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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The Development Centre seeks to be the OECD’s knowledge centre for development, i.e., the Organisation’s interface between the international development research and policymaking communities in OECD member and non-member countries.

2. After a prolonged crisis, the Centre was restructured at the end of 2002 and started to function under new leadership in July 2003. In February 2006, its Governing Board decided to undertake an evaluation of the Centre to take stock of developments over these last three years. This evaluation would seek to establish what stakeholders think of the Centre’s recent and on-going work, and gain an appreciation of the direction in which they would like to see it heading.

3. The evaluation is based on two sources of information: the Centre’s own monitoring system and an email survey addressed to a broad range of stakeholders complemented by in-depth interviews. A total of 106 responses were received: The evaluation drew on the general evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.

Results of the evaluation

4. The Centre has made considerable progress: growth in the level of activity, particularly in terms of external presentations, events organised by the Centre, publications and downloads from the web site, has been impressive. Collaboration has intensified with the other OECD units that work primarily on development-related issues, particularly with the DAC/DCD. Contacts with other Directorates have also been strengthened and some joint work is being undertaken. As yet, however, the Centre is still some distance away from being perceived by other Directorates and Committees as a full partner, i.e., one whose interests overlap with their own and whose contributions are actively sought; progress on this front will require further mainstreaming of development thinking across the Secretariat.

5. Relations have been strengthened between Centre and governments, international organisations and institutional networks in OECD and developing countries. Opportunities to contribute to the international policy debate have consequently increased and the Centre has been better able to foster collaboration, avoid duplication of work and keep abreast of cutting-edge development research.

6. Stakeholders confirm that a turn-around has taken place over the past three years and approve of the direction being taken. They express general approval for the policy-oriented work and the choice of priority areas, particularly the three thematic areas and the African Economic Outlook (relevance). The Centre is perceived by a vast majority as having become more efficient and its leadership is seen as dynamic and progressive (efficiency). The role the stakeholders see for the Centre and their assessment of its strengths and weaknesses correspond to a large extent with that of the management. The most impressive finding is perhaps that a large number of governments and organisations state that the Centre has had an impact on their policymaking and work programmes (effectiveness).

7. The membership of the Centre has been enlarged with important new members (Romania, Thailand, South Africa, Brazil), while only one of the former OECD members has yet returned (Turkey).
However some former members support the Centre with voluntary contributions. The core budget is now relatively stable after years of decline and voluntary contributions have increased substantially.

Recommendations

8. The Development Centre should:

- maintain and enhance its position as a privileged place for dialogue, especially between OECD and non-OECD members;
- focus on fewer issues having identified niche areas where experiences from OECD countries can be used to promote development in partner countries;
- become more incisive in shaping OECD thinking on globalisation and development;
- forge stronger links with think tanks, academia and researchers in the South;
- develop a strategy for more effective outreach and communication; and,
- regain the confidence and support of key OECD countries which are not members at present.
EVALUATION OF THE OECD DEVELOPMENT CENTRE

I. Introduction

1. The Development Centre is the OECD’s knowledge centre for development. It is a research-oriented body that promotes better understanding of developing countries’ economic and social problems and shares the knowledge, information and experience gained by OECD members in their own development process. The strategic objective for 2006–2008 is to make the Centre an active and effective forum for evidence-based policy dialogue on leading issues concerning development and governance at the global, regional and national levels.

2. The Centre serves as the interface between the policymaking communities in OECD and non-OECD members, on the one hand, and the international development research community and other parts of the OECD Secretariat, on the other. Major activities are undertaken in collaboration with other development-related units and increasingly also with other Directorates. The focus of collaboration has shifted from the organisation of joint events to the undertaking of joint work.

3. The Centre has emerged from an important period of transition. From the mid-1990s to 2003 it experienced a prolonged period of crisis and diminishing interest and confidence. Some of the key member countries decided to leave the Centre, which led to a weakening of its position and status and reduced financial resources. In 2000, a task force was formed to review the critical situation. Following an external evaluation in 2002 decisions on a comprehensive restructuring were taken and the Centre was shaped in its present form.

4. The Advisory Board was converted into a Governing Board endowed with supervisory functions – guiding the preparation of the Centre’s programme of work, assisting in the design of policy dialogue activities and verifying the Centre’s performance.1 The Development Cluster was created with the aim of mainstreaming development into the OECD and the Centre’s management was restructured. The Centre started functioning under its new structure on 1 January 2003. In July, the outgoing President was replaced by a new Director, Dr Louka Katseli, who reports directly to the Governing Board and the Deputy Secretary General responsible for the Development Cluster.

II. The evaluation

5. Three years on, and with preparations for the 2007–2008 work programme under way, it is an appropriate time to take stock of developments and establish how stakeholders assess the work of the Centre and see its future.

6. Following a request for an evaluation of the Centre by Japan in February 2006, an informal group for the evaluation was formed by Ambassador Gun-Britt Andersson, Permanent Representative of Sweden to the OECD and Chair of the Governing Board. A smaller group was then formed to plan the evaluation, design a survey and conduct interviews. This informal group was composed of Ms. G.-B. Andersson (Sweden), Mr. J.-J. Hervé (France), Mr. J. Füllenbach (Germany), Mr. F. Cassese (Italy), Ms. M. Terakado (Japan), Ms. I. Hora Lopes (Portugal), Ms. M. Popescu (Romania), Mr. L. Gula (Slovak Republic), Mr. A. Stadler (Switzerland), Mr. D. Bendor and later Mr. R. Fox (UK). Ms. K. Hallberg, Ms. L. Abdallah and Mr. G. Forss (Sweden) assisted and co-ordinated the evaluation. The work was supported by a

---

1 The Governing Board comprises representatives of the Centre’s 27 member countries (21 OECD members and 6 non-OECD members: Brazil, Chile, India, Romania, South Africa and Thailand).
consultant, Ms. Elisabeth Lewin, who conducted some of the interviews, analysed the data and prepared the evaluation report.

7. The rationale of the evaluation is to supply credible, verifiable information that can inter alia be used to assess how far the Centre has travelled since its new structure was established in 2003, provide additional guidance from a broad stakeholder base for the future, reinforce transparency and accountability, and inform decisions on resource allocation and priorities. The evaluation is focused on the orientation and functioning of the Centre and its outputs. The work was also guided by the forward-looking document “Building a Coherent Framework for the OECD’s Work on Development in 2007–2008”.

8. The evaluation drew on the general evaluation criteria established by the OECD:

- **relevance**—whether the Centre is addressing current needs, and is likely to do so in future;
- **efficiency**—whether the Centre is optimising the relation between its financial and human resource inputs and the quality of its outputs;
- **effectiveness**—whether its outputs are being widely used and impacting on policy formation; and
- **sustainability**—whether its policy impact is long-lasting.

9. Data have been drawn from primary sources (i.e. an email survey addressed to a broad range of stakeholders and a smaller number of personal interviews) and secondary sources (principally the self-evaluations undertaken by the Centre of its performance in 2004 and 2005). 336 questionnaires were sent out and 21 interviews were conducted with selected stakeholders. It is worth pointing out that the survey and the interviews ask for the perceptions of the respondents (qualitative data), while the self-evaluations contain mainly quantitative data on outputs.

10. The main users of the evaluation will be the Centre’s Governing Board and its members and observers, OECD senior management, the Directorates with which the Centre has close working relationships and external stakeholders. The evaluation is also expected to be of interest to non-member countries or those that are considering resuming membership.

III. Recent Evolution of the Development Centre

*The work programme 2005–2006*

11. The Centre’s 2005–2006 programme of work seeks to underpin the move towards a broader approach to development co-operation and greater coherence in global policymaking through undertaking a range of policy analyses, publishing the associated policy conclusions and engaging in dialogue with stakeholders. The work is to be undertaken in close collaboration with other parts of the OECD Secretariat, as well as with experts and institutions in developing and transition countries. The programme focuses on four major interrelated activities:

- **Policy Coherence and Productive Capacity Building**
  Aid coherence; the impact of migration on receiving and sending countries; measures to promote capacity building and export diversification; and the development impact of the ascendancy of China and India.

- **Development Finance and Public Support**
  Optimal mix of grants and loans; innovative sources of development financing; aid architecture and aid effectiveness; and public awareness of development issues in OECD countries.

---

Governance Reform and Institutional Development
Identification of governance–investment interlinkages and options for governance reform; and assessment of the role of local institutions and the bases for pro-poor decentralisation.

Contributing to the NEPAD initiative
African Economic Outlook; and assessment of political governance systems in Sub-Saharan Africa.

12. The management objectives include further integration of the Centre into the Development Cluster and expanding co-operation within the Cluster and outside; mainstreaming development in the OECD; increasing outreach by enlarging the membership and broadening the constituencies; contributing to the international policy debate; and consolidating the financial position.

Annual reports and self-evaluations

13. The Centre deserves recognition for having established a monitoring system with objective and verifiable indicators to assess its own performance. Data are systematically collected, summarised at the end of the year and presented in the annual report. As a complement, OECD directors and member country delegations are asked about their knowledge and opinion of the Centre by means of a questionnaire. In its annual reports for 2004 (DEV/GB(2005)1) and 2005 (DEV/GB(2006)1) the Centre has summarised progress and challenges.

14. According to these reports, collaboration has intensified within the Development Cluster, particularly with the DAC. The launching of the Global Forum on Development is a case in point. The Cluster is now firmly rooted in bi-weekly meetings chaired by Deputy SG Akasaka. Contacts have been intensified with other Directorates and some opportunities for joint work identified. One example is the Policy Coherence Project led by the Centre, which has brought together AGR, DCD, ECH and ECO; another is the Migration Project which involves ELS in addition to the Cluster units. Better knowledge of the Centre has led other Directorates to seek collaboration and use its products in their work. The number of references to the Centre in OECD documents has increased.

15. The Centre has adopted a Membership Strategy outlining ways of encouraging former members to return and new members to join, particularly those that are playing important regional leadership roles. Since 2004 Romania, Thailand and South Africa have joined the Centre and Brazil and Turkey have returned as members.

16. Relations have been strengthened with governments, international organisations and institutional networks. This has given the Centre opportunities to contribute to the international policy debate, avoid duplication of work, foster collaboration and keep abreast with cutting-edge development research. It is interpreted as a sign of increasing recognition that the staff of the Centre were invited to make presentations at 90 events in 2005, twice as many as in 2004. The international visibility and impact of the Centre are based to a great extent on its publications. In 2005, there was a significant increase in internet-based distribution through the website (almost 400 000 documents downloaded).

17. The Centre has not succeeded in increasing the core budget. In 2005 it remained at approximately the same level as in 2004, about € 4 million. It is, however, worth noting that this relative stability followed almost a decade of continuous decline. Extra-budgetary resources have increased substantially, with non-members, among them the UK and Japan, contributing substantial amounts.

18. The Centre outlines as its most important institutional challenge the need to raise its value-added as an effective OECD forum for evidence-based policy dialogue on strategic issues concerning development policy. Meeting this challenge is expected to require that the Centre (a) raises both the
visibility and the impact of its contributions to the international policy debate, (b) enhances the involvement of key stakeholders in its activities, and (c) further consolidates its financial base.³

19. The response rate to the annual questionnaires directed at OECD Directors and delegations has been very low, which limits the value of this instrument. The majority of the respondents were OECD Directors and staff. Not surprisingly, those who replied were familiar with the Centre and its work and publications and had often worked with the Centre. One interesting aspect is their perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the Centre, which are summarised in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to provide in-depth analysis of development-related policies to underpin dialogue across the OECD</td>
<td>Absence of key OECD member countries in the Development Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity to think “out of the box” and in longer perspectives than other parts of the OECD</td>
<td>Limited resources and budget instability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its status as an interface between the policy and knowledge-based communities</td>
<td>Insufficient linkages with the rest of the OECD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse membership and a broad network of researchers, experts and civil society</td>
<td>Not enough involvement of capital-based delegates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to address new and sensitive issues</td>
<td>Communication and dissemination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building a coherent framework for the OECD’s work on development

20. In order to facilitate the preparation of the 2007–2008 programmes of work and budgets of the Cluster units, the Development Cluster has drafted the document “Building a Coherent Framework for the OECD’s Work on Development in 2007–2008”, ⁴ endorsed by the Council on 9 February 2006. The document also proposes broad orientations for the global development-related activities that, consistent with the roles and mandates of their respective Committees, other parts of the Secretariat will undertake during this period. The aim is to assist Directorates and Committees in identifying the type of development work they might wish to undertake and to help improve co-ordination across the OECD on work which has development implications. It should be recognised however that for several Committees and Directorates development issues are not a high priority and that when they engage with non-members, it is with middle-income countries and emerging economies, not with the less developed countries to which the Centre relates.

21. Four key thematic areas where the OECD has demonstrable leverage and value-added are identified in this framework. They could, if appropriately articulated and co-ordinated, comprise the core pillars of a coherent framework for OECD-wide work in support of global development:

- engaging with developing countries to maximise the benefits of globalisation for all, supporting policy reform for growth and poverty reduction;
- supporting capacity development and promoting good governance;
- mobilising resources for development and improving their effective use; and
- addressing shared risks.

Initial proposals for the 2007–2008 work programme

22. In line with this framework the Centre has formulated initial proposals for its 2007–2008 programme of work. The aim is to meet the challenges identified in the 2005 annual report (paragraph 18) and to ensure that work undertaken properly exploits the Centre’s comparative advantages, complements activities undertaken outside the OECD and focuses on the delivery of outputs targeted at the specific requirements of its key stakeholders and end-users.

23. The proposed work programme is organised around strategically selected output areas, culminating in the production of regular annual flagship publications and regional outlooks. These would serve as the hubs for associated policy dialogue events organised by the Centre and as instruments for engaging key stakeholders. Six output areas are proposed—three for “development policies and peer learning” (Policy Coherence for Development and Human Security, Business for Development, and Financing Development) and three for the “monitoring of regional performance” (African Economic Outlook, Latin American Economic Outlook, and Black Sea and Central Asian Economic Outlook). The three regional outlooks would be financed almost entirely by voluntary contributions.

IV. Results of the survey and the interviews

Respondents and response rate (Q. 1)

24. The survey was directed at various categories of stakeholders: government officials, academia, think tanks and experts of OECD member and non-member countries, international organisations, civil society and OECD Directors/Deputies. 86 responses to the questionnaire were received, which gives a response rate of 26%. The 21 interviews with selected stakeholders included the same questions as the questionnaire but invited the interviewee to give more analytical and in-depth responses. Of the total of 107 respondents (questionnaire and interviews combined) the largest categories were government officials of OECD members (38) and academia/think tanks/experts (37), followed by civil society representatives (12), representatives of international organisations (10), and OECD staff (9).

25. One reason for the rather low response rate may be that the survey was conducted during the summer holiday months, and another that the questionnaire was sent to a very large number of people some of whom are not regularly involved with the Centre. It should also be said that a total of 107 responses is in itself not bad. It is more than many other evaluations are based on. Many of the responses were from very well-informed and engaged persons offering a wealth of insights and views.

26. The “no reply” rate is quite high for some of the individual questions. One reason for this may be that they did not have sufficient information, another that they did not agree with any of the available reply alternatives. The open (unstructured) questions (Q. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16), which were optional in the questionnaire received fewer but more complex answers. They are challenging to analyse, categorise and present, but are the most interesting as they allowed the respondent to elaborate.

6 A more detailed analysis of the results is provided in annex 3.
7 The questionnaire and the interview guide are found in annexes 1 and 2.
Length and level of engagement with the Centre (Q. 2–4)

27. Just over 40% of the respondents had been in contact with the Centre for over five years and just below 40% for less than three years (Q. 2). Over 60% of those that responded to this question said that their engagement in the Centre had increased in the past three years (Q. 3).

28. Much more than half (62%) of the respondents believed that the engagement between the Centre and its stakeholders might be improved through informal technical advisory groups allocated to each of the planned “flagships”, while a little less than half (45%) supported the idea of more regular contacts with heads of research and co-ordinators from capitals attending Governing Board meetings. Government officials were even more supportive of the two proposals.

29. Suggestions were offered that the Centre should forge stronger links with academia and think tanks in developing countries, organise joint ventures with international organisations, create small topical working groups, establish relations with institutions in OECD countries and multilateral organisations, and work for more effective dissemination of its reports (Q. 4).

Views on the membership of the Centre (Q. 5)

30. A large majority of the respondents (75%) thought that the Centre needs more G7 members to rejoin, and about two-thirds (68%) thought that it needs more developing country players. Very few disagree with these proposals. As a new developing country member, most proposed China. Some suggested that the Centre use alternative means of interaction with partner countries, e.g. umbrella organisations representing groups of developing countries. The need for regional balance was emphasised (Q. 5).

Relevance (Q. 6, 10, 11 and 12)

31. Almost all respondents answered the question on the value they attach to each one of the six flagships that the Centre is proposing to create. The result is shown in the figure below.
32. Many respondents attach a high value to the three thematic flagships (the three columns to the left), and especially to Policy Coherence. The interest in the regional flagships (the three columns to the right) is less strong. The AEO, however, receives a high value, drawing twice as much interest as the LEO and almost three times as much as the CACEO. Several respondents warned about overlap with products of other institutions. For example, Business for Development was said to be a crowded field. The values given by different categories of respondents were on the whole similar (Q. 6).

33. When respondents were asked to list two or three policy areas they believe are adding value, the following areas were the most frequently mentioned (Q. 10):

Mentioned by 20–25 respondents:
- the Policy Coherence Agenda; and
- financial flows, innovative financing systems, foreign investment, trade and development, and aid architecture.

Mentioned by 13–19 respondents:
- African focus, the AEO, benchmarking and peer review in Africa; and
- China, India and development policy/Chinese growth and its impact on Africa/the role of Asian countries in world development and globalisation.

Mentioned by 8–12 respondents:
- migration and development, migration management;
- the aid effectiveness agenda; and
- governance, governance reform, institutional strengthening.

34. When asked what should be the key mission of the Centre, the respondents gave a variety of answers. They are very rich in content and it is difficult to do them justice in this summary. They can roughly be divided into the following four categories (Q. 11):

An independent knowledge centre and clearing house
35. Link research to policymaking: produce, formulate and transfer research findings in a user-friendly form to inform policymakers. Draw on experiences in OECD countries and disseminate it with the OECD brand. Tackle new and difficult issues in terms of policy responses and provide informed policy options for member countries.

A bridge between OECD and non-OECD members/developing economies
36. Serve as connection between OECD members and developing countries. Assess the impact of OECD policies on developing countries. Serve as interface between development concerns and OECD member government policies. Draw on the best experiences in OECD, emerging economies and other middle-income countries for the benefit of less developed countries. Act as a bridge to multilateral organisations and civil society.

A forum for policy dialogue
37. Serve as a meeting point of rich, emerging and poor countries for policy dialogue on development and governance issues. Promote the active engagement of a broad range of development actors from governments, academia and civil society. Assist in building capacity for policy makers and researchers, inter alia in Africa. Pursue in-depth advocacy for development.
A think tank on development for the OECD

38. Integrate development thinking into all parts of the Secretariat. Forge a close relationship with DCD/DAC and strengthen the Development Cluster. Promote horizontal development thinking and work across the Directorates. Inspire the DAC leadership, as was often the case in the early days of the Centre. Work on policy coherence based on synergies with other OECD programmes. Conduct research which other Directorates could tap into. To ensure that the Centre’s work is relevant and useful to other parts of the OECD, consultation should take place with the various Directorates.

39. When asked where they saw scope for increasing the relevance of the Centre’s work on policymaking, the respondents gave in part the same answers as in the previous question. This is not surprising as questions 11 and 12 are similar. However, there were also some new perspectives (Q.12):

- **Focus on fewer issues**

  The Centre needs to concentrate more of its activity and reflection on a smaller number of key areas. The work programme is still too dispersed. The Centre tends to overstretch itself, covering too broad a range of issues.

- **Visibility, exposure and communication**

  The visibility of the Centre needs to be significantly increased, both in terms of its products inside the OECD and externally. The Centre should develop an effective communication strategy to be used as a tool for (a) policy dialogue with partner countries, (b) policy development for improved aid effectiveness, and (c) raising awareness in donor countries. The Centre needs to continue to refine its forms and methods of presentation.

- **Linkages with stakeholders**

  The Centre should keep in close touch with stakeholders, target networks with influential players, and strengthen links with research institutions and with regional organisations and networks in developing countries. Sponsor South–South policy dialogue drawing on the knowledge base of the Centre.

**Efficiency (Q. 7, 8 and 13)**

40. Over half of the respondents appeared not to have sufficient information to assess the co-ordination between the Centre and the DCD/DAC. As might be expected, this was particularly the case for people external to the OECD. Government officials were better informed. Of the total number of respondents among government officials, 63% expressed a definite opinion, and of those the vast majority (84%) described the relations as “good”. This has not always been the case so this result reflects the conscious efforts made by the Centre in the past few years.

41. Respondents had even more problems characterising relations between the Centre and other Committees. 85% did not express an opinion. It is worth noting that, among the few respondents who did express an opinion, almost as many considered that relations were “bad” as “good”. Although responses are few, this points to a need for improvement. One respondent commented that collaboration has improved but more is needed, and suggested that the Centre should increase its “personality” by talking more with the Committees and participate in their meetings (Q. 7).

42. The question on a possible change in the Centre’s efficiency was to be answered only by those that had had a longer-term relationship with the Centre. Nearly half of the respondents answered the
question and all of those thought that the Centre had become more efficient in the past three years. This is indeed a very positive outcome for the Centre and its Director (Q. 8).

43. When asked to assess how efficient the Centre had been in an area of interest to the respondent and to give examples of a meeting or seminar, most mentioned one or more events that they had attended. In most cases the respondents had found the events well managed and rewarding. Many different events were quoted but the following were referred to most frequently:

- **China and India – What’s in it for Africa?** This workshop was considered as having had a high impact on a variety of policy-based communities.

- **African Economic Outlook.** The fact that this annual flagship publication was presented in several African capitals received particular recognition.

- **Public Information: Deepening Voice and Accountability to fight poverty.** This workshop was considered important as a dialogue among those engaged in communication work with the public.

44. Also mentioned in positive terms were events related to Policy Coherence for Development, Aid Architecture, Governance Reform, Corporate Governance, Decentralisation, Emerging Multinationals and the Centre’s mission to Bucharest. Many respondents stated that the events had provided them with valuable insights, and the opportunity to discuss issues with important actors from different regions of the world and to establish good contacts for the future.

45. There were also occasional critical comments on the management of the seminars: that their purpose is not always clear, they are not well focused, they do not allow sufficient time for discussion or they are inconclusive. A couple of respondents suggested that the Centre should engage more Southern experts and networks in the events (Q. 13).

**Effectiveness and sustainability (Q. 9, 14, and 15)**

46. As many as 41 of 96 respondents could think of a concrete example in the past three years where an output from the Centre had impacted on policy formulation. Of the government officials who responded to this question, 50% said that the Centre had had an impact on policy formulation. This is quite a remarkable result, showing that the Centre does indeed have an impact on policymaking at national level. Business for Development, African Economic Outlook, Policy Coherence, and India/China were the areas most frequently mentioned. The examples given reflect the interest in thematic flagship areas and in Africa and India/China seen in earlier responses (Q. 9).

47. A large number of respondents (27) stated that they use the Centre’s outputs to support their own research, teaching or writing. A good number (13) said that they use it as an input into their own work programmes or policymaking, while others explained that they share the information with other institutions and individuals or use it to bring media attention to development issues (Q. 14).

48. Respondents had difficulty answering the questions about the sustainability of the Centre in its present structure (Q. 15) and whether the Centre fulfils its demands and needs. Many commented on what they perceived to be critical issues and necessary changes. Some of these are brought up in the concluding section of this report.
V. Conclusions and recommendations

Comparative advantages

49. The Centre has intellectual independence and freedom. It is in a position to play the role of a multi-stakeholder, solid, credible, balanced and non-ideological centre for thinking about the theory and practice of development and to be an international meeting point of rich, emerging and poor countries for policy dialogue on development and governance issues.

50. The Centre is in a privileged position to act as an interface between the OECD policy communities and developing countries using its intellectual autonomy and administrative flexibility to apply the best experiences and practices of OECD and other countries.

51. Thanks to its independent status the Centre can initiate work on controversial and sensitive issues of relevance for development on which the Committees are not yet ready to engage due to political controversy. In this way the Centre can pave the way for policy formulation in later stages.

Progress and achievements since 2003

52. There has been impressive growth in the level of activity. The Centre’s monitoring system shows a quantitative leap, among other things in the numbers of external presentations, meetings with other parts of the OECD, visits to member countries, contacts with international organisations and networks and downloads from the website. The engagement with non-member countries has expanded.

53. The membership of the Centre has been enlarged with important new and returning members, although none of the OECD members that left the Centre in the period 1996–2003 has yet returned.

54. The core budget has achieved relative stability after years of decline. Voluntary contributions have increased substantially in amounts and as a share of the budget.

55. Co-ordination within the Development Cluster has become a reality. In particular the collaboration with DCD/DAC has become more effective. Contributions to the subsidiary bodies of the DAC are significant. The proposal “Building a Coherent Framework for the OECD’s Work on Development in 2007–2008”, to which the Centre made important contributions, represents an achievement with respect to the mainstreaming of development in the OECD. It remains to be seen to what extent Directorates and Committees will make use of this proposal and whether horizontal co-operation will increase.

56. The Centre has made serious efforts to extend collaboration within the OECD. Progress has been made in terms of the Policy Coherence project and the Migration project. For some Committees and Directorates, however, development issues are not high on the agenda and they rarely see the need or the usefulness of co-operation with the Centre. Some directors go as far as to say that they do not see the rationale for a separate body such as the Centre.

57. The survey and interviews point to an increasing engagement of the stakeholders in the Centre and recognition of the turn-around and progress achieved in the past three years. The Centre earns approval for its policy-oriented work and the choice of priority areas, which are considered highly relevant. In particular, the three thematic flagships and the AEO meet with broad approval. The role the stakeholders see for the Centre and their assessment of its strengths and weaknesses correspond to a large extent with the views and analysis of the Centre’s management.
58. The Centre is perceived as having become more efficient and its leadership is perceived as dynamic and progressive. The participants praise many of the events organised by the Centre. Perhaps the most important and impressive result is that a large number of respondents state that the Centre has had an impact on the policymaking of their government or organisation.

**Challenges**

59. The most important strategic institutional challenge according to the Centre’s own management is to raise its value-added as an effective OECD forum for evidence-based policy dialogue on strategic development policy issues.

60. Another main challenge is to get OECD members back to the Centre (in particular members of the G7) and to have key developing countries join. This is necessary to increase the political relevance of the Centre and strengthen its financial base.

61. A third challenge is to integrate development thinking into all parts of the Secretariat, overcome the resistance of some Directorates and expand horizontal co-operation.

**Recommendations**

62. The Development Centre should:

   a) Maintain its position as a privileged place for dialogue, especially the North–South dialogue;

   b) Focus on fewer issues and become a leader on those issues. Identify niche areas among those issues where experiences from OECD countries can be used to promote development in partner countries. Be careful to avoid duplication with the work of other institutions;

   c) Become more incisive in shaping OECD thinking on globalisation and development by strengthening links and initiating more debate and co-operation with other parts of the Secretariat. Define work plans in consultation with other Directorates to ensure that the work of the Centre is relevant and useful to them;

   d) Forge stronger links with academia, think tanks and researchers in the South. Have more workshops take place in the developing world for increased exposure to policy makers. Sponsor South–South policy dialogue; and

   e) Develop a strategy for more effective outreach and communication. Significantly increase the visibility of the Centre and its products inside and outside the OECD. Market and disseminate publications more effectively and more widely. Contribute to increase public knowledge of development and development co-operation. Serve as a public information network.
ANNEX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE IN ENGLISH

The answers of this survey will be analysed applying the following criteria:
- **Relevance**, *ie* whether the Development Centre is addressing your current needs, and is likely to do so going forward;
- **Efficiency**, *ie* whether the Centre is optimising the relation between its financial and human resource inputs and the quality of its outputs;
- **Effectiveness**, *ie* whether its outputs are being widely used and if they are impacting on policy formation;
- **Sustainability**, *ie* if its policy impact is long-lasting.

**RELATIONSHIP WITH THE CENTRE**

1. Please tick which of these categories applies to you, one or several that applies to you

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible for the Centre within your government structure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant in policy dialogue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External participant or counterpart in the Centre's research activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader of the Centre's publications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A user of the Centre's services (Website, library, data, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working within the OECD Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. For how long have you had contacts with the Centre?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Recently: within the last three years</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) For 3-5 years</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Over 5 years</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. If you have answered (b) or (c), has your engagement during the last three years:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Increased</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Decreased</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Remained the same?</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. How do you think engagement between the Centre and its stakeholders might be improved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through more regular contacts with Heads of Research or co-ordinators from capitals attending the Governing Board (or a new Advisory Board) once or twice a year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through informal technical advisory groups allocated to each flagship/regional outlook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please outline)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Do you have any views on the membership of the Centre?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The size and balance of the membership is about right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Centre needs more developing country players (if you agree please give examples).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Centre needs more G7 members to rejoin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RELEVANCE**

6. Looking ahead, the Centre is proposing to create three ‘flagship’ products in addition to regional outlooks. Please indicate the value these are likely to offer you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flagship</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Coherence for Development and Human Security (Evidence-based policy dialogue on Policy Coherence for Development and Human Security, together with the management of policy networks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business for development (Evidence-based policy dialogue directed at reducing supply-side constraints and promoting private sector involvement and development in developing countries, together with managing policy networks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative finance for development (Evidence-based policy dialogue on the international development finance system, financial instruments and development assistance, together with the management of policy networks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Economic Outlook (Monitoring and evidence-based policy dialogue focussing on African regional issues, and managing policy networks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American Economic Outlook (Monitoring and evidence-based policy dialogue focussing on Latin American regional issues, and managing policy networks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Sea and central Asian Economic Outlook (Monitoring and evidence-based policy dialogue focussing on Black Sea, Central Asian regional issues, and managing policy networks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EFFICIENCY**

7. How satisfactory is the co-ordination/co-operation between the Centre and the OECD and its Committees, in particular the DCD/DAC?
a) DCD/DAC

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Other Committees

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. If you have had longer-term relations with the Centre, have they become more or less efficient during the last three years (e.g., in managing meetings or providing you the outputs you need)?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More efficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less efficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EFFECTIVENESS AND SUSTAINABILITY

9. I can think of a concrete example, in the past three years, where an output from the Centre has impacted on policy formation.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: If you agree, which policy area do you have in mind?
OPTIONAL QUESTIONS

These questions are optional. Please, feel free to put forward your views on all or selected!

Relevance
10. Please list the two or three policy areas where you believe the Centre is adding value. Please underscore the area which is of particular relevance to you.

11. What do you think should be the key mission of the Centre? Is this mission a priority for you and/or your own agenda?

12. Where do you see scope for increasing the relevance of the Centre’s work to policy making/implementation?

Efficiency
13. To the extent that you can, please provide a brief assessment of how efficient you think the Centre has been in an area of interest to you. For example, was a meeting or seminar you attended well organised and managed? Does the Centre accomplish its tasks/mandate in time and at reasonable cost? (Please indicate area/s)

Effectiveness and Sustainability
14. In an area of relevance to you (which you have already indicated) please explain how you are using the Centre’s output. (Please indicate area/s)

15. Do you think that the Centre in its present structure, with its mandate and support will be in a position to serve its clients in a durable fashion and have sustainable impact on policy development? If not, what changes do you consider most urgent?

Thank you for your time.
ANNEX 2: INTERVIEW GUIDE IN ENGLISH

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The answers of this survey will be analysed applying the following criteria:

- **Relevance**, *ie* whether the Development Centre is addressing your current needs, and is likely to do so going forward;
- **Efficiency**, *ie* whether the Centre is optimising the relation between its financial and human resource inputs and the quality of its outputs;
- **Effectiveness**, *ie* whether its outputs are being widely used and if they are impacting on policy formation;
- **Sustainability**, *ie* if its policy impact is long-lasting.

**RELATIONSHIP WITH THE CENTRE**

1. Please tick which of these categories applies to you, one or several that applies to you

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible for the Centre within your government structure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant in policy dialogue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External participant or counterpart in the Centre's research activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader of the Centre's publications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A user of the Centre's services (Website, library, data, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working within the OECD Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. For how long have you had contacts with the Centre?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Recently: within the last three years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) For 3-5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Over 5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. If you have answered (b) or (c), has your engagement during the last three years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Level</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Increased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Decreased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Remained the same ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. How do you think engagement between the Centre and its stakeholders might be improved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through more regular contacts with Heads of Research or co-ordinators from capitals attending the Governing Board (or a new Advisory Board) once or twice a year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through informal technical advisory groups allocated to each flagship/regional outlook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please outline)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Do you have any views on the membership of the Centre?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The size and balance of the membership is about right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Centre needs more developing country players (if you agree please give examples).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Centre needs more G7 members to rejoin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RELEVANCE (NOTE 10, 11, 12 ARE OPEN QUESTIONS)

10. Please list the two or three policy areas where you believe the Centre is adding value. Please underscore the area which is of particular relevance to you.

11. What do you think should be the key mission of the Centre? Is this mission a priority for you and/or your own agenda?

6. Looking ahead, the Centre is proposing to create three ‘flagship’ products in addition to regional outlooks. Please indicate the value these are likely to offer you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flagship</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Coherence for Development and Human Security (Evidence-based policy dialogue on Policy Coherence for Development and Human Security, together with the management of policy networks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business for development (Evidence-based policy dialogue directed at reducing supply-side constraints and promoting private sector involvement and development in developing countries, together with managing policy networks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative finance for development (Evidence-based policy dialogue on the international development finance system, financial instruments and development assistance, together with the management of policy networks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Economic Outlook (Monitoring and evidence-based policy dialogue focussing on African regional issues, and managing policy networks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American Economic Outlook (Monitoring and evidence-based policy dialogue focussing on Latin American regional issues, and managing policy networks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Where do you see scope for increasing the relevance of the Centre’s work to policy making/implementation?

EFFICIENCY (NOTE 13 IS AN OPEN QUESTION)

13. To the extent that you can, please provide a brief assessment of how efficient you think the Centre has been in an area of interest to you. For example, was a meeting or seminar you attended well organised and managed? Does the Centre accomplish its tasks/mandate in time and at reasonable cost? (Please indicate area/s)

7. How satisfactory is the co-ordination/co-operation between the Centre and the OECD and its Committees, in particular the DCD/DAC?

   a) DCD/DAC
      
      Good
      Bad
      Indifferent
      Don't know

   b) Other Committees
      
      Good
      Bad
      Indifferent
      Don't know

8. If you have had longer-term relations with the Centre, have they become more or less efficient during the last three years (eg in managing meetings or providing you the outputs you need)?

   More efficient
   Less efficient
   Not sure

EFFECTIVENESS AND SUSTAINABILITY (NOTE 14, 15 ARE OPEN QUESTIONS)

14. In an area of relevance to you (which you have already indicated) please explain how you are using the Centre’s output. (Please indicate area/s)

9. I can think of a concrete example, in the past three years, where an output from the Centre has impacted on policy formation.

   Agree (please indicate)
   Disagree
Not sure

Comment: If you agree, which policy area do you have in mind?

15. Do you think that the Centre in its present structure, with its mandate and support will be in a position to serve its clients in a durable fashion and have sustainable impact on policy development? If not, what changes do you consider most urgent?

Additional question (optional for interviewer)
16. In your opinion, does the Centre fulfil its demands and needs?

Thank you for your time.
ANNEX 3: ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND THE INTERVIEWS

Table of contents

PART 1. RESPONSE RATE
PART 2. RELATIONSHIP WITH THE CENTRE. Questions 1-5.
PART 3. RELEVANCE. Questions 6, 10, 11 and 12.
PART 4. EFFICIENCY. Questions 7, 8 and 13.
PART 5. EFFECTIVENESS AND SUSTAINABILITY. Questions 9, 14, 15 and 16.

PART 1: RESPONSE RATE

Categories of respondents:

1. Officials from Development Centre members
2. Officials from OECD members that are not members of the Dev. Centre
3. Officials from OECD non-members
4. Academia and Think Tanks: OECD Countries
5. Academia and Think Tanks: Other countries
6. International/Intergovernmental Organisations
7. Experts
8. Civil Society, Private Sector and the Media
9. OECD staff (Directors and Deputy Directors except DEV)

Number of questionnaires sent out and received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sent out</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response rate: 26%.

Number of telephone or personal interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conducted by members of the informal group for the evaluation and the consultant. 30 interviews planned initially.

The analysis is based on 86 questionnaires and 21 interviews = a total of 107 responses.
PART 2: RELATIONSHIP WITH THE CENTRE - Questions 1-5.

QUESTION 1: Type of relationship with the Centre

Respondents according to the categories specified on page 1:
Category 1+2 = 36%
Category 4 - 8= 57%
Category 9 = 7%

QUESTION 2: For how long have you had contacts with the Centre?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recently: within the last three years</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For 3-5 years</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5 years</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OECD based government officials had on an average shorter experience (81% less than 3 years) than government officials from capitals (52% less than 3 years).

**QUESTION 3:** If you have had contacts with the Centre for over three years, has your engagement increased, decreased or remained the same?

![Bar chart showing engagement over 3 years]

**QUESTION 4:** How do you think engagement between the Centre and its stakeholders might be improved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Through more regular contacts with Heads of Research or co-ordinators from capitals attending the Gov. Brd</th>
<th>Through informal technical advisory groups allocated to each flagship.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent or no reply</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Government officials were more favourable to the two proposals than the average. 53% agreed with the first proposal, and 74% with the second one.

**Other suggestions made by respondents:**
- The Centre should forge stronger links with leading knowledge institutions in developing countries, promote joint research and identify “best practices” on how to influence public policy.
- Better dissemination of reports needed. Activities are too Paris-focused. Make presentations in different capitals.
- Organise joint ventures between the Centre and international organisations! Forge tighter links with research departments in these organisations.
- Create small topical working groups. Organise thematic study days on different topics.
- The Centre should be more proactive in promoting and maintaining links with DAC/DCD and participate more actively in Working Parties.
- Have researchers rather discuss research topics - politicians are too focused on the short term.
- More contacts with other institutions in OECD countries and with multilateral organisations.
QUESTION 5: Do you have any views on the membership of the Centre?

Conclusions:
- A large majority thought that the Centre needs more G7 members to rejoin and also more developing country players. Very few disagreed, but some warned against taking on too many developing countries. The balance needed to be maintained. Alternative means of interaction were suggested, e.g. identifying umbrella organisations that could represent groups of developing countries.

- The views of government officials, as a group (see chart below), corresponded roughly to the average values. Officials based at the OECD were however more supportive of both proposals (89% for more developing country members and 82% for G7 members). 100% of OECD directors wanted more G7 members to rejoin.

- As new developing country members, most respondents suggested China. A few mentioned countries that are already members (South Africa, Brazil), an entire region (Africa, Middle East, Latin America) or “emerging economies. Need for regional balance was emphasised.
PART 3: RELEVANCE - Questions 6, 10, 11 and 12.

Question 6: Looking ahead, the Centre is proposing to create three ‘flagship’ products in addition to regional outlooks. Please indicate the value these are likely to offer you.

Comments by respondents:

- Flagships are important in that they give visibility to the Centre.
- The key question is whether the flagships are adding value as compared to what the regional development banks and the UN Regional Social and Economic Commissions produce. Priorities must be established in relation to what others are doing.
- The AEO has been an excellent idea; it is a good tool for comparative analysis. Should continue.
- Policy coherence has a potentially high value but there is a risk that the Centre is not the right place or does not have a comparative advantage.
- Business for development is a crowded field. Is it the appropriate niche of the Centre?
- Publications are interesting in themselves but it is equally important to disseminate them effectively so that they reach the right people, *inter alia* policy makers and decision-makers.

**Comments**

*There is a great interest in the three thematic flagships, but most of all in Policy Coherence.*

The value attached to the regional flagships was not as high with the exception of the AEO. Rather few respondents gave a high value to the two other regional flagships which are now at the planning stage. The preference for different regions reflects the country of residence or work of the respondent. Overall interest in Africa was stronger among development policy makers/practitioners in Europe.

Caution for overlap with other institutions’ flagships was expressed by some respondents.

There were no major differences between the views expressed by the different categories of respondents with the exception of respondents from the OECD Secretariat. They attached a much lower value to the three thematic flagships (27, 29 and 29% respectively). However, they attached higher values than the average respondent to all three thematic flagships.

**Question 10:** Please list two or three policy areas where you believe the Centre is adding value. Please underscore the area which is of particular relevance to you. This question was included in all interviews. It was optional to respondents of the questionnaire.

**Comment**

Questions 10-16 are open and unstructured. It is always a challenge to analyse the responses to such questions where the respondent is invited to express his/her thoughts freely. In this analysis, similar responses have been brought together in groups to facilitate the interpretation and see the trends. There are not always clear boundaries between the different categories and occasionally contradictions are found between statements made by different respondents. The reader will also notice that several of the questions produce similar responses, e.g. questions 11, 12 and 15.

Policy areas mentioned by 20 - 25 respondents:

- The Policy Coherence Agenda
- Financial flows, innovative financing systems, foreign investment, trade & development, aid architecture.

Policy areas mentioned by 13-19 respondents:

- African focus, AEO, benchmarking and peer review in Africa
- China, India and development policy/Chinese growth and impact on Africa /Role of Asian countries in world development and globalisation.
Policy areas mentioned by 8-12 respondents:

- Migration and development, migration management
- The aid effectiveness agenda
- Governance, governance reform, institutional strengthening

Policy areas mentioned by 3-7 respondents:

- Public information, development education
- Economic policy research, research on poverty reduction, public-private partnership
- Linkages between development and trade/migration/investment
- Private sector development

Comment by a respondent:
- The Centre has an important task in bringing up emerging and sensitive issues. Many developing countries are confronted with new issues and problems and are looking for ways to respond.

**Question 11**: What do you think should be the key mission of the Centre? Is this mission a priority for you and/or your own agenda? This question was included in all interviews but was optional to respondents of the questionnaire.

The answers can roughly be divided into the following four categories:

1. **An independent knowledge centre and clearinghouse**

   Produce serious, relevant and understandable research and disseminate it with the OECD brand. Become a leader on selected development issues. Draw on experiences in OECD countries. Tackle difficult areas in terms of policy responses providing informed options for member states.

   Link research to policy making: produce, formulate and transmit research findings to inform decision-makers. Impose itself as a think tank on institutional best practice.

   Identify and analyse emerging global issues that the OECD member states should give more attention to. Provide analytical insights into the development process and its constraints. Conduct research free of political interference. Carefully guard and use freedom to be critical.

   Provide analysis relevant for development policy on which DAC is not ready to engage due to political controversy. The work should span a broader field than covered by traditional donor agencies and seek inputs from a broad array of expertise available within the Secretariat and Committee structure.

**Quotes**

The Centre must seek not to replicate the work of specialised research centres or other international organisations. It should rather see its role as an agency promoting the interface between specialised researchers and the DAC policy community.

Offer guidance on pro-development policy of developed and big developing countries. Identify win-win changes in international relations in trade, capital movement, migration and knowledge transfer. Identify low-cost efforts to foster the development of the poorest, e.g. in sub-Saharan Africa.
2 Bridge between OECD and non OECD members/developing economies

Be the connection between OECD and developing countries. Bring development perspectives into the OECD. Assess the impact of OECD policies on developing countries.

Serve as an intermediary between members of the OECD and non-members sharing information and experience and networking with academia, research centres, think tanks, policy makers etc.

The Centre’s ‘value added niche’ is to be the interface between development concerns and OECD government policies across the board; to draw on the best experiences in OECD, Asian and other countries for development in less developed countries.

Quote
The Centre has a solid research capacity and is in a privileged position to act as a bridge between the OECD policy communities and developing countries using its intellectual autonomy and administrative flexibility to apply areas of excellence of OECD countries. The Centre also represents a bridge to civil society organisations and other multilateral organisations.

3 Forum for policy dialogue

Be an active meeting point of rich, emerging and poor countries for policy dialogue on development and governance issues. Assist developing countries policy makers in their search for policy solutions. Facilitate policy dialogue between OECD and civil society organisations.

Promote an active engagement of a broad range of development actors connecting people from academia, policy making and civil society. Assist in building capacity, i.a. in Africa.

Serve as a production and resource centre whose purpose it is to nourish the political dialogue, formal and informal, and help advance the debate on certain issues related to development.

4 Think Tank on development for OECD

Integrate development thinking into all parts of the OECD Secretariat. Inspire, pioneer and promote the Development Cluster. Promote horizontal work across the various directorates. Forge a close working relationship between the Centre and DAC/DCD. Inspire the DAC leadership with subjects and focus, as used to be the case in the early days of the Centre.

Work for policy coherence on development issues based on synergies with other OECD programmes and in alliance with others (member and non-member countries, emerging donors, North and South, public and private).

Conduct research that other directorates could tap into. To ensure that the Centre’s work is relevant and useful the Centre should consult with directorates when developing its work plans.

QUESTION 12: Where do you see scope for increasing the relevance of the Centre’s work to policy making/implementation? This question was included in all interviews. It was optional to respondents of the questionnaire.

The answers can roughly be divided into the following four categories:
1 **Focusing on fewer issues**

The Centre needs to concentrate more of its activity and reflection on a smaller number of key areas. It tends to overstretch itself covering too broad a range of issues.

The focus should be on areas where experiences from OECD countries can be used to promote development in partner countries. They must be other areas different from those studied in other institutions. Be particularly aware of the risk of duplication with other international organisations. Flexibility to emerging issues is paramount.

The Centre should strive to maintain high quality of research to become a centre of excellence in selected focus areas. The Centre should feed research results to the Committees rather than make policy recommendations. That is a task of the Committees.

2 **Visibility, exposure and communication**

Increase the visibility of the Centre and its products both inside and outside the OECD using strategic, planned communication as a tool for policy dialogue with partner countries, policy development for improved aid effectiveness, and raising awareness in donor countries.

Contribute to increasing public knowledge and understanding of development and development cooperation. Serve as a public information network.

Enhance dialogue with key multilateral development organisations. Include more decision-makers and parliamentarians into dialogue and platforms.

Have more expert workshops take place in developing countries for increased exposure to policy makers in these countries.

3 **Linkages with stakeholders**

Keep in close and permanent touch with stakeholders. Target networks with influential players. Continue to strengthen links with research institutions and regional organisations. Achieve better integration into networks in developing countries. Develop formal links with selected academic and research institutions through designated titles (along the lines of WHO Collaborating Centres).

Sponsor south-south policy dialogue. Balance the interest in geographical areas by paying more attention to South-East Europe.

4 **Interface between research and policy making**

Communication, networking, trustworthiness and credibility are keys to linking research to policy making. The Centre must seek not to replicate the work of specialised research centres but see as its role to promote the interface between researchers, the DAC and other policy communities.

Help developing countries benefit from policy experiences of OECD countries; undertake collaborative policy-relevant research with African academia and think tanks; and forge linkages with them.
Be more proactive in helping countries draw on findings for policy-making. The work should be more policy oriented integrating the views of developing countries and academics.

5 Think tank for all of OECD on development issues.

By acting horizontally within OECD the Centre should aim to become more incisive in shaping OECD’s thinking on globalisation and development. The Centre could become a catalyst for pushing and convincing OECD to fully capitalise on its potential.

The Centre should nurture and deepen the collaboration and strengthen its substantive co-operation also with directorates outside the Development Cluster. The Centre must demonstrate that it can contribute to the work of the committees. DEV and DCD/DAC should work more closely together.

The Centre should draw on its comparative advantages: integrating the views of civil society, incorporating policy dialogue with non-members, and using its strong analytical function.

Thanks to its independence the Centre can initiate work on new and controversial issues of relevance for development. Examples are the impact of emerging economies (India and China) and migration.

**PART 4: EFFICIENCY - Questions 7, 8 and 13.**

**Question 7: How satisfactory is the coordination between the Centre and the OECD and its Committees, in particular the DCD/DAC?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All respondents</th>
<th>DCD/DAC</th>
<th>Other committees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How satisfactory is the coordination between the Centre and the rest of OECD?**

- **Bad**
- **Indifferent**
- **Good**

Don’t Know = 47%
Comment
Please observe that in the figures on the preceding page the large proportion of “Don’t know” is not included, as it is in the table above the figures.

A majority the respondents (57% for coordination with DCD/DAC and 85% for coordination with other parts of the OECD) apparently did not have sufficient information or insight into the OECD to answer (Indifferent/Don’t know and No reply combined). As expected, this is particularly the case for people external to OECD. An analysis of respondents with more than three years of contact with the Centre shows approximately the same pattern as for all respondents.

Relations between the Centre and DCD/DAC
Government officials, many of whom are based at OECD delegations, were not surprisingly better prepared to respond. 53% of those who responded considered that relations between the Centre and the
DCD/DAC were good and 8% that they were bad. Among OECD based government officials, however, 91% thought these relations were good and nobody that they were bad.

It is remarkable that OECD Directors had a much less favourable assessment of the relations. Only 25% thought that they were good; 13% that they were bad.

Relations between the Centre and other committees of the OECD
85% of respondents did not express an opinion (indifferent and don’t know combined). Naturally it is not possible for people external to OECD to be informed. The only category that had a reasonable response rate was OECD Directors/Deputies and they are only 9. Again their assessment was not very positive. 29% said relations were good and an equal percentage that they were bad. Again the respondents are few and the result has to be interpreted with caution.

Comments by respondents:
- The collaboration has improved in the last three years but more is needed. The Centre needs to increase its “personality” by talking more with the committees and participate at meetings, inside and outside the organisation. There is a rationale for horizontal work but it is difficult to make it work in practice.
- Relations are good with some committees, bad with others and with some there are no relations at all. Dr Katseli has brought much more dynamics to the Centre but there is still a long way to go.

Question 8: If you have had longer-term relations with the Centre, have they become more or less efficient during the last three years?

If you have had longer-term relations with the Centre, have they become more or less efficient during the last three years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More efficient</th>
<th>Less efficient</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultant’s comment
Half of the respondents said they were not sure or did not reply at all. Apparently they did not have enough information. However all respondents that expressed an opinion said that the Centre had become more efficient. This is a very positive result for the Centre and its management.
**Question 13:** To the extent than you can, please provide a brief assessment of how efficient you think the Centre has been in an area of interest to you. For example, was a meeting or seminar you attended well organised and managed? Does the Centre accomplish its tasks/mandate in time and at reasonable cost? (Please indicate area/s)

**Comment**

Most respondents mentioned seminars and meetings they have attended, and commented on the usefulness of the Centre’s work and/or how the Centre works. Respondents did not comment on the latter part of the question – whether tasks were accomplished in time and at reasonable cost. It is reasonable to expect that they did not have sufficient information.

**Significant events and areas of work frequently mentioned and praised:**

1. **China and India – What’s in it for Africa?**
   
   **Comment:** The March 2006 workshop on Asian Drivers was pioneering, well-organised and had a high impact on a variety of policy-based communities. (expert). The timely publication of the India/China/Africa study – a topic on many agendas now (African think tank)

2. **AEO – particularly the presentation in African capitals. The 6th International Forum on African Perspectives**
   
   **Comment:** Very productive participation of the Director in the Big Table dialogue on Africa.

3. **Public information: Deepening Voice and Accountability to fight poverty:**
   
   **A dialogue of Communication Implementers.**
   
   **Comment:** The public opinion work is extremely relevant and seems to be carried out on a shoestring budget (OECD government)

**Also mentioned in positive terms:**

- Aid architecture
- Political coherence for Development
- Governance
- Corporate governance (outstanding experts and officials participating. Inclusion of China important)
- Decentralisation and poverty issues
- Emerging multi-nationals
- The Director’s mission to Bucharest. The CACEO Outlook.

The great majority of respondents spoke of the conferences and seminars in very positive terms, but there were also a few respondents who made critical remarks (see comments below).

**Comments by respondents:**

**On the efficiency of the Centre and its work**

- There is good dissemination and presentation, in particular of policy coherence research, in seminars. This contributes to widening the knowledge base and increasing awareness of the work of the Centre to policy-makers and other stakeholders. (government official, OECD)
- The documentation is mainly used in our capital. Relations have been established with academia and think tanks working on international relations there (government official at OECD delegation).

- Meetings have provided me other participants with valuable insights into some issues which help us with our work in the OECD. They have offered the possibility to meet and discuss with important actors from different regions of the world and to establish good contacts for future cooperation (European government official).

- The work presented by the Centre often allows us to refine our analysis and initiate group discussions on issues that are relevant for actors on the national scene. It allows us also to develop programmes and activities locally (African think tank).

- Seminars are well organised and benefit from the participation of excellent experts. However one may ask what the practical impact is on the problems of development countries.

- The budget is obviously small; still expensive products like the AEO are being produced. It may be a good idea to make a comparative cost-benefit analysis.

**On how the Centre works**

- It seems that too much time and money is spent on dialogue which leads nowhere. The Centre should be more of a think tank than a bureaucratic organisation (European university).

- The Centre is strong on accessing and engaging northern research networks but not as active in linking up with research networks or identifying individuals from developing countries who can contribute to the work of the Centre.

- My impression is that the Centre operates within a very narrow circle of external academics and advisors thereby missing the cutting edge of the development debate.

**On the management of meetings and seminars**

- Seminars are extremely efficiently organised but the purpose is not always clear.

- It would be worthwhile for the Centre to find a clear focus for the seminars, sending documentation in time, and dealing with participants from non-member states. These have sometimes been weak points (government official OECD).

- Participants are a heterogeneous group with different interests and agendas which makes it difficult to focus the seminars and make them results-oriented.

- About the seminar on political coherence: Very well managed but the lack of conclusions can be frustrating for external participants (European university). The chair could have been more aggressive. It is important to conciliate the very different view points from policy makers, academics and others (government official).

- The agenda of the seminar on India/China was overloaded and did not allow real dialogue. Sometimes seminars take the form of presentations rather than a forum for discussion and dialogue.

**On the Centre’s management and staff**
- With the present Director operations have become much more efficient in all aspects. Staff members are good ambassadors for the Centre and are good in follow up. The staff is responsive in providing information and engaging in discussions.
- The staff is very qualified and work is cost-efficient but time-poor. More staff is needed.

PART 5: EFFECTIVENESS AND SUSTAINABILITY - Questions 9, 14, 15 and 16.

Question 9: I can think of a concrete example, in the past three years, where an output from the Centre has impacted on policy formulation.

![Pie chart showing responses to Question 9](image)

I can think of a concrete example, in the past 3 years, where an output from the Centre has impacted on policy formation

49% Agree
7% Not sure
44% Disagree

Comment
About half of the respondents answered that they were not sure. But of the other half, the great majority (41 out of 49 respondents) confirmed that an output from the Centre had impacted on policy formulation. This is a remarkable result showing that the Centre really has impact!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Civil Servants</th>
<th>External Peers</th>
<th>OECD Secretariat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment
This table shows the response of different categories. Government officials (civil servants) and External peers confirmed the impact of the Centre on policy formulation (50 and 46% respectively), while none of the OECD Directors considered that the Centre had had such an impact. Again it is important to remember that the number of respondents in this category was quite small, why this result must be interpreted with great caution.
If you agree, which policy area do you have in mind?

- Business for development, foreign investment, private sector development, corporate governance (mentioned by 11 respondents)
- African Economic Outlook (8 respondents)
- Policy coherence (6 respondents)
- India/China – impact on Africa (5 respondents)
- Financing development, innovative instruments (5 respondents)
- Aid effectiveness (4 respondents)
- Migration (3 respondents)

Also mentioned:
- Public information/development education
- Trade policy, strengthening of trade capacity

Comment
The examples given reflect the interest in thematic flagship areas and in Africa and India/China seen in earlier responses. The number of respondents mentioning the area of Business for development etcetera was surprisingly high.

Question 14 (optional): In an area of relevance to you (which you have already indicated) please explain how you are using the Centre’s output (please, indicate area/s).

A majority of the responses can be grouped roughly into the three following categories:

1. To support own research, teaching, writing (27 respondents: 11 from academia/think tanks/experts, 6 from governments, 6 from international organisations, and 3 from civil society/private sector/the media).

2. As an input into own work programme or policy-making (15 respondents, nine of whom from governments and three from the OECD Secretariat)

3. Sharing information with relevant institutions/persons in own country/capital (6 respondents)

Also mentioned:
- Bringing media attention to development issues
- Collaborating and debating with professional colleagues at the Centre
- Using Centre events for networking with academia and think tanks on development issues
- Reading the Centre’s publication and website to keep abreast with developments.
Comment
The responses indicate that the Centre serves an important purpose for many respondents. It makes a significant contribution to policy making, as well as to research, teaching and the international development debate. Again, also in these responses, it was repeated that the Centre has an impact on the policy-making of OECD governments.

Question 15 (optional): Do you think that the Centre in its present structure, with its mandate and support, will be in a position to serve its clients in a durable fashion and have sustainable impact on policy development? If not, what changes do you consider most urgent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No clear answer</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment
Rather few responded to this question (17 persons) but those that did contributed interesting thoughts and well founded suggestions which are summarised below. The answers corresponded very well with the result of several of the previous questions and with question 16.

1. Maintain the Centre as a privileged place for dialogue, especially the North-South dialogue. Strengthen the links to other parts of OECD.
2. Attract some major players, particularly the G7 members and the bigger developing countries. The financial base must be secured.
3. Ensure higher visibility of the Centre’s work. Market and disseminate publications more effectively. If the Centre gets recognition, it will attract funding.
4. Focus the work programme further. Refining priorities in order not to replicate what others do and build on comparative advantages.
5. Improve mechanisms for interaction. Consolidate relations with member states and partner countries, intensify contacts with high officials and representatives from capitals, enhance integration with African policy networks, include more experts from non-member countries and facilitate contacts with other parts of OECD.
6. Engage more researchers, also from developing countries.
7. Maintain public information on the agenda.

Selected comments made by individual respondents:

1. Despite a fragile financial structure the Centre has managed to fulfil its mandate in the recent past. It has the potential to have a bigger impact on policy development within the OECD constituency and beyond. To this end it is crucial to achieve improvements in the following areas:
- Secure the full participation of G7 countries in the Centre and engage with key players in the developing world ensuring a fair balance between emerging economies and less-developed countries. Beyond individual country membership, it could be envisaged to expand membership to international organisations or country groupings, such as the G20;

- Reduce the volatility of financing and the high share of voluntary contributions that do not enter the core budget. In fact, they weaken the ability of the Centre to deliver better results and may push the Centre to overstretch its activities and engage in small projects;

- Establish a comprehensive communication strategy in order to improve the visibility and impact of the Centre (member government).

2. If seen from a dynamic angle, the answer is yes. The Centre is in the midst of a process where a lot of (needed) improvements are being made. The structure should continue to evolve: niches of work can be made more precise, more “cutting edge”, relations with other actors need to continue to evolve, more members are much welcome (member government).

3. The Centre should choose the niche of providing for better analytical underpinnings of DAC member policies in international development cooperation. The Centre should stay close to the OECD institution (member government).

4. The Centre appears to be overly linked to the operational priorities of other parts of OECD. It could have greater impact if it looked more at outcomes and impact, as opposed to processes (expert).

5. The current structure is good. I have been impressed by the changes over the past three years. The Centre is reverting to a level of efficiency and relevance of earlier days (academic).

6. The Centre needs to maintain the critical balance between scientific excellence, on the one hand, and advisory services for policy makers, on the other (think tank).

7. The Centre should focus on some specific areas. Focus should be on the articulation between developed and developing countries in a globalised world (inter-governmental organisation).

8. The work is useful: giving advice to OECD members and developing countries on sustainable effects and the impact of development assistance (inter-governmental organisation).

9. Analytical instruments already exist. What is important now is a policy dialogue among a broad range of development actors, including policy decision makers (African think tank).

10. With more resources and a more open policy the Centre is able to play a larger role in analysis, dialogue and independent critique (expert).

11. There are some good researchers at the Centre but they are not used – or motivated. Recruitment to senior positions is heavily dependent on internal politics; this deters good applicants from applying (think tank).

12. Research team should be strengthened and made more multi disciplinary (civil society).

13. Financial stability is a critical requirement (OECD staff).
Question 16 (optional for interviewees): In your opinion, does the Centre fulfil its demands and needs? This question was only posed in the interviews. Responses are very few and some of them are summarised below.

Many centres do similar work. The Centre needs to focus on what is value adding and not just being a replica. I do believe that the Centre fulfils its demands, but needs to carve out a certain niche, like the relationship between OECD member countries and partner countries (inter-governmental organisation).

Broadly speaking, yes, but the Centre requires in-house expertise on equality and poverty issues to engage in more significant policy dialogue and become more influential. If the Centre would link its knowledge of financial flows to equality issues, it would have more impact on policy making (inter-governmental organisation).

There are some doubts. Even though the Centre is focused on areas which are not covered by other institutions, the quality of the output is not sufficient to change policies. The work does not fulfil the needs of my Government (OECD member government, non-member of Centre).

The Centre has come a long way having an important evolution. In order to better fulfil its objectives, the Centre should consider the following:

- Be more policy oriented integrating the views of developing countries and academics.
- The work should be more narrowly defined. It is now too dispersed.
- Collaborate with other Directorates, especially with DCD-DAC dividing the work between them. The Centre should concentrate on its comparative advantages: integrating the views of civil society, incorporating its policy dialogue with non-members, use its strong analytical function, and raise new and controversial issues.
- Move away from in-house academics.
- There should be more debate and technical cooperation with other OECD structures.

(OECD member government, non-member of the Centre)

Comment to questions 15 and 16
The responses reflect the thinking of individuals who are truly engaged in the Centre and have given serious thought to these questions. They offered a variety of suggestions and advice that are much in line with the current thinking of the Centre’s management and that is expressed in the preliminary work programme for 2007-2008. Almost all comments reflected positive expectations of the Centre’s ability to fulfil its role but pointed out important conditions that have to be fulfilled.

The main messages of the evaluation are by and large summarised in the answers to questions 15 and 16.