietary research is in fact distributed in a whole range of non-university institutions (Gibbons 1998), it still takes the view that it is 'especially well suited to universities and other higher education bodies' (Task Force 2000: 42). It is refreshing, for once, to see higher education, and research in particular, argued for on grounds of its value to society, and not on the usual grounds of financial comparative advantage. It accepts that there is bound to be specialisation world-wide in knowledge production, but argues that a country's main way of reaping the additional public benefits of the global knowledge system is by having a sufficiently strong research system at the national level that it can make international linkages.

Its most ambitious claim for research as an international public good goes to the heart of the difference between commercial and academic research whose findings are universally and freely available. In a purple passage, the Task Force characterises research and scholarship as the ideal, non-profit activity:

Internationally, higher education is an intellectual commons represented by the invisible college of independent scholarship, knowledge production, and scholarly training. This intellectual commons allows the world to tackle a number of widely recognised international challenges (Task Force 2000: 42-3).

The Vision of the Intellectual Commons and the Reality of Globalisation

Having sketched out so powerfully and persuasively the vision and the mission of globally networked university research on behalf of mankind, the Task Force is less certain about the underbelly of higher education in the era of globalisation. On the one hand, it admits that globalised higher education can have 'damaging as well as beneficial consequences', and notes the downside of the international marketing of fraudulent degrees and the threat of substandard education in some forms of franchising. But it does not deal as thoroughly with whether the transnational trade in educational qualifications and the internationalisation of higher education are perhaps leading in a different direction from the Task Force vision of an intellectual commons. It is almost as if this negative side of globalised higher education is seen as an aberration and not as something that is inherent in the contemporary marketisation of higher education.

The Task Force does not satisfactorily deal with the new marketisation of higher education – which is not just a question of some dubious degrees and some sub-standard franchising. Rather what is under debate is a world system of competitive higher education – which has been described as "The brave new world of international education and training" in NN27.

Nor does the Task Force deal very satisfactorily with the relationship of the University to the economy. If universities produce the kind of students that are discussed in the Task Force Report – thoughtful, critical, innovative, critical thinkers – they will in most countries of the developing world not be snapped up like hotcakes by industry, but have earned themselves a passport to leave the country. Unless the government and industry themselves acquire the characteristics of countries that are profiting from globalisation.

It is probably too early to be sure whether the vision of the Task Force corresponds to the reality of international co-operation in higher education. But it is certainly the case that a great deal that is contained within the mantra of the internationalisation of higher education has very little to do with international co-operation and the older vision of solidarity between North and South but rather with OECD universities maintaining and increasing their 'market share' of international students. The character of this present internationalisation seems to focus increasingly on the richer parts of the world, and to pay less and less attention to the majority of low-income countries. Although there are certainly initiatives and ambitions to begin to deal with the digital divide, the current patterns of accessing knowledge (whether by staying at home or moving to another country) parallel the movements of the massive flows of speculative capital across the world – that is to say - they predominantly involve movement across the high and middle income countries of the world.

The Task Force thus leaves us with a dilemma. It sees higher education as a rational and feasible way for poorer countries to mitigate or even avert the continuing decline in their relative incomes. But it does not adequately deal with the possibility that, in the era of the international trade in educational services, universities in the richer countries of the world are becoming part of the problem rather than part of the solution.

It will be interesting to see in what ways the new World Bank strategy on higher education takes forward some of these unanswered questions (see Salmi).

Bibliography

Department for International Development (DFID) 2000 *Eliminating world poverty: making globalisation work for the poor* Cm 5006, DFID, London

Task Force on Higher Education and Society 2000 *Higher education in developing countries: peril and promise* World Bank, Washington.

0-0-0-0

MEETINGS

Thank you once again for sending in listings of meetings that are to take place in the next six months or thereabouts. As previously:

O = Open; I = By invitation

Date	Title of Meeting	Venue	Sponsor	Contact	O or I
July	Training for Peer Evaluation in Higher Education	Panama City Panama	CSUCA/DSE	C. Hansert hansert@dse.de	I
	Report writing for Educational Researchers	Gaborone Botswana	ERNESA/DSE	W. Gmelin gmelin@dse.de	I
Aug 15-17	Launch of the Network for Girls Education Movement (GEM)	Kampala	Govt of Uganda (Office of the President and several ministries)	Parliament Bldg PO Box 7168 Kampala Uganda	I
18-22	2 nd International Conference on Children's Rights in Education	British Columbia, Canada	Child Rights Education International University of Victoria	University of Victoria British Columbia Canada	I
Sept 10-14	BDS meeting	Turin Italy	ILO, SEEd	Jim Tanburn (Tanburn@ilo.org) and (in Turin) Peter Tomlinson (SME@itcilo.org)	I
10-12	Linking work, skills and knowledge: learning for survival and growth	Interlaken Switzerland	Swiss Development Cooperation	Malte Lipczinsky SDC Bern Switzerland malte.lipczinsky@deza.admin.ch	I
13-14	Working group for International Cooperation in Skills Development	Interlaken Switzerland	Working Group on Skills Development	Michel Carton IUED Geneva Switzerland Michel.Carton@iued.unige.ch	I

Sep 18- 20	Knowledge Sharing for International Development: Asia Workshop	Chennai, India	CIDA, DFID, IFAD, SDC and World Bank	Bellanet International Secretariat 250 Albert St., 5 th Floor Ottawa, ONT Canada	I
19- 21	Knowledge, Values and Policy (The 'Oxford' International Conference on Education and Development)	Oxford UK	UK Forum for International Education and Training (UKFIET)	Sarah Jeffery CFBT PO Box 4917 Reading RG6 5XX sjeffery@cfbt- hq.org.uk	O
19- 21	United Nations Special Session on Children	New York, USA	UN	Secretariat for the Special Session on Children UNICEF House 3 UN Plaza New York NY 10017 USA	
Oct	Accreditation Forum	Guatemala City, Guatemala	CSUCA/DSE	C. Hansert hansert@dse.de	I
Nov	First meeting of the High Level Group (EFA)	Paris France	UNESCO/ Intergovernmen tal Committee	UNESCO 7 place de Fontenoy 75352 Paris 07 SP France	I
	Music in Primary Education	Berlin	Ministry of Education, Chile/ DES	I. Jung jung@dse.de	I
6	DFID's education research knowledge base	Slough UK	UKFIET/NFER/D FID	T Henderson Thson349@aol.com	Limit ed Nos

**THE SIXTH UKFIET "OXFORD" CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION AND
DEVELOPMENT**

Bill Ozanne, Conference Secretary
Email: wozanne@cix.co.uk

For 10 years, this year, the UK Forum on International Education and Training (UKFIET) has brought together a unique combination of scholars, planners, aid agencies, governmental and non-governmental organisations as well as grassroots practitioners to review the global and local realities of education in human development. Its themes have been radical and

cross-cutting and the interaction of individuals within the secure context of an Oxford College has been seminal in the initial development of thought, expertise and even of projects, programmes and education plans.

KNOWLEDGE, VALUES AND POLICY – the theme for 2001

The Sixth Oxford Conference addresses a series of major debates on knowledge policies, changing values and ethical issues in education and development, and the evidence base of local and global policy itself. The start of a new century is an appropriate time to take stock of current knowledge paradigms in relation to world development. This is all the more necessary as the globalisation of development knowledge continues apace, much aided by information and communication technologies. The relationships between knowledge and power are fundamental, not least in considering the 'digital divide' between the 'North' and the 'South'. At the same time, there are emerging concerns about the ethics and core values embedded in international policies and education and its formal and informal development at all stages of life, relating to the schooling of the young, post compulsory learning, work-related training and education for its intrinsic worth for those of more advanced years. The debate about 'Whose knowledge for whose development?' has reopened issues about the essential roles of local knowledge and local policy and practice.

The conference offers an opportunity to look critically at three overarching concepts and their inter-relationships. There is a particular interest in papers that examine the education and training dimensions of these concepts that have become central to the discourses on aid, development and globalisation. Other important contributions might examine: Education and ethnicity; Economic theories and human values; Spiritual and ethical knowledge and education planning; Political education and individual empowerment; The role of non-economic research and academic freedom in higher education; Oral cultures in a world of assessment and certification; Pedagogical alternatives in traditional religious cultures; Knowledge and the formation of religious consciousness; the value basis of poverty reduction and pro-poor growth.

Whatever their specialist interest, those wishing to take part are encouraged to locate their papers within one of the following five themes, which will represent the main five sections of the conference:

KNOWLEDGE PARADIGMS AND WORLD DEVELOPMENT

Plenary Speakers: Gudmund Hernes, Director IIEP
Santosh Mehrotra - UNICEF

Chair: Prof. Christopher Colclough

The start of the new century is an appropriate time to take stock of theory. Where do we stand on functionalist theories of education and development? Do we now know more about these relationships in the context of achievements in Asia and SSA? Has human capital/modernization theory survived well the accounts of East Asian success, and the lack of it in Africa? Is schooling always a vital prior factor, and, if so, what are other necessary conditions?

Where do radical theories of education stand in the development debate? Has liberalization in Eastern Europe, and in the adjusting countries of Africa changed the parameters? Has the argument between liberal and radical feminist approaches in education provided insights for policy and practice towards girls' education in developing countries?

The relationships between knowledge and power are fundamental to interpreting action. Whose knowledge counts? Is it ever neutral? Can the Bank be a broker for what is and is not knowledge for development. Do its clear interests in this debate make it appropriate for this role?

The distribution of knowledge generation is increasingly skewed towards the north. What needs to change in order to reverse this trend? Can research collaboration really change this balance? What are the logical and practical limits to capacity building - to whom, of whom, by whom?

What do the IDT targets signify? Who owns them? Is the Jomtien paradigm unchanged by Dakar? We need empirical tests of new and old theory; new syntheses across these fields; new critiques of practice and policy - of international institutions, of bilateral policy and practice and of national experience.

THE GLOBALISATION OF DEVELOPMENT KNOWLEDGE

Plenary Speakers: Anriette Esterhuysen, Executive Director, Association for Progressive Communications (APC)

Second Plenary Speaker to be confirmed

Chair: Prof. Kenneth King

In the late 1990s and early 2000s information and communication technology advances have made it possible to conceive of dramatic opportunities for synthesising, sorting and disseminating massive quantities of knowledge relevant to development. These possibilities for the new management of development knowledge span a range from the Global Development Gateway (first associated with the World Bank), to the reorganisation of all project and programme knowledge (being pursued by individual development agencies and NGOs), to the schemes for accessing global knowledge at the level of the local school, the community, or the local development project. -These new frontiers of global development knowledge are powerfully influenced by the very information systems that technically make possible these gigantic advances.

This section of the Conference will explore the following sub-themes:

- the theoretical and philosophical issues associated with the global reorganisation of Knowledge-for-Development;
- the role of the public and the private sector in facilitating these colossal knowledge projects (both for profit and non-profit);
- the position of 'Southern' or local knowledge in global knowledge developments and the implications for the future of the current 'digital divide',
- the potential of these 'borderless' knowledge systems dramatically to alter the position of 'Southern' universities, 'Southern' research, and even the knowledge resources of ordinary schools;
- the opportunities and threats facing NGOs and other elements of civil society in repositioning themselves in light of the new knowledge for development debate;
- the potential of new knowledge banks, knowledge highways, and the apparently 'borderless' knowledge opportunities - for new conceptions of student mobility.

Proposals for other dimensions of the values embedded in the globalisation of knowledge for development are welcomed.

EVIDENCE BASED POLICY

Plenary Speakers: Dr. Jon Lauglo, World Bank

Prof J Prochaska, Cancer Research Institute, Rhode Island

Chair: Prof. Roy Williams

We would all like to be able to say that our educational practice is based on evidence. We have sophisticated EMIS (Education Management Information Systems); GPS (Satellite based

Geographic Positioning Systems; many global organizations (intergovernmental, public sector, private sector, civil society/charity) concerned with Human Resource Development, Education, Training and Employment; "league" tables for institutions; journals and researchers, and so on.

A key question is: what information, knowledge, and values do we actually use (or not use) to make actual decisions on: equity, access and quality, or in more detail, on: entrance, accreditation, planning, exclusion, planning, costing and financing, pedagogy, training, remuneration, state intervention or privatisation, regulation and so on? It might be interesting to unpack some of these decisions, and see what kind of mechanisms and processes we have put in place to achieve educational progress/excellence in our "knowledge societies".

WHAT VALUES FOR WHOSE FUTURE?: IDEOLOGY AND CULTURE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND EDUCATION

Plenary Speakers: Lesley Limage, UNESCO
Hugh Hawes, BAICE Presidential Lecture

Chair: Prof. Keith Watson & Mr William Ozanne

Our knowledge of the world and new discoveries is doubling every few years. Much of the rapidly multiplying knowledge of the world is being 'discovered' by research institutes and business corporations, rather than traditional universities, many of which are increasingly constrained by bureaucracy and government-imposed regulations. How the dissemination and exchange of this knowledge is managed and used raises questions of access and values. Who obtains what kinds of benefit from much of this new knowledge? Who has copyright or dominance? In an age of globalisation is it the TNCs or governments, that dictate what should, or should not, be taught/learnt/accepted/understood? Moves towards sharing of insights and priorities through partnership arrangements carry with them the need to negotiate the values implicit in language and concept no less than in objectives, targets and priorities. With the growth of the Internet, IT and now forms of individualised learning what impact will this have on the development of 'virtual' universities? Will it lead to growing disparities in access to knowledge? How much is the private sector, commercial, secular, or religious, being expected to take over the provision of education, and thus influencing the knowledge and values being imparted?

What are the values underpinning development theories? What bodies, and for what reasons, have decided that education should be judged by measurable, often global, outcomes and indicators rather than by the quality of all round human development, or the needs of the poorest? Is the sector wide approach really only a mechanism for the donor countries to impose their values on the poorer countries or is it really intended to lead to a real sharing of ideas and knowledge?

Some themes might include:

Education and the preservation of ethnicity; Economic dogma and human values in international aid funding; Redefining human resources and freedom in higher education and research; Management of knowledge between partners in development; Spiritual and ethical knowledge in indigenous cultures and education planning; Political education and individual empowerment; Oral cultures in a world of literacy, assessment and certification; Pedagogical alternatives in traditional religious cultures; Knowledge and the formation of religious consciousness; Poverty, progress and planning for development; Educational approaches to gender equity in relation to indigenous structures.

WHOSE KNOWLEDGE, WHOSE VALUES? LOCAL CONTRIBUTION TO THE POLICY PROCESS

Plenary Speakers: Juliana Gyanwa Adu-Gyamfi – ActionAid Ghana
Mark Bray, University of Hong Kong

Chair: Mr. David Theobald & Dr. Michele Schwiesfurth

To people working at the local level in education, policy decisions may be perceived as distant impositions over which they have little influence. In reality, rather than being mere recipients of policy, people in communities, schools and other educational environments are in a position to make major contributions to all stages of the policy processes that affect them, from formulation to implementation, evaluation and impact analysis. Under the title 'Whose knowledge, whose values? Local contributions to the policy process', these important themes will be explored, with examples of innovative action and mediation at all levels. We are especially interested in case studies of policy initiatives that respond to local concerns and are based on local knowledge and values.

FINAL PLENARY OPEN SESSION ON FRIDAY 21ST**INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS: A CONTINUING CHALLENGE (PROVISIONAL TITLE)**

Plenary Speakers: Prof. Denise Lievesley, Director, UNESCO Institute for Statistics

Chair: Dr. Rosemary Preston with Prof. Kenneth King

The House Style of the UKFIET Oxford Conference in 2001

In 2001, the Conference will break new ground in the format of papers to be submitted to the conference Organisers. Those still wishing to contribute papers to the programme should send them as an **extended and detailed abstract** to the Conference Secretary (William Ozanne) as soon as possible. All papers of relevant standard and addressing the themes of the conference will be included in the book of papers available at the Conference and will be acknowledged in the appropriate session of the Conference programme. From the total papers in the Conference volume a smaller number will be presented by their authors to one of the sessions of the meeting.

Every effort will be made to inform authors quickly of the decision to include their paper in the Conference volume and programme, to facilitate funding and travel arrangements. After the Oxford Conference, all whose papers are included in the programme will be invited to submit a full paper for possible publication in one of the journals associated with Conference.

Submissions should not exceed two sides of A4 (max. 1500 words including all headings and references). Please request full details relating to submission of papers by ticking the box on the response form.

Programme Enquiries should be made to

Bill Ozanne

74 Billesley Lane,

Birmingham B13 9QU

UK

email: wozanne@cix.co.uk

Applications and Reservations to:

Sarah Jeffery

CfBT Education Services

1 The Chambers,

East Street

READING RG1

UK

email: Sjeffery@cfbt-hq.org.uk

Further information is available on www.ukfiet.fsnet.co.uk

[The UKFIET ‘Oxford’ Conference has become increasingly popular over the 5 preceding occasions. Those intending to come, as participants, should register as soon as possible as there will be a cut-off point once the planned numbers have been reached. The proposals of those hoping to present papers are being reviewed at the moment. Those who have not yet sent in their extended abstract should do so with all possible speed.]

**The UKFIET “Oxford” International Conference
on Education and Development
19 - 21 September 2001**

Conference Registration Form

PLEASE USE BLOCK CAPITALS

PERSONAL DETAILS

Title: (Prof/Dr/Mr/Mrs/Ms) _____ Family Name: _____

Other Name or Initials: _____ Organisation: _____

Job title: _____

Name and affiliation for badge: _____

Full correspondence address including postal code:

Telephone No: _____ Facsimile: _____

Email address: _____

Special dietary requirements or special needs e.g. wheelchair access, difficulty with stairs:

I have submitted a paper for consideration:

REGISTRATION

Full Registration fee **£260.00**

Single Day Registration fee **£90.00** per day

Please indicate your chosen attendance day/s by ticking the appropriate box:

19 Sept. 20 Sept. 21 Sept.

ACCOMMODATION

18 Sept. 19 Sept. 20 Sept. 21 Sept.

Study bedroom @ **£66.00** per night
(Bed, breakfast and evening meal)

Accommodation is only available for the nights shown above.
Please also note that if you are not booking accommodation for the period
18 - 21 September inclusive, nights must be consecutive.

GRAND TOTAL

Registration and Accommodation

PAYMENT

I enclose a cheque drawn on a UK based bank made payable to C/fBT Education Services

Please charge my VISA/MasterCard (delete as applicable).

Card number: _____

Expiry date: _____

Signature of Cardholder: _____

Name and address of cardholder if different from overleaf:

I understand and agree to abide by the terms as set out in this registration document:

Signature: _____

Date: _____

UKFIET "Oxford" International Conference on Education and Development Data Protection Terms and Conditions
The following forms part of the UKFIET "Oxford" International Conference on Education and Development 2001 terms and conditions.

You will only be entitled to a participants' list if you agree to these terms and conditions.

UKFIET "Oxford" International Conference on Education and Development Data Protection Consent

CfBT is the data controller for the UKFIET "Oxford" International Conference on Education and Development 2001 (the conference).

The UKFIET "Oxford" International Conference on Education and Development 1999 produced a participants' list that delegates found extremely useful. We would like to produce a similar list to be distributed at the conference in 2001. We would also like to keep your details in order to contact you with information about other events and services in which you might be interested.

Ongoing Contact with UKFIET and CfBT

- I consent to CfBT and/or UKFIET contacting me in relation to future UKFIET and CfBT conferences, events and services that might be of interest to me.

Participants' List

- I consent to my name and contact details (my data) being included on the conference participants' list (the list) and thereby being given to people attending the conference. I consent to the people who receive the list using my data in accordance with the section entitled "Use of the Participants' List" below and I consent to the people who receive the list returning to countries outside of the European Economic Area with my data.

Use of the Participants' List

I agree to use the information provided to me in the participants list (the information) only in accordance with the UK Data Protection Act 1998. I will not pass the information on to third parties, I will neither use the information for financial gain nor for direct marketing. I agree to be bound by these terms and conditions and by the principles and provisions of the UK Data Protection Act 1998 in countries within and outside the European Economic Area.

Signed:..... Date:.....

A copy of the UK Data Protection Act 1998 is available at:
www.legislation.hms.gov.uk/acts/acts1998/19980029.htm

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM TOGETHER WITH PAYMENT TO:

SARAH JEFFERY

CfBT

PO Box 4917

READING

RG6 5XX

UK

Tel/Fax: (44) (0) 118 921 2146 or by Email sjeffery@cfbt-hq.org.uk

REGISTRATION AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Registration Fees (excluding accommodation)

Full registration fee - **£260.00** (incl. VAT)
Single Day registration fee - **£90.00** (incl. VAT)

Full registration fee includes:

Full programme with papers

Lunch and mid morning and afternoon refreshments.
Drinks Reception. (please refer to website as programme is finalised)

The Single Day registration fee includes:
Full programme with papers
Lunch and mid morning and afternoon refreshments on days attended.
Drinks Reception on day attended (please refer to website as programme is finalised)

Each conference day will be 9.00am – 5.00pm

Location

Conference sessions will take place in the University of Oxford Examination Schools, Oxford. Accommodation will be in University College Oxford.

The Oxford University Examination Schools can be found in the heart of the City of Oxford, adjacent to University College, five minutes walk from the city centre and main shopping areas with easy access to the main bus and railway stations.

Transport

Regular rail, bus and coach links serve the city including a 24-hour coach service to and from London.

There are 3 major airports within 90 minutes of Oxford: Heathrow, Birmingham, and Gatwick. Regular coach and train services connect these with the city.

Although the city is at the centre of a network of major roads and motorways, there is no parking available at either the Examination Schools or University College; city car parks are expensive and we therefore recommend public transport where possible.

Accommodation

Accommodation is in student study bedrooms.

The cost per night for bed, breakfast and evening meal is **£66.00** (incl. VAT and all service charges). Rooms may be reserved by completing the relevant section on the registration form and returning it to Sarah Jeffery by **24 August 2001**.

Reservations received after this date cannot be guaranteed. Early booking is advised as space is limited.

Official Language

English will be the official language of the conference.

Proposals for papers

A few late proposals for papers that relate to the theme will be welcomed for consideration and should be submitted by 1st August 2001 to: Mr. W I Ozanne, 74 Billesley Lane, Birmingham B13 9QU, UK. Tel/Fax: (44) (0) 121 449 3839. Email: wozanne@cix.co.uk www.ukfiet@fsnet.co.uk Please contact Sarah Jeffery for full details on format of papers.

sjeffery@cfbt-hq.org.uk

Dress

Smart casual during conference sessions, jacket and tie for gentlemen at receptions.

Payment

All prices quoted are in £STG and are inclusive of VAT at 17.5%.

Registration fees are payable in advance of the conference.

Cheques drawn in £STG on a UK based bank should be made payable to C/FT Education Services.

Credit cards: **VISA** and **MasterCard** are accepted; we regret we are unable to accept American Express or Diners Club cards.

If payment is made by bank transfer a £STG10.00 surcharge will be made. Please contact Sarah Jeffery to request bank details and obtain a reference number

Your registration will be acknowledged in writing. If you have not received pre-conference information pack 14 days prior to the start of the conference, please contact Sarah Jeffery Tel/Fax (44) (0) 118 921 2146 Email: sjeffery@cfbt-hq.org.uk

Cancellation

Substitutions may be made at any time, but please advise change of name. In the event of cancellation, please contact Sarah Jeffery immediately by telephone, fax or email and request a cancellation number.

Provided written notice is received by 24 August 2001 a full refund will be given, less a 10% administration charge. Provided written notice is given by 31 August 2001 a 50% refund will be made. It is regretted that cancellations after this date are not refundable.

Changes

Details of programme are correct at time of going to print. UKFIET and C/FT reserve the right to change any session in the final programme.