

Workshop on More Coherent Policies for More Inclusive Growth and Development

First meeting of the informal network of Policy Coherence for Development Focal Points

30 November 2007 – draft summary record

Introduction

Mr. Mario Amano, Deputy Secretary-General of the OECD, welcomed participants to the first meeting of the informal network of OECD focal points for Policy Coherence for Development (PCD). He stressed that even though the provision of development assistance is important for development, it is only one of the efforts needed to reach the Millennium Development Goals (MDG). A broad set of coherent policies, reaching “beyond aid”, are necessary to promote sustainable growth and effective development.

Mr. Amano noted that work on PCD was mandated by OECD ministers five years ago and that this is taken forward at different levels within the OECD:

- *Council*: A progress report on PCD was presented to the OECD Council on 14 November 2007. There was a strong support to continue and enhance the work on PCD and to renew the high-level statement at next year’s Ministerial, in order to sustain political support.
- *Secretariat*: the PCD co-ordination function has been relocated to the SG’s office. This reflects the thinking that PCD is the responsibility of *all* directors and committees, not solely of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC). The Secretariat continues analytical work on specific sectors including migration, environment and the information society.
- *Committees*: all OECD committees are encouraged to systematically anchor a development dimension in their Programme of Work and Budget for 2009-2010.
- *Member countries*: an informal network of focal points in OECD member countries and in member countries of the Governing Board of the Development Centre was established in July 2007.

Mr. Amano emphasised that the OECD’s role is essentially to provide policy recommendations and thus the main challenge lies in developing and implementing coherent policies at a *national level*. This is where the question of “political economy” comes in to play - in other words how to convince politicians to support long-term development goals which not always directly benefit OECD country citizens. He asked participants to reflect upon:

- Where should we focus attention for greatest impact and who are the main drivers of change?
- What are the entry points for promoting more coherent policy-making?
- How to increase joint efforts and co-operation among OECD members, international organisations, civil society organisations and the private sector?
- What should the future priorities be for PCD and what is the role of the OECD?

Professor John Humphrey, Institute of Development Studies delivered the keynote speech, outlining in what ways the current phase of globalisation creates new challenges for policy coherence for development.

He argued that increased global interdependence has resulted in the multiplication of harmonised regulations. International banking standards, likely to be adopted by banks irrespective of whether they are

mandatory, sometimes conflict directly with development policies and priorities related to, for example, capital flows, financing for development and promotion of small and medium enterprises. Similarly, tightened food safety standards in OECD countries - a response to increasing lack of consumer confidence – adversely affects farmers in developing countries.

Professor Humphrey also made the case that the rise to economic and political power by China and India creates new challenges for OECD countries in general, and for ongoing efforts to make policies more coherent in particular. Such challenges are often related to trade and investment, global public goods (e.g. climate change, security and financial stability) and development. As emerging donors define their own priorities for development assistance, developing countries have to manage conflicting advice and ensure mechanisms for dialogue with new global powers. Is it coherent to encourage Africa to invest in manufacturing and expand their markets towards Europe, when competition and market access has dramatically changed by China's global role?

SESSION 1: Internet access and the information society – what policy mix works for emerging economies and developing countries?

Session Chair: John Dryden, Deputy Director, Directorate for Science, Technology and Innovation, OECD

- How could Internet, communications, and innovation policies in OECD and developing countries better promote development outcomes such as economic growth and poverty reduction?
- What complementary policies and practices are needed to realise this potential? Where are the policy incoherencies that impede development?
- What are the key barriers that prevent the poor from accessing the Internet, and information and communications technologies (ICT)?
- What is the role of development financing and development agencies?

Mr. Dryden introduced this session by noting the dramatic changes in ICTs over the past decade, including the milestone of granting access to Internet for the first billion users and the considerable challenge which lies in connecting the next several billion users – mainly from developing countries. He noted the role that ICTs could play for development and poverty reduction, through addressing global challenges such as those connected to the environment and health. He also stressed the multi-stakeholder nature of governance in respect to the Internet, which is why decision-making has to be multi-dimensional and involve all stakeholders.

Mr. Ilkka Lakaniemi, Head of Global Political Dialogue and Initiatives, Nokia- Siemens (www.nokia.fi; www.nokiasiemensnetworks.com), emphasised the role *mobile* communication access can play for economic and social development, highlighting the way mobile phones are used for banking by poor people with no previous access to banking services (the so called 'unbanked') providing a secure means for transactions in environments where they otherwise may not exist.

He argued that the role of governments is to create an enabling environment for innovation and investment – including through establishing an independent regulator and an open and competitive market, and eliminating non-tariff barriers. He also stressed the importance of coherent policies in respect to taxation, and that lower taxes on equipment and services could bring in greater revenues and broader benefits to the economy through encouraging the expansion of service.

Mr. Lakaniemi felt that rural coverage is still an unlocked potential, though whereas monopolies once discouraged expansion in rural areas there is now a race to get to some of these markets first. Experience had also shown that people tended to have more financial resources available to communications that are reflected in official statistics and there was tremendous demand for communications access. It is likely that by 2015 there will be five billion mobile Internet subscribers - up from around 3.3 billion today.

Applications developed in the future will increasingly be Internet applications and content and services would be increasingly tailored to local requirements in emerging markets.

Mr. Amitabh Singhal, Director, Telxess Consulting Services, Founding Member of National Internet Exchange of India (www.nixi.in), summarised ICT developments in India. He presented a comprehensive range of statistics demonstrating growth in access and the contribution of ICTs to the overall economy. He also discussed the evolution of the policy and regulatory environment in India, including the liberalisation of the telecommunications market and the positive impact it had on growth. He noted that the changed regulation had made possible affordable communications with average revenue per unit (ARPU) as little as 5 USD per month. He also noted that liberalisation had enabled Indian-owned firms to become the largest players in the world's undersea cable market.

Mr. Singhal also outlined the considerable challenges India still was to address. He noted that a Universal Service Fund had been created to assist in the further development of infrastructure in rural areas. Efforts are underway to adopt international best practices in areas such as adherence to the OECD's Privacy Guidelines and to scale up the development of e-government. Notwithstanding, there is still substantial underinvestment in ICTs, and local loop unbundling - as recommended by the regulatory authority (TRAI) - is still to be implemented.

Mr. Ingo Imhoff, Special advisor to the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany, summarised developments in ICT policy in Germany. He reported that while the country was trailing in the development of broadband compared to some other OECD countries, it is relatively advanced in the use of e-government and has a strongly developed market for electronic commerce.

Mr. Imhoff stressed the importance of enhancing coherence between ICT and development policies, in particular in relation to education and capacity development, to improve Internet security as well as Internet access in developing countries and avoiding brain drain in key ICT sectors. Mr. Imhoff suggested there was a need to address the tension between countries wanting to attract the best talent in a competitive global economy and the need to develop local capacity building.

Mr. Bill Woodcock, Research Director, Packet Clearing House (www.pch.net) introduced the role played by Packet Clearing House (PCH) in supporting the development of Internet exchange points (IXPs), which are crucial for developing local Internet markets. In 1992 there was just one single IXP in the world (in Washington) and there are today nearly 300 IXPs. There are, however, still 90 countries in the world which do not have an IXP - generally the least developed countries. As a result, they incur higher communications costs than do countries which already possess IXPs.

To develop Internet access in the least developed countries, it is important to introduce policies and technologies appropriate for the country context. Market reforms need to be viable and adapted to the resources and human capital available. Mr Woodcock argued that ICT entrepreneurs and users in developing countries will find adapted solutions to expanding access and use of ICTs if enabled by good policy and regulatory settings, and allowed to take ownership of the process. He highlighted recent success experienced by developing countries in developing facilities for expanded access to communications services, in particular in the Caribbean.

He also stressed that multinational corporations need to demonstrate an ethical and moral responsibility in developing countries, at the same level as they would in an OECD country. He was encouraged by the recent policies of some leading carriers in this respect.

References:

<https://prefix.pch.net/applications/ixpdir/summary>

Discussion

Finland recalled the multidimensionality of PCD in knowledge and information based societies. Education and capacity development is a prerequisite for sustained ICT development and access. **USA** stressed the important role that ICT's can play for development and called for more co-operation between all stakeholders to build "global commons" in ICT.

Participants welcomed the growing recognition of the role ICTs can play for development, and the need for policy coherence in this respect. They also noted the growing role ICTs play in globalisations and the transparency it adds in areas ranging from development assistance to the dissemination of information. Some participants felt there is a need to shift focus from supply-side discussions to demand-side applications (e.g. health, education). On the other hand, several panellists felt that areas such as health and education were just a few of many services which could be developed if appropriate communication access is made available.

It was noted that reform of communication markets made them demand-led rather than being supply-driven. Discussion ranged over the cost of Internet access (and what policy settings would make services more affordable), the most appropriate way to license operators and allocate spectrum, the issue of addressing areas which may not be attractive to the market, and the potential role of public-private partnerships.

SESSION 2: Improving assessment of policy coherence: learning from each other

Session Chair: Ms Alda Medeiros Fernandes, Delegate to the Development Assistant Committee, Portugal

- How can we enhance PCD more effectively?
- What assessment tools (e.g. indicators, benchmarks) are useful, informative, practical and acceptable for policy evaluation?

Ms. Françoise Moreau, Head of Unit, Forward-Looking Studies and Policy Coherence, European Commission, presented the *EU Report on Policy Coherence for Development*, which aims to track progress made by the EU in promoting policy coherence for development and to identify issues for further action. She explained that the policy framework that serves as a reference for the report was part of a set of measures adopted by the EU in 2005, to accelerate progress towards the MDGs.

Main findings from the EU report include that there is a strong general commitment to PCD within the EU. At Commission level, Inter-Service Consultations allow for internal discussions prior to any policy decision, an impact assessment system is in place to evaluate the consequences of major policy proposals, an Inter-Service Group is set up to promote PCD, and efforts are made to integrate PCD issues into the programming dialogue for Country and Regional Strategy Papers. In addition, a PCD unit in the Commission's Directorate General for Development acts as a focal point for the follow-up to PCD commitments.

A PCD Network of member state representatives was established in 2003 and serves as an informal forum for dialogue. Moreover, a rolling PCD Work Programme has been set up to identify common priorities, and a PCD Report is prepared biannually to monitor progress on PCD made by the EU and its Member States.

In addition to addressing institutional mechanisms, the report deals with PCD in 12 policy areas: trade, agriculture, fisheries, security, migration, social dimension of globalisation, research and innovation, information society, environment, climate change, transport, and energy. Presenting a couple of the report's findings, Ms Moreau pointed to the fact that a number of trade regimes favourable to developing countries are in place, but that developing countries still face important obstacles in trade-related issues

such as Sanitary and Phytosanitary Standards and Rules of Origin. Concerning migration, although much progress was made in setting an EU coherent policy framework and in enhancing the dialogue with countries of origin and transit, she stressed the need to turn brain drain into brain circulation.

Mr. Gerardo Bracho, Delegate to the Development Assistance Committee, Mexico, provided comments on the *EU report*.

Mr. Bracho argued that the concept of PCD has shifted with time and that it is not always clear. PCD was originally defined negatively as the need to *avoid incoherence* between domestic policies and development goals. The most polemical and political issues between developing and developed countries thus came to the fore - including trade protection, agricultural subsidies, brain drain, capital flight and intellectual property rights. However, the concept of PCD has since expanded and currently comprises actively *seeking more coherence* across sectors through co-ordination and synergies - and ultimately achieving a “whole-of-government approach to development”.

This broader concept of PCD has been endorsed by both the OECD (most recently at the Council meeting in November this year) and by the European Union. It also underlies the *EU Report on Policy Coherence for Development*. Mr. Bracho made the case that this broad definition may water down the concept of PCD by focussing on co-ordination or synergies rather than directly addressing clashes between conflicting interests. Consistent with a broader definition of PCD, the EU report is not always organized according to “incoherences” spotted in each of the 12 highlighted areas. But more broadly, on what the EU is doing and aims to do for the benefit of developing countries in these sectors. He encouraged participants to ensure that the broader and more inclusive PCD does not devoid the concept of its teeth, power and political relevance.

Mr. Paul Engel, Director, European Centre for Development Policy Management reinforced Mr. Bracho’s view that PCD has to be political rather than solely an administrative exercise, and regretted the fact that parliamentarians are rarely involved in PCD processes. However, administrative and institutional settings *also* need to be in place to address PCD. The EU has made some significant progress in building institutional structures. Mr. Engel argued that there is a lack of general knowledge about PCD and that investment in research and capacity building as well as involvement of different stakeholders should be increased. Assessing PCD results is an important part of promoting it, and partner countries need to be involved in this.

Discussion

Participants stressed the need to clarify and communicate the practical meaning of PCD to politicians and policy makers. This needs to be done issue by issue. They also agreed that PCD *is political* and will need to address conflicts of interests in a transparent way. The importance of impact assessments and reporting to parliaments was emphasised. Participants encouraged the OECD and the EU to work closely together on PCD.

SESSION 3: International migration: what impact on development?

Session chair, David Batt, Director of the Africa Partnership Forum,

- What is the development potential of international migration for developing countries?
- What role do development assistance, migration, trade and other policies play in helping migrant-sending and migrant-receiving countries gain from labour mobility?

Jeff Dayton-Johnson, Senior Economist, OECD Development Centre, highlighted findings of the recent Development Centre publication entitled *Policy Coherence for Development: Migration and*

Developing Countries. More coherent policies are needed, Dayton-Johnson argued, because migration and development interact. To be effective, policy-makers in both domains should be aware of the impact of other policies on the outcomes they care about: the impact of migration policies upon development, and the impact of development policies upon migration. He claimed that international migration – particularly migration from low- and middle-income countries to OECD countries – can contribute to economic development. Moreover, economic development – and aid flows, more particularly – can help countries gain more from migration flows, though development should not be expected to slow or stop migration in the short to medium term.

As an example of the interaction of development and migration, Dayton-Johnson pointed to the evidence surrounding international migration by low-skilled workers. Their mobility contributes more to poverty reduction than the mobility of their high-skilled compatriots. This is for three reasons: First, because when low-skilled workers leave, they reduce unemployment or underemployment among other low-skilled workers who remain behind – and might even contribute to rising wages; second, because low-skilled workers tend to send more money home; third, because those remittances by low-skilled workers have a larger poverty-reduction impact than remittances from the high-skilled, because they are channelled to poorer families and communities.

Some suggestions included to introduce more flexible options for migrants and employers to engage in legal circular mobility, thus encouraging more remittances and circulation of skills. Countries with meaningful emigration flows must revisit their macroeconomic, human-resource, educational and infrastructure policies; official development assistance can help.

Khady Sakho-Niang, the Gender and Migration group, affiliated with the Forum of Immigrant International Solidarity Organisations (FORIM, Forum des Organisations de Solidarité Internationale issues des Migrations) (www.forim.fr), drew the attention of participants to the contribution of migrants to the enrichment both in societies of destination and countries of origin. These contributions have several dimensions: economic and financial (investment, saving, transfers); technical and scientific (transfer of skills, for example the DIAPOLE initiative to mobilize skilled members of the Senegalese diaspora); and multicultural (providing an example of diverse populations living together).

Ms. Sakho-Niang proposed a contemporary perspective on co-development, which she defined as the recognition of the migrant as a necessary agent of development. She directed participants attention to the December 2006 Forum on Co-development, hosted by Minister Brigitte Girardin in Paris, which illustrated the benefits of immigration to many stakeholders in sending and receiving countries. For Ms. Sakho-Niang, the most relevant policy question has to do with the appropriate measures to accompany migrants' associations and diaspora network, encouraging participants to evaluate their value added.

Ms. Sakho-Niang underscored the importance of women and youth in the contribution of diaspora networks to migration and development. Women and youth play multiple roles that must be acknowledged in this dynamic wealth-creation process. These multifaceted roles, for women in particular, will only grow in importance with the increasing feminisation of migration flows. Accordingly, policies must adopt a gender perspective, to optimise the contribution of women, as entrepreneurs and in other contributions they make.

Jean-Christophe Dumont, Senior Economist, Department of Employment, Labour, and Social Affairs, OECD, cautioned against being overly optimistic about the development impact of migration on development. Migrant flows, he reminded, are comparatively small: in 2000, there were about 57 million persons born in non-OECD countries living in the OECD, representing about 5 per cent of the OECD total population and no more than 1.1 percent of the population of their countries of origin. As a result, even a major and sustained increase in net migration flows to OECD countries could have at best a limited impact their home economies.

Mr. Dumont identified three channels through which migration impacts, positively or negatively, the economic development of origin countries. First, *remittances*, which have grown remarkably, have a

limited effect on poverty because migration does not primarily come from the poorest countries nor does it necessarily concern the poorest people. Nevertheless, several studies find that remittances increase households' spending in education and health and thus the accumulation of human capital. Second is *highly skilled migration*. While a "brain gain" is theoretically possible – in which case the prospect of emigration encourages higher rates of educational attainment to the benefit of the home country – recent research shows that the optimal migration rate would be no more than few percentage points. New OECD/DELSA data on immigrant stocks and educational attainment in origin countries suggest that only large developing countries such as India, Brazil or China meet the conditions for a brain gain of this sort. Moreover, the impact of highly skilled migration on origin country critically depends on the employment opportunities at home: under-development is the cause rather than the symptom of the brain drain. Third is *return migration*: under what circumstances do migrants go back home and does it benefit their home countries? Return on a voluntary basis will occur only if the economic conditions are sufficiently attractive and secure. Once again the economic development comes before any benefits from return migration.

Four axes for action for coherent policies are:

- **Enhanced efficiency:** facilitate mobility, reduce remittance costs. Examples include twinning hospitals or developing memoranda of understanding, as in the case of South Africa and the United Kingdom regarding health professionals.
- **Increased equity:** better share the cost of education and training between receiving and origin countries including through targeted aid programs; put in place policies to increase the impact of remittances on poverty reduction. Examples include programmes to attract and support foreign students.
- **Sustainability:** better manage human resources in origin and receiving countries to avoid dependence on migration; put in place sound macroeconomic policies that could result in a more efficient and extensive use of remittances for investment purposes, including in human capital.
- **Ethical approaches:** promote best practices regarding international recruitment of foreign workers (e.g. the ethical code of recruitment of the National Health Service in the United Kingdom.)

Nicole Gesnot, Delegate to the Development Assistance Committee, Canada, speaking in her personal capacity, drew attention to the illustrative differences between the immigration experiences of Canada and European countries. Ms. Gesnot noted that studies and economic theories have tended to give a conflicting picture: from a negative view of migration and development – focused, for example, on the destructive damage of brain – to a more positive view, of the imperative of migration to sustain economic development. It would be useful to better understand the examples of Ireland a century and a half ago, Spain and Portugal in recent decades, and Poland currently. Ms. Gesnot pointed out that the dynamics and impact of migration -- internal, south-south or south-north -- are not well understood. Moreover, no single theory or model fits all cases, and different impacts can be discerned at the micro, meso or macro levels.

Ms. Gesnot echoed other speakers' concerns regarding remittances and the brain drain. She pointed out that

Skeldon's 1997 Migration and Development report to the UN argues that development may actually increase rather than decrease migration. Assessment of these and other claims is hampered by the lack of reliable and detailed statistical data. In light of the emerging evidence and the uncertainties that remain, Ms. Gesnot underscored the emerging international consensus that given sustained increases in migration flows, efforts should be directed towards minimising migration's negative impacts and maximising its development benefits for migrants, their households and communities, and countries alike.

What is the appropriate policy response? Over the long-term, the best solution is still basic development, creating conditions that do not compel potential migrants to leave their communities. Long-term solutions will depend on the existence of strong, accountable state institutions that can design and implement

effective policies responding to their populations needs and concerns and being respectful of the human rights of their citizens and non-citizen residents

In the meantime, decision makers are encouraged to mainstream migration in development policy, to implement balanced development that creates long-term sustainable jobs where people live (notably in rural areas and small and intermediate cities), to manage migration, by improving the institutional capacity and governance of national immigration departments in source countries. A simple but powerful example: faster and more efficient processing times at borders would greatly increase the livelihoods of female cross-border traders. Strategies must be developed to enhance the retention of skilled labour (cf. Global Health Workforce Alliance). Policy makers should seek to enhance the development impact of remittances, notably by seeking of decreasing the cost of sending remittances, bearing in mind that remittance recipients are best placed to know what they should prioritise, including investment in local projects. Ms. Gesnot encouraged decision makers to pay greater attention to the development consequences of South-South migration, too often neglected in OECD discussions. Finally, diasporas can play an important role. Dual citizenship is one of the most useful measures to facilitate diaspora's ties to their country of origin as well as enable investment and other business opportunities. Canada, for example, imposes no restrictions on Canadians holding citizenship in more than one country.

Ms. Gesnot acknowledged that achieving policy coherence on migration and development issues is a major challenge for many developed and developing countries. Coherent North/South approaches should be developed, including: jointly identifying channels for legal migration; better matching of employment opportunities and labour force development; providing training and support for return migration; supporting statistical information gathering to establish migration profiles; seeking incentives for diaspora participation in development; providing multiple entry visas for the highly-skilled to avoid one-way brain-drain; pursuing south-south and circulatory migration; recognising the poverty reduction effects of low-skilled migration; and creating co-development groups.

Discussion:

A lively and far-ranging discussion followed the panellists' presentations. New Zealand drew upon the experience of migration to the country from neighbouring islands to remind participants that migration and development are complements rather than substitutes. Aid, for example, can increase the development impact of remittance flows, but the incredible recent growth in remittances should not be seen as an opportunity to reduce aid spending. Attention to non-financial, or social, transfers: skills, technology and new ideas that flow with migrants was stressed.

Several discussants pointed out the difficulties in separating discussion of immigration and emigration issues, where the former refer to social integration, labour-market access and social attitudes toward migrants, whereas the latter refer to the so-called "root causes" for migration (poverty, weak job creation, etc.). Some participants called for a relentless focus on the benefits of migration for OECD economies, focusing on best practices and engaging origin, destination and transit countries, to combat demagogic, xenophobic threats.

Another theme evoked by several discussants is the role of non-state actors: businesses and diaspora groups most notably. Businesses, particularly in the financial sector, can make help migration have a larger impact on development by lowering the cost and extending the reach of money transfers. Diasporas, meanwhile, can be important partners to states in delivering a wide range of related policies, including integration, development co-operation (via co-development strategies) and international trade.

A final theme: migration will benefit countries of origin, if the policy environment is a good one. In that case, centres of excellence, like the malaria research centre in Mali, was mentioned as a good example that attracts world-class talent. In a good policy environment, migrants will be delighted to invest in their home economy. The paradox, of course, is that with sufficiently good policies and institutions, a developing country doesn't really need the benefits brought by mobility and migration. Indeed, for this reason, our efforts must focus on creating inclusive and sustainable development.

SESSION 4: Future challenges and critical themes for policy coherence for development

Session Chair: Mr. Otto Genee, Director of Policy Coherence for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands.

- What are the critical themes that will require particular focus in the coming years?
- Where do we need further research and evaluation to identify productive avenues for policy coherence?
- How could the informal network of focal points best assist in promoting PCD issues – at home and at the OECD?

Ms. Raili Lahnalampi, PCD Advisor at the OECD, provided a brief history and update of PCD work at the OECD, noting the creation of the informal network of focal points in July 2007. The network will co-operate closely with its sister network co-ordinated by the EU. She stressed that the OECD is currently in the process of preparing its programme of work and budget for 2009-2010 and that, therefore, participants' feedback and suggestions for future themes for PCD work are crucial.

Ms. Lahnalampi reiterated the topics for discussion set out for this session and also asked participants to further reflect upon: i) how the OECD can support the focal points at a national level (e.g. by addressing particular topics or improving ways of communicating); and, ii) how focal points, in turn, can support the OECD (e.g. by providing feedback or identify useful interlocutors)?

She seconded previous speakers' view that PCD is political and therefore needs to address conflicts of interests. Differing interests are also the main reason why policy recommendations on PCD sometimes are not implemented even in countries where PCD is endorsed at ministerial level. Ms. Lahnalampi reiterated the need to better explain and communicate what PCD is in practice.

Mr. Javier Cortes Fernandez, Development Policies Bureau, Spain, outlined his views on the role of PCD focal points of the OECD informal network. He noted that Focal points should have knowledge about decision-making processes and be able to clarify and communicate the concept of PCD. They should also provide a platform for discussion between relevant stakeholders - including the academic sector and politicians. Co-ordination function is an important tool to enhance PCD. Mr. Cortes Fernandez felt that there is a need to further clarify the definition and role of a focal point, as well as that of PCD, and concentrate on the positive outcomes and potential opportunities of improved coherence.

The OECD network of focal points could:

- Provide a platform for sharing national discussions and results between OECD members;
- continue the dialogue with institutions and organisations which are not members of the OECD;
- identify good practice.

Discussion

Participants welcomed the heightened profile of PCD within the OECD and the creation of the informal network. A number of future actions for focal points of the informal network, and possible themes to work on, were suggested.

Action for focal points and for the informal network:

- focus on existing *incoherencies*, such as in agriculture and trade;
- explain and raise awareness about the PCD concept;
- create incentives in both OECD member countries and developing countries by showing the benefits (in particular the economic benefits) of PCD;

- produce facts and figures to show the implications of policy incoherence to policy makers;
- link up to the national decision-making process - work together with parliaments;
- engage, and encourage collaboration between, OECD committees and policy communities at a national level;
- bring in, and learn from, civil society organisations;
- be practical – for example by linking up to the OECD Secretary General’s agenda of the OECD as a “hub for globalisation”.

Focus themes for the network: Participants felt that the informal OECD network should focus on areas which are “easy wins”, which have real incoherences and are relevant for developing countries, and for policy-makers. In addition to ongoing work on migration and information technology, future themes could include:

- Trade (including aid for trade);
- Agriculture (including food security);
- Governance;
- Decent work;
- Conflict and arms;
- Climate change;
- Gender equality.

More information on: www.oecd.org/development/policycoherence