

# DPRN PHASE II

## PROGRESS REPORT 2009

## Colophon

This document reports on the activities and results in 2009 of the Development Policy Review Network ([www.DPRN.nl](http://www.DPRN.nl)), financed with a grant from WOTRO Science for development (Subsidy No. W 02.22.010.00 valid from 1 January 2008 to 31 December 2010). This grant was made possible by a subsidy from the Ministry of Affairs/Cultural Cooperation, Education and Research Department (DCO/OC), which transferred the DPRN dossier to the newly formed Effectiveness and Coherence Department (DEC) in October 2009. With a view to stimulating informed debate and discussion of issues related to the formulation and implementation of (Dutch) development policies, DPRN creates opportunities to promote an open exchange and dialogue between scientists, policymakers, development practitioners and the business sector in the Netherlands. For more information see [www.DPRN.nl](http://www.DPRN.nl), [www.global-connections.nl](http://www.global-connections.nl) and [www.Search4Dev.nl](http://www.Search4Dev.nl).

# CONTENTS

ACRONYMS	5
MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIRMAN	7
I INTRODUCTION	8
II CONTEXT	9
II.1 Institutional setting	9
II.2 Policy environment	10
II.3 Problem analysis	10
III CONTENT	11
III.1 Activities	11
a. DPRN–instigated process	11
b. Facilitated processes	13
1. Understanding Development Better	14
2. Stimulating business development: another side of microfinance?	15
3. Risks and benefits for sustainability of genetically modified soy in Latin America	17
4. Value chain governance and endogenous growth: how can NGOs, firms and governments achieve social inclusion and poverty reduction?	19
5. Gender mainstreaming process	21
6. Supporting developing countries' ability to raise tax revenues	23
7. Phosphorus depletion: the invisible crisis	25
8. Fuelling knowledge on the social and ecological impact of agrofuel production: the generation of intersectoral debate and interdisciplinary analysis	28
9. Commercial pressure on land: rethinking the policies and practice for development	30
10. Singing a new policy tune: towards (re)foundation of Dutch development assistance policies	32
c. Global–Connections.nl web portal	34
d. Search4dev	35
e. DPRN website	36
f. Participation in the Worldconnectors initiative	36
g. Support for The Broker	37
III.2 Results	38
III.3 Objectives	40
III.4 Feasibility and sustainability	40
III.5 Relevance	41
IV ORGANISATION	42
IV.1 Organisational characteristics	42
IV.2 Finances	42

IV.3 Administration and monitoring -----	42
Appendix 1 - DPRN target groups -----	43
Appendix 2 - Overview of facilitated processes and implementing organisations -----	44
Appendix 3 - Agenda of DPRN meetings 2009 -----	54
Appendix 4 - Participants in the DPRN meetings and their distribution over the various professional categories (2009) -----	55
Appendix 5 - Expenditure in the period 1 January 2009 - 31 December 2009 -----	57
Appendix 6 - Expenditure in the entire period 1 January 2008 - 31 December 200 -----	60
Appendix 7 - Breakdown of expenditure per external process (2008-2009)-----	63

## ACRONYMS

AMIDSt	Amsterdam Institute for Metropolitan and International Development Studies
AISSR–GID	Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research–Governance and Inclusive Development department
API	Application Programming Interface
ASC	Afrika–Studiecentrum / African Studies Centre (Leiden)
BDS	Business Development Services
CERES	Research School for Resource Studies for Development
CIDIN	Centre for International Development Issues Nijmegen
CDS	Centre for Development Studies (Groningen)
CMS	Content Management System
DC/IC	Development cooperation / International cooperation
DCO/OC	DGIS’ Cultural Cooperation, Education and Research Department
DDE	DGIS’ Sustainable Economic Development Department
DGIS	Directorate General for International Cooperation
DPRN	Development Policy Review Network
ECDPM	European Centre for Development Policy Management (Maastricht)
EU	European Union
EZ	Ministry of Economic Affairs
GM soy	Genetically modified soy
GPNM	Global Partnership on Nutrient Management
ICCO	Interchurch Organisation for Development Cooperation
ICT	Information Communication Technology
IDP	Foundation for International Development Publications (publisher of The Broker)
IFAD	International Fund and Agriculture Development
ILC	International Land Coalition
ISS	Institute of Social Studies (The Hague)
ITC	International Tax Compact
KIT	Koninklijk Instituut voor de Tropen / Royal Tropical Institute (Amsterdam)
KNAW	Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences
LNV	Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality
MDF	Management for Development Training & Consultancy
MFI	Micro Financing Institutions
MFS	Dutch Co–financing System
MVO	Maatschappelijk Verantwoord Ondernemen / Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)
NCDO	National Commission for International Cooperation and International Development
NFTG	Nutrient Flow Task Group
NGO	Non–governmental organisation
NWO	Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research
NWP	Netherlands Water Partnership
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co–operation and Development

PROVO	Programme for the organisation of Dutch DC/IC
PRI	WUR's Plant Research International
RTRS	Round Table on Responsible Soy
SID	Society for International Development
SNPT	Singing a New Policy Tune
SOMO	Centre for Research on Multinational Corporations
SSL	Secure Socket Layer
TA	Technology Assessment Steering Committee (phosphorus depletion process)
UDB	Understanding Development Better
VNO-NCW	Organisation of Dutch Entrepreneurs
VROM	Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment
V&W	Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management
WOTRO	Foundation for the Advancement of Tropical Research (The Hague)
WUR	Wageningen University and Research Centre
WWF	World Wildlife Fund
WRR	Scientific Council for Government Policy

## MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIRMAN

In 2009 the latter half of the second phase of the Development Review Network's development had been reached. The network is growing and the results – increased cooperation and synergy between science, policy, practice and the business community – are becoming increasingly visible. Intersectoral coalitions to organise DPRN processes are achieving a great deal by creatively managing relatively small budgets. The DPRN often acts as a catalyst. This became particularly clear with respect to the phosphorus depletion, raising tax revenues and agrofuel processes. Some of these topics were put on the agenda thanks to the DPRN initiatives. After an initial phase of research-oriented 'taking stock', the gender mainstreaming process and value chain governance processes proceeded gradually towards a dissemination of results, discussions with other parties, and analyses of how strategies can be anchored in policy and practice.

The DPRN Task Force continued its architecture debate in an intensive process of mobilising people in four working groups and a public event. The statements produced by the working groups and sector-specific discussions resulted in a 'Programme of requirements of the organisation of Dutch IC/DC' ('PROVO'), which raised issues which were similar to those brought forward later in the report by the Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR) entitled 'Less pretension, more ambition'. The DPRN Task Force aims to continue this debate into 2010 and build on the results of the WRR report. Among the issues to be addressed are the consequences for the aid architecture and research agenda, if the global agenda as outlined in the WRR report is taken as a starting point for international cooperation.

All these processes cover a lot of different themes, but share a similar mission, namely convening development experts from practice, policy, businesses and academia with a view to enhancing policy review and informed debate. In the last year of phase II, the DPRN is going to monitor specifically the possibilities for cross-pollination between the processes.

As far as the DPRN's target groups are concerned I am happy to note that the business sector is now firmly represented in DPRN activities. Moreover, senior staff of policy theme departments at the Directorate General for International Cooperation (DGIS) are properly involved. Researchers and practitioners are still the groups best represented at DPRN events. In the last call for proposals issued before the end of 2009, the DPRN successfully mobilised Flemish organisations.

DPRN invested a lot in improving the interactivity and user friendliness of the Global-Connections web portal, creating the basis for an update of its searchable expert database. The launch of Search4Dev, the online library for digital publications by Dutch development organisations, that was developed by KIT Information & Library Services, was a huge success and attracted a great deal of interest.

Overall, the DPRN is satisfied that its mission, that is to provide an appropriate joint platform to the very diverse stakeholders in development cooperation, is being accomplished. A more open dialogue and a better understanding are the intended results.

Dr Jan Donner  
Chairman of the DPRN Task Force

## I INTRODUCTION

This report relates to the activities and results of the Development Policy Review Network ([www.DPRN.nl](http://www.DPRN.nl)) in 2009, financed with a grant from WOTRO Science for development (Subsidy No. W 02.22.010.00 valid from 1 January 2008 to 31 December 2010). This grant was made possible by a subsidy from the Ministry of Affairs/Cultural Cooperation, Education and Research Department (DCO/OC), but the DPRN dossier was transferred to the newly formed Effectiveness and Coherence Department (DEC) in October 2009. DPRN was set up as a network and platform for development experts by the Research School for Resource Studies for Development (CERES) in 2003 with its mission being to stimulate the informed debate and discussion of issues related to the formulation and implementation of development policies, in particular those related to Dutch policies and aid organisations. To achieve this, DPRN promotes information exchange and dialogue between scientists, policymakers, development practitioners and entrepreneurs in the Netherlands and Belgium. It does so by creating opportunities for different kinds of experts in development and international cooperation to meet and discuss and by increasing their visibility. In this way, DPRN eventually hopes to enhance cooperation and achieve greater synergy between the activities carried out in the various sectors.

The subsidy granted by WOTRO Science for Development allowed DPRN to carry out the following activities in 2009:

- Organise a debate on the organisation and architecture of Dutch Development Cooperation / International Cooperation (DC/IC);
- Finalise and continue the five processes approved in 2008, namely Understanding Development Better; Microfinance and Business Development Services; Genetically Modified (GM) Soy; Value Chain Governance; and Gender Mainstreaming (the latter two being multi-annual processes);
- Initiate five new processes, namely Supporting developing countries' ability to raise tax revenue; Food insecurity and commercial pressures on land: risks and opportunities; Phosphorus depletion: the invisible crisis; Fuelling knowledge on the social and ecological impacts of agrofuel production: the generation of intersectoral debate and interdisciplinary analysis; and 'Singing a new policy tune' ('Uit een nieuw beleidsvaatje tappen');
- Support and contribute to related initiatives such as the Worldconnectors and The Broker;
- Increase the interactivity of the web portal for development expertise in the Netherlands (<http://www.global-connections.nl>);
- Continue support for the online library for digital publications from Dutch development organisations (<http://www.Search4Dev.nl>).

This document reports on the activities and results achieved in 2009. More detailed information on the context, content and organisation can be found in the Strategic Plan 2008–2010 which is available on the DPRN website (under Publications).



## II CONTEXT

### II.1 Institutional setting

DPRN was initiated and in its first phase (2004–2007) hosted by the Netherlands Research School for Resource Studies for Development (CERES), but it is not an official part of that organisation. The following arrangements were in place in 2009:

- CERES functioned as a ‘gateway’ to a significant section of the Dutch development-oriented research community, through its members and associated organisations and research schools. In addition, CERES actively supported DPRN via participation in the DPRN Task Force.
- The Amsterdam research institute for Metropolitan and International Development Studies (AMIDSt)<sup>1</sup>, as part of CERES, is WOTRO’s contract partner as regards being a host to the DPRN Coordination Unit. In 2009, the DPRN team consisted of (a) the DPRN coordinator, Dr Mirjam A.F. Ros–Tonen (0.4 fte), (b) programme assistant Ms Kim de Vries (0.8 fte), (c) webmaster of the DPRN website and provider of ICT support for the Global–Connections, Mr Joska Landré (0.5 fte), who was temporally assisted by Mr Merijn de Bakker (0.2 fte during 4 months), (d) DPRN representative in the Worldconnectors Support Team, Mr Koen Kusters, (0.2 fte), and (e) AMIDSt Secretary Ms Marianne van Heelsbergen, who provided administrative support (0.2 fte) until June 2009, and was later replaced with Mr Tijmen de Groot. Furthermore, the AMIDSt Project Bureau was responsible for financial management, together with the coordinator. The staff were jointly responsible for monitoring the DPRN processes, as well as their follow–up, and for providing administrative support and ICT services.
- In 2009, the DPRN Task Force, which was based on a broad representation of scientific, policy and development organisations, consisted of:
  - Dr Jan Donner, President Royal Tropical Institute (KIT) (Chairman);
  - Prof. Dr Paul Hoebink, Professor at the Centre for International Development Studies (CIDIN) (Convener);
  - Prof. Dr Ton Dietz, AMIDSt Director, University of Amsterdam;
  - Dr André Leliveld (from September 2009 onwards), Academic researcher at the African Studies Centre;
  - Ms Lolita van Toledo, Policy advisor CERES (until September) and Prof. Dr Han van Dijk (CERES Director) (from September onwards);
  - Dr Paul Engel (until March 2009) and Bernike Pasveer (from March 2009 onwards), resp. Director and Senior consultant knowledge for development of the European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM);
  - Ms Dieneke de Groot, Research and Evaluation Coordinator at the Interchurch Organisation for Development Cooperation (ICCO);
  - Mr Pieter van Stuijvenberg, Director Euroconsult/BMB Mott MacDonald;

---

<sup>1</sup> As from 1 January 2010 this department merged into the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research (AISSR) and is now referred to as AISSR–GID, where GID stands for Governance and Inclusive Development.

- Mr Pieter de Baan (until November 2009) and Ms Jessie van Bokhoven (from November onwards), respectively Senior Strategist and Chief Strategy Officer at the Netherlands Development Organisation SNV;
- Mr Jan Gruiters, Director IKV Pax Christi Nederland;
- Prof. Dr Rob Visser (until September 2009) and Mr Guus Wattel, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (from September onwards) (observers);
- Dr Henk Molenaar, Executive Director NWO/WOTRO (observer).

The Task Force, which is responsible for DPRN's administrative organisation and internal control of DPRN met eight times during the period under review: in February, March, April, May, July, September, October and December 2009. Its main activities included monitoring progress of the awarded processes and the other DPRN activities, organising the debate for 'The organisation of Dutch development and international cooperation' debate and associated publications, and proposal assessment (December).

## **II.2 Policy environment**

The institutional framework for 'learning about development and international relations' in the Netherlands is made up of a large number and variety of institutions, with thousands of affiliated professionals. The target groups include the policy sector, academia, the NGOs ('practice') and the corporate sector as specified in Appendix 1.

## **II.3 Problem analysis**

As outlined in the Strategic Plan 2008–2010, DPRN created a mechanism during its first phase through which development experts from different sectors could meet on a regular basis. It was acknowledged, however, that unique events were insufficient to bring about structural cooperation. In its current phase (2008–2010), DPRN therefore intends to move beyond 'meeting each other' and set the stage for an ongoing process of exploring common ground and opportunities for multi-sector agenda setting and cooperation. The activities involve focusing more on reflecting policies and particular attention is to be paid to involving specific target groups (e.g. business sector, policymakers, and scientists from medical, technical and applied sciences).

### III CONTENT

#### III.1 Activities

##### *a. DPRN–instigated process*

In 2009, the DPRN Task Force continued the ‘future architecture of Dutch Development Cooperation (DC) or International Cooperation (IC)’ process. This topic was put on the agenda<sup>2</sup> out of discontent with the fragmented and hence ineffective structure of Dutch DC/IC. The debate was guided by the catchphrase ‘Structure follows strategy’, meaning that more effective alternatives to the structure of Dutch IC/DC could only be found if attention were paid to a more clear and comprehensive strategy. The first year of the process was used to gather opinions and fine–tune thoughts through ‘internal’ discussions within the Task Force and a small circle of experts around it. In 2009 an ‘external’ approach was followed by stimulating the debate within the Dutch DC sector.

In the period March–May 2009, four ‘mixed’ working groups prepared propositions on the organisation of Dutch IC/DC. Each working group included participants from policy, practice, academia and the business sector. The respective chairpersons of these groups were Maarten Brouwer, René Grotenhuis, Peter Nijkamp and Herman Mulder as representatives of the four DPRN target groups. A total of 59 people participated in the working group meetings, and it was pleasantly surprising that a lot of them came from the business community (31%). Policymakers were also well represented (19%), with this group including five policymakers from other ministries. Each working group met twice and reports of the meetings were distributed amongst the participants. The four groups formulated a total of 47 propositions, which the DPRN Task Force arranged in a synthesis document according to two scenarios: poverty alleviation & human development, and sustainable global development.<sup>3</sup> In each scenario a further distinction was made between the propositions that focused on (i) strategy, (ii) structure, (iii) limiting conditions, and (iv) the necessary steps to involve the public. This organising principle largely built on that of the issue paper published in 2008, on the basis of interviews with Task Force members and a few additional key persons, in order to ensure continuity of the process.

The next step in the process was the organisation of a public meeting, which was held on 15 June 2009 at the Royal Tropical Institute in which the outcomes of the working groups were discussed with a larger audience. In order to stimulate the discussion in advance of the meeting, the four chairpersons were asked to comment on the scenarios proposed by the Task Force, and to consult with their constituencies (mainly the working group participants who belonged to their sector). During the first part of meeting these sector–specific

---

<sup>2</sup> As mentioned in the 2008 progress report, this was inspired by an internal note from the Chairman, and led to an issue paper based on interviews with DPRN Task Force members and three other experts.

<sup>3</sup> The synthesis document titled ‘De Nederlandse OS/IS na 2010 – 47 stellingen’ can be found at: <http://structurefollowsstrategy.dprn.nl/sites/structurefollowsstrategy.dprn.nl/files/file/DPRN%20Phase%20I%20Report%20No.%206%20-%20De%20Nederlandse%20OS-IS%20na%202010%20-%2047%20stellingen.pdf>

discussions were continued under the leadership of the same chairpersons, who later presented the outcomes to the larger audience. The second part of the meeting was reserved for a plenary discussion in which the chairpersons, three prominent members of political parties – Marianne Douma (D66), Peter Heintze (PvdA) and Joris Voorhoeve (VVD) – and the audience debated the outcomes of the discussions.<sup>4</sup> A total of 112 participants attended the meeting.<sup>5</sup>

Based on the process outcomes so far, the DPRN Task Force drew up a 'Programme of requirements of the organisation of Dutch IC/DC' – known by the acronym PROVO – to inform the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and political parties about a possible strategy and ways of organising the infrastructure deemed necessary for a more effective IC/DC.<sup>6</sup> The document, published in September 2009, identifies the main features of the discussions. As far as the strategy is concerned, the document underlines the need to shift from DC to IC, implying that policy should be oriented towards global issues. This means that classic poverty alleviation is no longer the only driver for IC, but that action is also required to deal with the many new problems that the globalised world is facing and which affect both the North and the South (environmental problems, climate, migration, security, etc.). The document also emphasises the need for a more strategic positioning of the Netherlands, both by focussing on specific Dutch expertise, but also by grounding policy more in Dutch society. In connection with this, there is a tension between the international dimension of the IC architecture and the organisation and use of instruments and capacities available for that purpose in the Netherlands.

Another main outcome of the debate was that the business and knowledge sectors – and their respective values of focussing on returns on investments and investing in learning capacity – need to be integrated more into the field of IC. However, the participation of the knowledge and business sectors should not lead to new proliferation and an excess of organisations since this would be contrary to the need for consolidation. The PROVO therefore argues in favour of operational management with a hybrid public-private character.

---

<sup>4</sup> The report of the meeting titled 'De Nederlandse OS/IS na 2010 – Verslag debat 15 juni 2009' is available at:

<http://structurefollowsstrategy.dprn.nl/sites/structurefollowsstrategy.dprn.nl/files/file/DPRN%20Phase%20I%20Report%20No.%207%20-%20De%20Nederlandse%20OS-IS%20na%202010%20-%20Verslag%20debat%2015%20juni%202009.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> The total figures presented here differ from those in the meeting report, which only included those who had registered via the website.

<sup>6</sup> The document entitled 'Programma voor Ontwikkelingssamenwerking (PROVO)' is available at: [http://structurefollowsstrategy.dprn.nl/sites/structurefollowsstrategy.dprn.nl/files/file/DPRN%20Phase%20II%20Report%20No.%208%20-%20Programma%20voor%20ontwikkelingssamenwerking%20\(PROVO\).pdf](http://structurefollowsstrategy.dprn.nl/sites/structurefollowsstrategy.dprn.nl/files/file/DPRN%20Phase%20II%20Report%20No.%208%20-%20Programma%20voor%20ontwikkelingssamenwerking%20(PROVO).pdf)

The English translation is available at:

<http://structurefollowsstrategy.dprn.nl/sites/structurefollowsstrategy.dprn.nl/files/file/DPRN%20-%20Phase%20II%20Report%2008%20-%20Programme%20for%20the%20Organisation%20of%20Development%20Cooperation.pdf>

Serious doubts were expressed about whether the strategic goals could be achieved through the bilateral and multilateral channels as they are now organised. In this respect the PROVO proposed setting up an independent, non-political and market-oriented project office or clearing house. There was much less doubt among participants about the effectiveness – and therefore about the preservation – of the civilateral channel in IC.

On the basis of this process, the DPRN aimed to increase the sense of urgency to discuss the Dutch DC/IC architecture through an intensive round of public consultation. Although some felt that the time frame was too short to acquire the depth required for a discussion on such a broad theme, there was appreciation for the fact that the intensity kept people involved and brought to light some of the most pertaining issues in this debate.

The process website (<http://structurefollowsstrategy.dprn.nl/>), which largely contains the documents that were published for this process, was well-visited in 2009. It had 595 unique visitors who together visited the site 1,056 times, and viewed the individual pages of the website a total of 3,972 times.

#### ***b. Facilitated processes***

In order to achieve informed debate, policy review, common agenda setting and inter-sectoral cooperation, DPRN meetings in the second phase (2008–2010) are to be embedded in a process that is targeted at bringing together the various sectors and at identifying opportunities for cooperation (see DPRN Vision Plan 2008–2010 for more details). In the second phase (2008–2010), DPRN is to facilitate at least five processes per year. These processes should correlate with the DPRN mission and objectives and therefore be aimed at stimulating a continuous exchange of information and experiences amongst researchers, policymakers, staff of development organisations, and business people. The involvement of relevant partners from different sectors in the preparation and implementation of the proposed activities is a prerequisite. The process should furthermore be relevant for policy and practice. Reviewing existing (thematic or regional) policies and the active involvement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs are therefore essential elements of the process. The proposed activities and outputs have to be suitable for (i) initiating an in-depth debate about various insights between the different sectors; (ii) discussing common agenda setting; and (iii) identifying opportunities for synergetic cooperation. Finally, the processes should be outcome-oriented, with a view to offering perspectives for follow-up and continued networking and cooperation.

The yearly call for proposals is open to *all* organisations that belong to the DPRN target groups, provided that the proposal is submitted by at least two parties representing different sectors. The proposals may relate to a one-year or multi-annual process. Preferably, the processes should include: (a) the preparation and prior dissemination of position papers about the theme to be addressed using relevant sources; (b) the facilitation of online information exchange before and after a meeting, and/or the joint writing of position papers or research proposals; (c) the drawing up of a list of ‘must-read’ literature (including policy documents) relating to the region and/or theme to be addressed in order to facilitate an informed debate, and; (d) the provision of overviews of relevant policy documents, processes, development interventions and ongoing research related to the theme or region

that is the subject of the meeting on the basis of which lacunas and complementarities in expertise, hence opportunities for collaboration, are identified.

Of the five processes started in 2008, three were finalised in 2009 and two continued as multi-annual processes. In addition, the DPRN Task Force awarded five processes out of 24 applications following the call for proposals in the autumn of 2008. The new processes started at the beginning of 2009. An overview of ongoing processes in 2009 can be found in Appendix 2.

### 1. Understanding Development Better

This one-year process, organised by the Management for Development Foundation (MDF), Vice Versa and the Institute of Social Studies (ISS), was largely carried out in 2008 when a conference was organised to discuss 'development' and 'development processes' from different theoretical perspectives. The idea was to revive the debate on the fundamental drivers of development that had come to a standstill during the 1970s (see DPRN progress report 2008). This process was followed up in 2009 by a paper entitled '*Een wereld van verschil – Een zaak van iedereen. Ontwikkelingssamenwerkingsbeleid van Pronk tot Koenders*' that reviewed and reflected on Dutch DC policies of Ministers Pronk, Herfkens, van Ardenne and Koenders.<sup>7</sup> Based on presentations held by scientists at the Understanding Development Better (UDB) conference and a review of policy documents of the respective ministers, the paper aimed to assess which understanding of development formed the basis for these policies, and to what extent they were intended to act as a catalyst for development processes.

The paper concludes that all four ministers focused on poverty reduction, but that they approached this in a different way. In Pronk's policies the '*why*' of engaging in DC was central, while Herfkens used as a basis the five poverty dimensions formulated by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and was more concerned about the question of '*how*' organisations (North-North or North-South) should collaborate to achieve results. This also applied to Van Ardenne, albeit with a stronger focus on Northern organisations. The 'how' of the two female Ministers is reflected in Koenders' agenda, but he has combined this with Pronk's 'why'. That is not the only reason why the authors of the paper consider Koenders' agenda to be more challenging and robust since he also tried to integrate a large number of global problems such as energy, climate, food and financial crises into the DC/IC agenda. However, the paper concludes by stating that it remains unclear how and to what extent this policy and those of previous ministers are based on results of empirical research. There is no underlying policy theory.

Given this conclusion, the paper can be seen as an attempt to link the results of the UDB conference to the ongoing Singing a New Policy Tune process, organised by the same organisers (reported on below).

---

<sup>7</sup> The paper can be found at:

<http://www.dprn.nl/sites/dprn.nl/files/file/processes/reports/DPRN%20-%20Phase%20II%20Report%2014%20-%20Understanding%20Development%20Better%20-%20Een%20wereld%20van%20verschil%2080%93Een%20zaak%20van%20iedereen.pdf>.

## 2. Stimulating business development: another side of microfinance?

During this one-year process, organised by Triodos Facet and Hogeschool InHolland, three consecutive and interlinked seminars addressed the role that Microfinance Institutions (MFIs) can play in improving the access of entrepreneurs to non-financial services. MFIs have achieved tremendous results, unprecedented in development cooperation, and have improved the lives of many poor people. However, for small enterprises to grow and flourish they need entrepreneurial competencies and access to markets. The question is therefore raised as to whether MFIs, with their extensive outreach, can play an even more important role by being vehicles for integrated business development and by acting as facilitators of sustainable economic development.

The process started in 2008 with the first seminar during which 'Microfinance and Business Development Services' (BDS) in developing countries was discussed.<sup>8</sup> The second seminar, which took place on 12 February 2009, discussed 'Microfinance in the Netherlands' and questioned what the Netherlands could learn from the South. The starting point for this discussion was that programmes and projects of MFIs in the Netherlands are designed and developed without referring in any great detail to lessons learned and good practices from the South. The discussions included an examination of the different situations of MFIs as regards investing in the Netherlands and in developing countries. It was found that microfinance in developing countries is related more to the need for survival, and might be regarded more positively because of a different culturally determined attitude towards lending. In the Netherlands, the microfinance industry is mainly concerned with the size of the potential market and the economic viability of the microfinance industry. Whereas there is great potential to offer BDS, these MFIs currently do not offer, or link to, it in a systematic way. In this regard it would be beneficial if practitioners from MFIs investing in the Netherlands and those in developing countries learned from each other and shared insights on how to link MFIs and BDS. The main challenge in this context is to adopt policies and programmes that reflect the actual segmentation in society and meet the needs of the various groups searching for external financial services and to develop the proper channels.

This conclusion was also drawn in a position paper that was written as part of this process and which served as an input to the seminar.<sup>9</sup> The paper compares growth and development of microfinance in developing countries with those in Europe and, in particular, the Netherlands. It contains recommendations as to what practitioners dealing with the different contexts can learn from each other.

Forty-nine participants attended the second seminar. Most of these were practitioners (45%) and researchers (20%). People from the corporate sector and policymakers made up 16% and

---

<sup>8</sup> The report can be found at:

<http://www.dprn.nl/sites/dprn.nl/files/file/processes/reports/DPRN%20-%20Phase%20II%20Report%2002%20-%20Microfinance%20Seminar%201.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> The paper entitled 'Microfinance in the Netherlands: Do we learn from each other?' is available at:

<http://microfinance.global-connections.nl/drupal/sites/microfinance.global-connections.nl/files/pub/DPRN%20-%20Phase%20II%20Report%2003%20-%20Microfinance%20seminar%202.pdf>



10% of the participants respectively. Soon after the seminar, the website was updated with the seminar outcomes and a seminar report was made available.<sup>10</sup>

The process continued with a third seminar on 19 May 2009, in which ‘The future of microfinance and BDS in developing countries’ was discussed. Prior to the organisation of the seminar in May 2009, a stakeholder consultation revealed that policymakers, academics, practitioners and entrepreneurs have a keen interest in exploring the opportunities of microfinance in providing non-financial services. However, many stakeholders acknowledged the fact that MFIs face a significant number of bottlenecks in the provision of such services. In response to this, all the seminar participants were asked what policy measure they would propose in order to stimulate MFIs to contribute to the realisation of a flourishing micro-enterprise sector if they were the Minister of Development Corporation. As a result, about 80 quotes/opinions of participants were collected and these provided a starting point for the discussions during the seminar.

The third seminar focused on three issues. First, the identification of existing bottlenecks that prevent MFIs from providing (or linking) non-financial services to entrepreneurs. Second, an analysis was carried out as to how policymakers can help remove these bottlenecks. Third, there was a discussion of what academic research is needed in order to make informed policy decisions with respect to microfinance and/or BDS. All the suggestions brought forward during the meeting have been listed in the seminar report.<sup>11</sup> The seminar was attended by 62 people, 23% of whom were researchers, 5% policymakers and 35% practitioners, while 32% of the participants came from the business sector.

With three seminars organised, the main insights of the process were summarised in a synthesis report.<sup>12</sup> The report states that there is a need to be realistic about the demand for BDS as only a small group of MFI clients (estimated at about 5–10%) would have the potential to develop their business into a small or medium-sized enterprise. While MFIs might provide an interesting distribution channel for non-financial services to clients, they should not be delivering these services themselves. The term ‘BDS’ needs to be specified in more detail and three broad categories have therefore been identified, each with their own relevance for a particular type of enterprise. The report also states that linking financial and non-financial services to enhance the growth of the small enterprise sector requires interventions at the level of both MFI and BDS providers. Lastly, the report identifies the main bottlenecks that need to be dealt with in linking MFIs and BDS, and points out several basic questions that still need answers.

---

<sup>10</sup> The report can be found at:

<http://www.dprn.nl/sites/dprn.nl/files/file/processes/reports/DPRN%20-%20Phase%20II%20Report%203a%20-%20Microfinance%20seminar%202.pdf>

<sup>11</sup> The report can be found at:

<http://www.dprn.nl/sites/dprn.nl/files/file/processes/reports/DPRN%20-%20Phase%20II%20Report%2011%20-%20Microfinance%20seminar%203.pdf>

<sup>12</sup> The report can be found at:

<http://www.dprn.nl/sites/dprn.nl/files/file/processes/reports/DPRN%20-%20Phase%20II%20Report%2012%20-%20Microfinance%20Pocess%20Synthesis.pdf>



On reflection, the process was successful in obtaining a better understanding of the needs of entrepreneurs for non-financial services and the bottlenecks facing both MFIs and BDS providers as regards providing these services in both the Netherlands and in developing countries. The organisers and participants regarded the seminars as interesting networking opportunities, and appreciated the decision to reflect on both the Dutch and the 'Southern' microfinance industry.

The process website (<http://microfinance.global-connections.nl/>) was very well visited in 2009, with 1,711 unique visitors who together visited the website 2,700 times, and viewed the individual pages of the website a total of 12,452 times.

The process is currently being followed up by a continuation of the discussion in the Netherlands Platform for Microfinance. In addition, the research questions formulated during the process are taken up by the research group on Microfinance & Small Enterprise Development of Hogeschool InHolland.

### 3. Risks and benefits for sustainability and livelihoods of genetically modified soy in Latin America.

This one-year process, organised by Solidaridad, Plant Research International B.V. (PRI) of Wageningen University and Research Centre (WUR), WWF-Netherlands (WNF) and AidEnvironment, aimed to initiate a constructive, informed and science-based debate on the benefits and drawbacks of GM soy from an environmental and rural development perspective. The idea was that this process would lead to practical and broadly supported recommendations for (i) the inclusion of GM-related risks and benefits into the Round Table on Responsible Soy (RTRS) standard; (ii) the prevention and mitigation of GM-specific sustainability risks of soy production; and (iii) the promotion of GM-specific sustainability benefits of soy production. The GM Soy Debate consisted of two simultaneous processes, namely scientific research and consensus building. The research, carried out by PRI-WUR in cooperation with the University of Buenos Aires and the Brazilian parastatal company for agronomic research, EMBRAPA, aimed to clarify and validate stakeholders' claims regarding risks and possibilities of GM soy. Consensus was to be built through a Stakeholder Conference and online discussion through the GM Soy Debate web portal (<http://gmsoydebate.global-connections.nl>).

The Stakeholder conference that was held in December 2008 was an important step forward in bringing together opposing parties who seldom listen to each other's arguments. The conference was attended by 74 people, 30% of whom were researchers and 8% policymakers and embassy staff, while 27% represented the business sector and 35% were affiliated to NGOs. A total of 1,237 people visited the website to download and upload information and to find out more about the debate.

As a follow up to the conference, the GM Soy Steering Committee held several (teleconference) meetings which guided the research and the scope of discussion for the next stage of the process.

After the stakeholder conference, contacts with policymakers from various ministries were intensified. Spurred on a need for more knowledge on GM crops, the Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Development (VROM) even decided to grant additional funds to the

research project. This ministry also invited the organisers to present the process outcomes at an inter-departmental meeting of the Ministries of VROM, LNV and Foreign Affairs. The discussion focussed on how to apply the process' methodologies of public consultation into the ongoing debates at government level (e.g. about the development of socioeconomic criteria for admitting GM crops into the EU). In addition, the director of Solidaridad was invited by the Ministry of LNV to give a presentation at a seminar on genetic modification and sustainability on 9 June 2009.

The research report<sup>13</sup> was published in June 2009. The research results were summarised in a public report that was made available in English, Spanish and Portuguese.<sup>14</sup> The research report contains useful recommendations for preventing some of the identified risks (e.g. those related to the development of herbicide-resistant weeds, herbicide drift affecting biodiversity and mingling of GM soy with GM free soy in neighbouring plots) and opportunities (zero tillage<sup>15</sup> and conservation agriculture). Prem Bindraban presented the research outcomes at the Product Board for Margarine, Oils and Fats (Productschap Margarine, Vetten en Oliën – MVO).

Other spin-offs of the GM Soy Debate include:

- An invitation to Solidaridad to share the lessons learned at an EU Conference on socio-economic aspects of genetic modification, organised by the Dutch Ministry of LNV on behalf of the European Commission on 25 and 26 November 2009;
- Presentation of the research results at the prestigious 8<sup>th</sup> World Soybean Research Conference in Beijing, China, in August 2009;
- Efforts by PRI-WUR and Aidenvironment to extend the research to other socioeconomic impacts as well as to institutional aspects of GM (soy) cultivation.

The organisers gave up the idea of trying to include the GM-related risks and benefits into to the Round Table for Responsible Soy (RTRS) standard. The RTRS process was in an exceptionally fragile state at that time, and bringing in a potentially explosive discussion was considered inappropriate. Some members of the Steering Committee informally introduced the process outcomes in the standard setting discussions at the General Assembly of the RTRS in Campinas, Brazil in May 2009. Solidaridad is going to introduce the public summary of the research report in the RTRS process at a later stage.

The project evoked a lot of contrasting responses which ranged from positive to very negative. Both WWF and Solidaridad received hundreds of e-mails from opponents of the GM Soy Debate who felt that opening the discussion on the sustainability of GM soy legitimises

---

<sup>13</sup> Entitled 'GM-related sustainability: agro-ecological impacts, risks and opportunities of soy production in Argentina and Brazil' by P.S. Bindraban *et al.* available at:

<http://gmsoydebate.global-connections.nl/content/gm-related-sustainability-agro-ecological-impacts-risks-and-opportunities-soy-production-arg.html>.

<sup>14</sup> Entitled 'Agro-ecological impacts, risks and opportunities of soy production in Argentina and Brazil' available at:

[http://gmsoydebate.global-connections.nl/sites/gmsoydebate.global-connections.nl/files/library/GMsoja\\_publicReport.pdf](http://gmsoydebate.global-connections.nl/sites/gmsoydebate.global-connections.nl/files/library/GMsoja_publicReport.pdf)

<sup>15</sup> Zero tillage means that the practice of turning over the soil to prevent weed growth and improve soil conditions is not applied in order to prevent soil erosion.

genetic modification. This position was reaffirmed by a number of NGOs during the Stakeholder Conference in December 2008 and some refused to take part and protested outside the building. At the same time, various corporate parties felt that questioning the sustainability of GM soy would undermine its legitimacy in the market.

The organisers regarded it as disappointing that DGIS representatives chose not to participate in the process, based on the argument that such a discussion should be organised in soy-producing countries instead of the Netherlands and should not be held in isolation of the RTRS.

One of the outcomes of this project is the notion that technology development has built-in socioeconomic codes. Herbicide-resistant GM soy varieties have been developed to benefit scalable high-tech agriculture. This particular biotechnology may not be very beneficial for poor farmers, but there is considerable potential for biotechnology to help improve the resilience of the poor in the face of climate change, water and soil depletion and rising food prices. It would be interesting if the Ministry of Foreign Affairs could follow up on this important issue.

Reflecting on the process, it can be said that the project has contributed to an informed debate. The work by PRI-WUR is the only scientific publication that reviews a large number of studies of sustainability impacts. It revealed that little is known about those impacts and that there is hardly any monitoring of natural and socioeconomic impacts. When confronted with this observation, Minister Verburg pledged to create a 'pact of researchers and other stakeholders' to increase our understanding of those impacts. This is very much in line with the approach taken by the GM Soy Debate. Although this approach is not unique as such, it is innovative in the field of GM controversy. It is fair to say that this process has contributed to a breakthrough in the way the debate about biotechnology has been held. The organisers expect the research and debate to contribute to the formulation of GM-related criteria for sustainable soy under the RTRS framework and of sustainability criteria for EU admission of GM-crops.

The process website appeared very useful to keep the public informed throughout the process. In 2009, 1,188 unique visitors visited the site 1,630 times, and viewed the individual web pages a total of 5,843 times.

#### 4. Value chain governance and endogenous growth: how can NGOs, firms and government achieve social inclusion and poverty reduction?

This 2.5 year process, organised by the Institute of Social Studies (ISS), Wageningen University and Research Center (WUR) and supported by Woord & Daad, HIVOS, ICCO, Concept Fruits BV and the of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality (LNV), aims to achieve a shared understanding of the effectiveness and efficiency of multiple-actor value chain governance for inclusive development and endogenous development (*i.e.* economic development processes in the South that give local producers a greater stake and contribute to poverty reduction). In practice, international, national and local actors hardly share information or coordinate their actions and few actors have a full understanding of the entire chain and its dynamics. This process therefore aims to compare, discuss and integrate diverse analytical and policy frameworks, with a view to achieving greater overall coherence,

complementarities and synergies in the actions of public, private and non-profit actors along the chain.

After the organisation of an introductory dinner meeting in November 2008, the process continued in 2009 with the preparation of a research writeshop. Preparatory meetings were held between the two organisers and researchers of the CERES value chain network to form teams of researchers to focus on a similar thematic aspect of value chain inclusion and endogenous development from different disciplinary or theoretical perspectives or on the basis of different case study/practical experiences. In the teams, senior and junior researchers from different universities were matched and this offered junior researchers new opportunities to use and develop analytical and writing skills. Meetings with all researchers present were held in The Hague and Utrecht, after which the various teams met in several follow-up meetings. A total of 31 researchers worked on 12 papers. The draft versions of the papers, as well as other publications on value chains written by the researchers involved, have been made available at the process website <http://value-chains.global-connections.nl/>.<sup>16</sup>

The eventual research writeshop was held on 24 and 25 September 2009 at the ISS in The Hague, where the draft papers were presented. The discussion was enhanced by the presence of four external discussants. The outcome of the discussions at the writeshop showed that there is a need to coordinate actions relating to value chains and that information sharing between various actors can enhance this. In a way this also applies to researchers who perform research into value chains, inclusion and/or endogenous development, in very diverse thematic and disciplinary fields.

Following the writeshop, and based on the comments from researchers and discussants, the organisers prepared a book proposal that was sent to, and accepted by, the prestigious Routledge Publishing Company. Another meeting is to be scheduled in March 2010 to discuss the final papers for the book publication with the researchers.

A reflection on the activities in 2009 reveals first of all that the research writeshop was considered a great success by all the participating researchers. The intensity of debate and cross fertilisation of ideas provided new inspiration to continue developing the papers without there being any compensation for the time that was spent on it. The flipside of the coin (*i.e.* insufficient compensation) was that the writeshop – originally scheduled for the first half of 2009 – had to be postponed.

The process website was informative and visited by 427 people in 2009, who together visited the website 840 times and viewed the individual web pages of the site a total of 4,467 times.

While the activities in 2009 focussed on bringing together researchers to examine and contrast different theoretical perspectives and case-studies, the activities scheduled for 2010 are meant to discuss and translate the research results into the operations of other actors. To this end, so-called bilateral dialogues are going to be organised in which the

---

<sup>16</sup> The documents are available in a pass word protected section to avoid copy right complications.

participating researchers will discuss the results with representatives from business, NGOs and government.<sup>17</sup> The bilateral dialogues are expected to provide the basis for (i) a policy review which identifies the merits and discusses the efficacy of meso policy measures implemented by the three sectors and (ii) a framework connecting macro and micro issues. In preparation of the bilateral dialogue meeting, the organisers of this process are writing a position paper detailing a synthesis of the 12 papers. The three authors of this position paper each take a different perspective in carrying out this analysis – that of the government, business and NGOs respectively. The process will be concluded by a closing conference the main purpose of which is to enhance coherence, complementarities and synergies between the interventions of multiple actors in value chains, with a view to achieving greater inclusion and endogenous local development.

#### 5. Gender mainstreaming process

This three-year process, organised by the Centre for International Development Issues Nijmegen (CIDIN), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Hivos and Oxfam-Novib aims to reflect critically on experiences with, and generate insights into, gender mainstreaming. It seeks to bring together policymakers, practitioners, researchers, consultants and women's activists in a dialogue in order to create new synergies. Over the years, most governments and actors in DC have emphasised gender mainstreaming at the expense of support for specific policies, programmes and resources for women's empowerment. Gender policies, and in particular gender mainstreaming, have been vulnerable to 'evaporation' when translated into actual implementation. The organisers therefore feel that there is a need for an overall comprehensive and systematic analysis – with multiple stakeholders – on the possible causes and solutions for this limited success. Based on this analysis, this process aims to formulate new gender-related agendas and sharpen policies.

Following a call for papers issued at the end of 2008, five paper proposals were selected. A start was made to writing these in January 2009. As part of a 'Taking Stock' phase of the process, the papers sought to establish how gender has been institutionalised in different organisations (DGIS, NGOs and universities), what policies and strategies are being pursued and what can be learned from evaluations. The writing was done in a participatory process which allowed for the exchange of experiences and insights among gender experts in various Dutch organisations. The authors convened several meetings with experts on the possible content and key questions to be analysed in the paper. In April 2009, a follow-up meeting between the authors and the experts was organised to discuss the first drafts of the paper. During the research process, 48 gender experts were interviewed, coming from NGOs (48%), universities (31%), policy (17%) and business (15%, mostly consultants).<sup>18</sup>

Next, an expert meeting and public seminar were organised on 28 and 29 May 2009 at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the ISS in The Hague. The discussions during these seminars

---

<sup>17</sup> The original proposal foresaw three such dialogues. However, due to budget constraints, the organisers decided to organise one single event for all three bilateral dialogues, without however changing the format for these dialogues.

<sup>18</sup> Intranet facilities to exchange materials and comment on draft papers were made available on the process website. However it turned out to be more useful to do this on a face-to-face basis.

were based on papers with the main discussion theme at both meetings being, 'In what way does gender mainstreaming work or not, and why?'. The expert meeting was attended by 47 participants and the public seminar by 99 participants – including scientists (43% and 41%, respectively), practitioners (38% and 35%), business people (11% and 6%, mostly consultants) and policymakers (9% and 4%, mostly from the Gender Division at DGIS).<sup>19</sup> A seminar report was published on the website soon after the meeting.<sup>20</sup> The key conclusion was that there is an urgent need to contextualise and unpack gender mainstreaming and that this requires more clarity about how and to what extent development organisations are the objects or the subjects of gender mainstreaming. It was also found that gender mainstreaming policies need to be adapted to the specific characteristics, objectives and work processes of an organisation. The ambitious gender mainstreaming agenda needs to be broken down into smaller steps in order to make it comprehensible for organisations and staff. Institutional change can thereby be fostered through mobilising networks, which include gender experts.

The five papers and four articles based on the keynote lecturers of the meetings are going to be submitted to an international academic journal in development studies ('Development and Change') in 2010.

The outcomes of the Taking Stock phase are going to be translated into a policy brief which is to be published in March 2010. Several NGOs as well as DGIS are currently reviewing existing gender (mainstreaming) policies or developing new ones, to which the outcomes of the Taking Stock phase can contribute. In this sense it was beneficial that a large number of people involved in designing and reformulating these policies participated in the two meetings.

In addition to the events held during the process, shared learning was enhanced through a panel on gender mainstreaming that was organised at the CERES Summer School on 2 July 2009, which was attended by the papers' authors and some of the practitioners. The process has also provided input and inspiration for the design of the 'Kenniskring' (knowledge platform) on rights and opportunities for women and girls that DGIS is currently setting up.<sup>21</sup>

Throughout 2009, the process website (<http://www.ontrackwithgender.nl/>) was well visited: 696 unique visitors together visited the site 1,798 times, which resulted in 6,038 page views.

The outcomes of the Taking stock phase are going to be translated in a policy brief which will be published in March 2010. Several NGOs as well as DGIS are currently reviewing

---

<sup>19</sup> The total figures presented here differ from those of the progress report of the process. The latter included the participants that had registered via the website only and, due to a delay in processing the other registrations, they were not yet included in the report.

<sup>20</sup> The document can be found at: <http://www.ontrackwithgender.nl/sites/ontrackwithgender.nl/files/file/90714%20Report%20OTWG.pdf>

<sup>21</sup> Other spin-off activities of this process include the presentation by the organisers of outcomes and insights at several organisations (e.g. PSO) which invited them to their study days and the publication of two articles in the Journal for Gender Studies LOVA.

existing gender (mainstreaming) policies or developing new ones, to which the outcomes of the Taking Stock phase can contribute. In this sense it was beneficial that a large number of people involved in designing and reformulating these policies participated in the two meetings.

The process will continue along two tracks during the second phase. In one of these, the institutional aspects of gender mainstreaming are going to be assessed in more detail by (i) linking the results of the Taking Stock phase back to specific organisations (NGOs and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs), and by (ii) carrying out a case-study on Tanzania aimed at assessing how gender mainstreaming will be institutionalised in the new aid architecture. During the second track specific thematic policy fields will be subject to further scrutiny, namely (i) gender mainstreaming in microfinance and value chains, and (ii) women and violence. The objective of the second phase is to strengthen analysis, deepen insight, strengthen policy formulation and push the strategies for implementation a step further. Several meetings will be organised, involving Southern institutes and experts on women's empowerment, gender equality and gender mainstreaming, to discuss the various themes. Furthermore, the dialogue will be extended to non-gender experts in Dutch organisations.

The two tracks will be followed up by a closing conference planned for November 2010 (the third phase of the process entitled 'Back to the Future'), in which the insights of the first and second phase are going to be integrated into further design strategies for future collaboration. The second and third phases have been integrated more than was originally envisaged due to the fact that the first phase was time-consuming and started in mid 2008. The careful assessment that was made during the first phase was however necessary in order to explore, balance and link the various backgrounds and interests of the different sectors, and in the end it permitted a genuine dialogue.

#### 6. Supporting developing countries' ability to raise tax revenues

This one-year process, organised by SOMO, Tax Justice NL, Oxfam Novib, CIDIN, Stichting Oikos, and the Effectiveness and Quality Department<sup>22</sup> of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, was set up to enhance the exchange of information and cooperation among relevant actors that wish to support developing countries' ability to raise tax revenues. The process was aimed at formulating recommendations on how to address constraints regarding developing countries' ability to raise tax revenues – an issue that is rather new in the Netherlands and in the development field as a whole. This process was therefore a first step towards putting the issue on the policymakers and researchers' agenda, thereby highlighting the importance of tax justice to their work and ensuring that a possible policy change is based on scientific evidence and knowledge.

The process consisted of four activities. First, in order to enhance the exchange and availability of information about the issue, an extensive list of 64 literature sources (including publications from academia, NGOs and policy organisations) and 11 websites was gathered and published on the process website <http://taxrevenues.global-connections.nl>. Second, the intention was to enhance the knowledge base through a consultation round

---

<sup>22</sup> DEC since October 2009.



during which different organisations were asked to fill out an online questionnaire which contained questions about completed and ongoing studies and projects regarding taxation and development. Unfortunately, the response to this mapping exercise was not as successful as hoped for, as only 7 questionnaires were returned. However, despite the limited response, the mapping exercise was fruitful in the sense that it led to an exchange of information with the German government initiative International Tax Compact (ITC), which happened to carry out a similar mapping exercise at the same time. The organisers shared the outcome of the DPRN overview with the ITC, which published its draft overview early in February 2010.

The third activity involved the production of three research papers on international and domestic constraints to raising revenues and related aid implications, written by three of the process organisers (SOMO, CIDIN and Tax Justice NL). The aim of the papers was to provide input to policymakers dealing with the theme of taxation and development. In order to ensure that these papers would indeed meet the policymakers' expectations, several meetings were held with policymakers from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to identify the needs and to keep the Ministry informed of progress. The first drafts of the papers were completed just before the fourth activity, which was the organisation of an expert seminar on 2 December 2009, in which the outcomes of the three papers were discussed both on a plenary basis and in separate workshops. Before the seminar, the papers had been published on the website and sent to the invitees. Based on the workshop discussion, participants formulated policy recommendations, which were compiled to form a report that was sent to the participants and which were subsequently integrated into the papers. The authors received positive feedback on their work, and some experts offered their knowledge to improve the content. In the seminar 39 people participated, including researchers (31%) and a relatively high number of policymakers and practitioners (26% and 28% respectively). Business people, mainly consisting of consultants, represented 13% of the participants. Especially in the light of policy coherence it was interesting to see that representatives of both the Ministry of Finance and of Foreign Affairs participated.

The seminar enabled the organisers to place the issue on the agenda, and raise awareness of the idea that effective development assistance has to support developing countries in their efforts to raise tax. It was concluded that donor countries have a key role to play in stopping multinational corporations from siphoning off profits from poor countries through tax evasion and avoidance. An additional important conclusion was that the transnational nature of the problem means any solution to tackling barriers to tax raising revenues has to involve the international community. At the same time, policies and obligations have to be enforced at national level, through the setting up of efficient and well-equipped structures in both the South and the North that are able to tackle tax evasion, and ensure that tax raising in the South can be performed in an equitable manner. Furthermore, it was stressed that both the distribution effects of tax raising, as well as the increasing expenditure that arises from growing tax incomes, need to be taken into account. A seminar report was written shortly afterwards, and will soon be published on the DPRN and Tax Revenue websites.

The process website itself was visited by 423 unique visitors in 2009, who together visited the site 789 times which resulted in 4,559 page views.



Lastly, the process is being followed-up by embedding newly created linkages and information infrastructure in existing initiatives and networks. The discussion results and policy dialogues will be continued within existing structures such as Tax Justice NL, while research on the topic will be followed-up within SOMO's and CIDIN's tax research activities from 2010 onwards. Tax Justice NL will include the literature list of the mapping exercise in their online database, and update it with new reports and initiatives in the field of taxation and development. The organisation will also stimulate cooperation among the experts who participated in the process through a mailing list that will inform people about new developments and events. Next, thematic meetings and consultations will be held between the organisers and the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Finance. Furthermore, Tax Justice NL will try to engage multinational corporations in a dialogue about tax and Corporate Social Responsibility through existing forums, such as the Vereniging van Nederlandse Ondernemers, MVO Nederland and the National Contact Point for OECD guidelines. Lastly, Tax Justice NL will make an effort to increase knowledge on tax justice for development among consultants and tax advisors through dialogue, training activities and presentations. The DPRN seminar has already resulted in an invitation from the International Bureau for Fiscal Documentation (IBFD), which advises governments and other actors in this field.

#### 7. Phosphorus depletion: the invisible crisis

This one year process, organised by the Netherlands Water Partnership (NWP), WASTE and Plant Research International of Wageningen University and Research Centre PRI-WUR, on behalf of the Nutrient Flow Task Group (NFTG)<sup>23</sup>, was initiated in order to place the issue of phosphorus depletion on the Dutch and European debate agendas and to increase awareness of the problem. Phosphate fertiliser is a prerequisite for an economically viable agriculture since plants need phosphate to grow and produce seeds. However, demand for phosphate is increasing, while global reserves are finite. The general estimate is that known resources will last for 100 years. There are no alternatives for phosphate as a key component of fertilisers, hence the implications for global food production are enormous and may in the end result in large-scale famine. Phosphorous shortage is expected to further complicate competing claims for food, energy and land and could thus end in social-political turmoil. Considering the magnitude of this problem and its far-reaching implications, it is hard to understand why phosphorus depletion is generally not on any political agenda.

With a view to putting phosphorus depletion on the agenda the NFTG followed a – somewhat unusual – approach characterised by flexibility in order to respond to unforeseen developments and opportunities.

The NFTG members addressed phosphorus depletion at several national and international forums between March and August 2009. Among these were the 5<sup>th</sup> World Water Forum held in Istanbul in March 2009 and a seminar organised by the Ministry of LNV during the World Water Week in Stockholm in August 2009. On both occasions, a leaflet entitled 'Phosphorus

---

<sup>23</sup> The NFTG is a growing network of public parties, NGOs, the private sector, knowledge institutes and network organisations sharing a common concern for phosphorus depletion.

Depletion: The Invisible Crisis' was presented and made available to all interested parties.<sup>24</sup> The leaflet provides information on phosphorus scarcity and the NFTG. The subject was also brought to the attention of important actors such as the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (DGIS), the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Water for People, and many other organisations involved in water and sanitation issues in developing countries. Within the same period, the organisers made use of DPRN contacts to publish the article entitled 'Peak phosphorus. The next inconvenient truth' in The Broker of 4 August 2009.<sup>25</sup>

With a view to reaching Dutch policymakers in particular, a mini-seminar on phosphorus depletion was organised in Nieuwspoort in The Hague on 7 October 2009. This was done on the basis of a joint effort with the Technology Assessment Steering Committee (TA), which was appointed by LNV to advise the Minister directly on important strategic issues that concern the ministry. In June 2009 a partnership was set up between the NFTG and the TA with a view to jointly addressing phosphorus depletion as a key issue. The mini-seminar followed the publication of a study, commissioned by the TA and carried out by PRI-WUR, with input from NFTG members, entitled 'Phosphorus in agriculture: global resources, trends and developments'.<sup>26</sup> Based on this report and input by the NFTG members, the TA presented a policy note and accompanying letter to Minister Verburg.<sup>27</sup> The mini-seminar was meant to underline the importance of this policy note. The NFTG wrote a paper specifically for this occasion entitled, 'The emergent phosphorus shortage as a challenge'.<sup>28</sup> This paper proposes the setting up of a phosphorus bureau to coordinate joint learning by the different partners. The working paper's overall conclusion on the need for coordinated learning was supported by the 42 participants from various sectors. These included academia (36%), the business sector (31%), practice (12%) and policy (17%), with in the latter case representatives from at least five different ministries, including the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

It was recommended that such cooperation should take the form of a Nutrient Platform rather than a bureau and that it should also include other crucial nutrients. The mini-seminar has been a useful vehicle for addressing the issue with several important political

---

<sup>24</sup> The leaflet can be found at: [http://phosphorus.global-connections.nl/sites/phosphorus.global-connections.nl/files/file/Phosphorus%20Depletion%20-%20The%20Invisible%20Crisis\(5\).pdf](http://phosphorus.global-connections.nl/sites/phosphorus.global-connections.nl/files/file/Phosphorus%20Depletion%20-%20The%20Invisible%20Crisis(5).pdf)

<sup>25</sup> The article is available at: <http://www.thebrokeronline.eu/en/articles/Peak-phosphorus>. Following this article, the Scherpenzeel Foundation in the Netherlands placed the issue of phosphorous depletion at the top of its list of 'forgotten stories' see [www.hetvergetenverhaal.nl](http://www.hetvergetenverhaal.nl).

<sup>26</sup> The report written by Smit, A.L. *et al.* is available at: <http://phosphorus.global-connections.nl/sites/phosphorus.global-connections.nl/files/file/Plant%20Research%20International%20-%20Phosphorus%20in%20Agriculture%20-%20Global%20Resources%20Trends%20&%20Developments.pdf>

<sup>27</sup> The policy note can be found at: [http://www.stuurgroepsta.nl/rapporten/beleidsnotitie\\_fosfaat.pdf](http://www.stuurgroepsta.nl/rapporten/beleidsnotitie_fosfaat.pdf); and the policy letter at: <http://www.stuurgroepsta.nl/rapporten/briefadviesfosfaat.pdf>.

<sup>28</sup> The document can be found at: <http://phosphorus.global-connections.nl/sites/phosphorus.global-connections.nl/files/file/Living%20Document%20-The%20emerging%20phosphorus%20shortage%20as%20a%20challenge%20-%20settingup%20a%20Nutrient%20Bureau.pdf>

stakeholders, including the parliament and senate, the Ministries of LNV, Economic Affairs (EZ), and VROM. The conclusions of the seminar were published in a short document and sent out to all the participants.<sup>29</sup>

As a result of the mini-seminar in Nieuwspoort, structural relations have developed between the NFTG and the Global Partnership on Nutrient Management (GPNM) – an initiative by the Dutch and US Governments following the 17<sup>th</sup> Conference on Sustainable Development (CSD 17), coordinated by VROM – and with the Interdepartmental Project Scarcity & Transition in which the Ministries of LNV, VROM, EZ, DGIS and the Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management (V&W) participate. Both the GPNM and the Interdepartmental Project Scarcity & Transition approached the NFTG and invited it to participate in various meetings with a view to providing input for the discussions on phosphorus depletion.

This DPRN process has been accompanied by various publications and, together with other relevant scientific background information, these have been made available on the [www.phosphorus.global-connections.nl](http://www.phosphorus.global-connections.nl) website. This website was very useful for lobbying activities as it enabled the NFTG to show stakeholders background information. What was probably even more important was the fact that this website gave the NFTG a more formalised image and, as such, more legitimacy in lobbying activities aimed at important stakeholders. Unfortunately the online communications platform, that was developed to enable the NFTG members to exchange information and engage in online discussions, has not been used, for the same reason as observed in other processes (people do not take the time to engage in online discussions). The process website was visited by 537 people in 2009, who together visited the site 1,028 and generated 3,198 page views.

Among the activities still to be realised in this process, which will continue until April 2010, is the organisation of a mini-seminar in the European Parliament, co-organised with the Greens/European Free Alliance and the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe. This seminar is going to be held on 4 March 2010 and is intended to be an important first step to putting phosphorus shortage more prominently on the European political agenda. Also, an outline and strategy are going to be produced relating to how the topic of phosphorous depletion can be brought to the attention of a wider audience in the Netherlands and abroad using a drama documentary.

The process will be followed-up firstly by an assessment of how to transform the NFTG into a Dutch Nutrient Platform (in terms of necessity, objectives, funding, hosting/structure, agenda, aspiration level etc.). The NFTG members have asked the NWP to continue hosting the secretary of the Task Group for a bridging period of another half year (until mid-2010) in order to facilitate the transition from being an informal task group to being a (institutionalised) platform. Secondly, several organisations including the Gesellschaft für

---

<sup>29</sup> The report entitled 'Conclusions of the mini seminar on phosphorus shortage held on 7 October 2009' can be found at: <http://phosphorus.global-connections.nl/sites/phosphorus.global-connections.nl/files/file/Conclusions%20of%20the%20mini%20seminar%20on%20phosphorus%20shortage%20held%20on%207%20October%202009%20-%20setting%20up%20a%20Nutrient%20Platform.pdf>.

Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH from Germany and several players from Australia, have stated an interest in cooperating with the NFTG. The third outcome of this process is the successful application by two of the partners involved – PRI-WUR and the Stockholm Environmental Institute (SEI) – for a tender on Sustainable Use of Phosphorus that was issued by the by the European Directorate-General for the Environment in May 2009. The organisers regards this as a spin-off of the NFTG/DPRN process, which helped create the network needed for a successful combination of the expertise that is required to carry out this tender.

To summarise, this DPRN process has been crucial in getting the issue of phosphorus depletion on the Dutch and European policy agendas, in developing the future Nutrient Platform, and in facilitating joint learning by knowledge institutes, businesses, NGOs and policymakers. This will continue to be so for the foreseeable future.

#### 8. Fuelling knowledge on the social and ecological impacts of agrofuel<sup>30</sup> production: the generation of intersectoral debate and interdisciplinary analysis.

This one-year process is a joint effort carried out by Both Ends, the IUCN Nederland's Committee and its knowledge programme Natureandpoverty.net, the University of Amsterdam/AISSR-GID, Alterra, ETC, Cordaid, Mekon Ecology and the Law and Governance Group of Wageningen University. The process intends to generate intersectoral debate and interdisciplinary analysis of the social and ecological effects of agrofuel production and expansion, with a view to enabling informed decision-making aimed at minimising the negative effects. The idea for this process originated from the fact that there are strong opposing positions in the debate on the effects of agrofuels, which are often based on biased information. First and foremost, therefore, there is an urgent need for more (scientific) information on the issue. In addition, because policymakers (and businesses) seem to be impatient and may (have to) take decisions on the basis of assumptions, there is a need to clarify these assumptions and their underlying values and motives.

The process started with an internal kick-off meeting on 27 February 2009, in which the process organisers officially launched themselves as the agrofuels platform whose aim was defined as to contribute to an overview of the available (scientific) knowledge and the various stakeholders' interests and motives. The platform shares knowledge and provides information to a broader audience through the wiki <http://np-net.pbworks.com/Agrofuels-Knowledge-Platform> which currently holds more than 600 scientific and other documents.<sup>31</sup> During the meeting it was decided that a position paper should be written that would provide a broad overview of information and stakeholders' positions. Scientific information that has been integrated into the paper was gathered on the wiki, and policymakers from

---

<sup>30</sup> The term agrofuel refers to liquid fuel produced from agricultural crops, and is a narrower term than biofuels, which also covers fuels produced from waste products, algae, etc.

<sup>31</sup> This wiki is part of the website <http://www.natureandpoverty.net>, the overall knowledge network of the IUCN Netherlands Committee. It was decided to use this website because its facilities and numerous documents on the subject were already available. For this reason, the Global Connection website for this process, <http://www.agrofuelsplatform.nl>, functions merely as a gateway to the wiki, outlining the process activities in general terms.

various ministries (LNV, EZ, DGIS, VROM) were interviewed with a view to gathering information concerning the assumptions on which they based their policies. A draft version of the paper was discussed by the platform members during a second meeting on 17 June 2009. As an input to this meeting additional documents (research reports, policy notes and position papers of various organisations) were gathered and made available on the wiki.

The position paper highlights a striking difference between various stakeholders regarding the appropriateness of policies when it comes to stimulating the use of agrofuels, an example being the so-called blending targets. These are targets for the percentage of biofuels to be mixed with fossil fuels in petrol and diesel. The report shows that there is a growing consensus among scientists as regards the fact that blending targets cause significant agricultural expansion, with negative effects on biodiversity and food prices. However, the responses of other actors differ. Notably, policymakers remain in favour of such policy instruments, using the argument that they provide the opportunity to implement strict sustainability criteria, with potential positive effects on the sustainability of agriculture as a whole. At the same time, an increasing number of NGOs and researchers emphasise the risks and call for more sustainable alternatives.

After the initial stage of internal discussions and paper writing, two events were organised to discuss the issue with other stakeholders. Firstly, the organisers held two workshops at the CERES summer school on 3 July 2009, in which Dutch researchers presented case studies, discussed approaches and methodologies, and questioned and identified the role of knowledge in policymaking processes. Thirty-two participants attended the meeting, most of whom were researchers (75%). The other participants were practitioners (15%) and people from the corporate sector (6%). Unfortunately there were no policymakers present. To intensify the dialogue with policymakers, the organisers participated in a study day at the Ministry of VROM on 20 August 2009 during which the macro-effects of bio-mass production for energy purposes were discussed, with particular attention being paid to the perceptions of Dutch, Brazilian and Indonesian experts.

The last stage of the process was the organisation of an expert meeting which was held on 18 February 2010. During this meeting, researchers, policymakers and practitioners discussed policies regarding agrofuels in relation to current scientific knowledge. The meeting was also used to discuss the uncertainties in scientific knowledge regarding the effects of agrofuel production and how policymakers deal with them. A draft version of the position paper<sup>32</sup> formed the input to this meeting, which was characterised by an intensive dialogue, addressing issues that often fail to be discussed. Among these were assumptions underlying various models like available land and CO<sub>2</sub> savings. But also governmental ability and capacity to manage the expansion of agrofuels and its indirect effects on land use, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and biodiversity, figured prominently on the agenda. Twenty-five experts from science (36%), policy (20%) and NGOs (44%) participated in the meeting, which was on

---

<sup>32</sup> The paper entitled 'Burning questions – Certainties and uncertainties concerning agrofuels' is available at: [http://np-net.pbworks.com/f/Kusters+et+al+\(2010\)+Agrofuels+Burning+Questions-draft+for+DPRN.pdf](http://np-net.pbworks.com/f/Kusters+et+al+(2010)+Agrofuels+Burning+Questions-draft+for+DPRN.pdf)

invitation only. A meeting report will be made available online as a separate document, while the discussion outcomes will be included in the final version of the position paper.

Reflecting on the activities so far, it can be said that they acquired a clearer focus during the process. While the initial plan was to primarily gather research-based knowledge on agrofuels and communicate this to policymakers, it became clear that it would be more effective to start by examining the underlying assumptions of policies and combining this with the available knowledge. This was expected to be more beneficial for the uptake of research results. Furthermore, while the intention at the start of the process was to include the business community as stakeholders in the discussion, it was considered to be more important to discuss the issue first through the viewpoints of scientists and policymakers only. As a process outcome, the agrofuels platform submitted a project pre-proposal to the Global Sustainable Biomass Fund for research on the mitigation of indirect effects of agrofuel production in Indonesia. If this proposal is not going to be funded, other opportunities for further research and discussion will be sought. A follow-up meeting on the issue is already planned for 26–27 April 2010, when sustainable sourcing of biofuels will be discussed in more detail.

#### 9. Commercial pressures on land: rethinking policies and practice for development

This one-year process was an initiative of the Centre for Development Studies (CDS) of the University of Groningen, the International Land Coalition (ILC), and Oxfam Novib. Its main objective was to provide an evidence base for influencing global, regional and national policy processes on rural land with a view to enabling secure and equitable access to land for the vulnerable poor who face increased commercial demand for their land. The process was specifically meant to facilitate the communication, exchange and debate on analysis of land rights problems, approaches and policies.

To facilitate this communication, the organisers decided to make use of the existing ILC blog on 'commercial pressure on land' (<http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/>).<sup>33</sup> The blog has been designed to inform the public about policy documents, press reports, research papers, case studies, and any other relevant information on 'commercial pressures on land' that poor rural land-users are facing all over the world. More documents on the subject were gathered specifically for this process.

The main event of this process was a seminar held in Utrecht on 8 July 2009. During this event, national and international guests reviewed land policy and practice, and discussed how to enable coordinated response to commercial pressures on land. After a number of keynote speeches, three working groups discussed the issue from different perspectives, namely (i) the Southern stakeholder perspective, (ii) the corporate and multi-stakeholder perspectives, and (iii) the international community perspective. Numerous case studies were presented and these made this seminar a worthwhile exercise in comparing different cases and the policies and practices of organisations dealing with commercial land pressures on a

---

<sup>33</sup> The process website on Global Connections <http://pressuresonland.global-connections.nl/> therefore largely links to the ILC blog, which attracted 29,128 visits in 2009 or an average of 96 visitors per day.



global scale. One of the main conclusions of the seminar was that more evidence-based processes should be set up to enable the assessment of the implications of increased commercial pressure on land. The debate also covered whether a code of conduct would be a possible solution and it was agreed that it would only be feasible if a participatory and multi-stakeholder approach was adhered to. A total of 98 people participated in the seminar. Most of them were scientists (37%) and practitioners (36%). Policymakers were also well-represented (23%), but the corporate sector (4%) was not.

Before the seminar a number of activities had been undertaken to gather knowledge and raise awareness on the issue. First, a discussion paper was written by the organisers at the ILC, which gives an overview of the current knowledge about, and responses to, commercial pressures on land.<sup>34</sup> This paper puts forward some key considerations and questions for building a coordinated response, and was sent to all the seminar attendees and discussed during a presentation by the author at the seminar. A second activity was the formulation of a fact sheet, which was presented to the Dutch Minister of DC and which was eventually used as input for the speech by Mr Maarten Brouwer, the Ambassador for DC of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. A third activity was the setting up of smaller preparation meetings in which the organisers held several discussions with national and international experts, who had shown interest in the seminar. This also involved meetings with the Sustainable Economic Development Department (DDE) of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.<sup>35</sup>

After the seminar, the ILC blog continued to inform the participants of the seminar on a weekly basis about updates on the blog. The CDS also drew up an overview and carried out an analysis of policy documents and formulated policy recommendations. This analysis, which has been integrated in the process end report, states that an inventory needs to be made of the local outcomes of 'land grabbing', since the issue is often conceptualised from a global perspective. Moreover, what most parties have also failed to explore are the regional and inter-country differences affecting global outsourcing. Lastly, the issues of controlling and monitoring commercial pressures on land need clarity and social congruence in both formally and informally recognised rights. The organisers list several policy recommendations that underline the need for credible and flexible institutional and legal frameworks, which are focused on the long-term. They also call for capacity-building of state land institutions, and development projects that can help community organisations to develop knowledge of land laws and policies so that they can better negotiate and claim their rights. The process report is currently being reviewed and will soon be published on the DPRN and Commercial land pressure websites.

---

<sup>34</sup> This paper entitled: 'Increasing commercial pressure on land: Building a coordinated response' is available at:

[http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/09\\_07\\_cpl\\_discussionpaper.pdf](http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl-blog/wp-content/uploads/09_07_cpl_discussionpaper.pdf)

<sup>35</sup> With a view to creating synergy, the seminar was organised in conjunction with two other events. Firstly, a meeting was organised by the University of Utrecht on 7 July 2009 which provided academics with a platform to discuss ongoing research on land issues. Second, on 9 July 2009, the DDE and the EU Task Force on Land Tenure organised a meeting with a smaller group of experts to discuss specifically Dutch and EU land policy codes. A report of the latter was incorporated as an annex to the ILC discussion paper.

As a major follow-up to this process, the organisers worked on the setting up of a potential consortium in order to play a significant role of facilitating and fostering multi-stakeholder participation in land policy review, and of addressing the pressing need for innovative approaches to food security, safeguarding poor peoples land rights and sustainable rural development. The consortium developed a research proposal that was submitted for an IS academy grant. Unfortunately the proposal was granted to another consortium. Other opportunities are now being sought.

In retrospect, the rejection of the IS academy proposal, that took place short before the seminar, and the relative intermission of the process after an intensive period of working towards the seminar, made it a challenge to keep the process on track. The seminar itself was considered to be a major success, with numerous international experts participating, and many new contacts being established. However, one shortcoming was that the business sector was underrepresented, despite specific attempts by the organisers to ensure they were present. Since the seminar was about commercial land pressures, the organisers found this low representation rather disappointing.

#### 10. ‘Singing a New Policy Tune’: Towards (re)foundation of Dutch development assistance policies”. (‘Uit een nieuw beleidsvaatje tappen’)

This process – referred to hereafter denoted as the SNPT process – was set up as a one-year process by the MDF, ISS and Vice Versa, in close cooperation with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, with a view to (i) organise series of well informed, well documented presentations and public debates on the most relevant themes of Dutch and international development policies, and (ii) to contribute to the revitalisation of the efforts of academics, scholars and DGIS to formulate policies in a more systematic and thorough way (i.e. work towards the formulation of a policy theory). The process is regarded as a follow-up to the Understanding Development Better process, which was carried out within framework of DPRN in 2008.

The process was to start in January 2009. However, in consultation with the DPRN Task Force and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, it was decided to postpone the process until September 2009. This permitted the inclusion of the main outcome of the DPRN process ‘Structure follows Strategy’, namely the need for a shift towards International Cooperation (IC). The SNPT process officially started on 10 September 2009 in Ede, with a so-called ‘Pick your Brains’ meeting. In this meeting participants in five working groups discussed the (a) the main aim of a shift to IC policy in general and (b) the implications of a shift towards IC for some of the main current development policy themes.<sup>36</sup> A total of 33 experts participated in the discussions, most of them being policymakers (39%) with scientists and practitioners each accounting for 21% of the participants, and the corporate sector 12%. The working groups’ reports were sent to the participants after the meeting and after processing their comments they were published on the process website [www.singinganewpolicytune.nl](http://www.singinganewpolicytune.nl).

---

<sup>36</sup> These themes are (i) Governance and corruption, (ii) Economy, growth and distribution, (iii) Gender and Sexual and Reproductive Health Rights (SRHRs), (iv) Sustainability, climate and energy, and (v) Fragile states, peace and security.



In preparation for the meeting, all participants had received several policy documents that informed them about the current Dutch DC policy and the specific thematic policy domains that were to be discussed in the working groups. These documents were also made available on the process website. In addition, the participants received three documents that had been written specifically to investigate the formulation of a new policy theory. The first document, known as '*De broncodes*' (the source codes), had actually been written by DGIS policymakers in 2006, and gives an initial impetus to the formulation of a policy theory for Dutch DC.<sup>37</sup> The decision was taken to use this document as a starting point for the discussion on policy theory in this process. The second document comprised a reflection on '*De Broncodes*' in the light of a new IC policy theory.<sup>38</sup> This draft paper briefly examines the emergence of '*De Broncodes*', and provides an overview of a number of key dilemmas that emerge from it. Furthermore, it assesses how this document could be of use to the SNPT process. The third document is a paper that reflects on what exactly is a policy theory, how policy is made, and which steps can be followed in formulating a policy theory.<sup>39</sup>

The process continued with a two-day Kick-off conference in Ede on 1 and 2 October 2009, to which a broader public was invited. The first day was meant to be used for a discussion of the more detailed formulation of policy theory, through panel discussions and a presentation of the case of '*De broncodes*'. One of the outcomes was that there is an urgent need to make the choices and axioms on which the current policies are based more explicit. It was also stated that policymaking is an interactive process involving numerous stakeholders and requiring constant review and adjustments. The second day was geared towards a further assessment of policy theory for the five specific policy domains that were identified during the first meeting. DGIS policymakers presented the policies in more detail and discussed with the public what could be done to formulate a better defined policy theory. A total of 55 people participated, including policymakers (27%), scientists (24%), practitioners (24%) and people from the corporate sector (22%).

The reactions after the meeting were mixed. Some participants found it interesting. Others had expected the discussions to progress a lot more, even though the process was rather complicated. The objective of formulating a policy theory was not properly understood by some of the participants, and therefore the aim of the meeting was unclear. It also became apparent that such a complex objective requires discussion in smaller expert working groups. For this reason participants were more positive about the much smaller '*Pick your Brains*' meeting. A further complicating factor was that some participants were confused as

---

<sup>37</sup> This document, entitled '*De Broncodes van het OS-beleid: Articulatie van een beleidstheorie ontwikkelingssamenwerking*' is available at:

<http://e-mdf.nl/projects/dprn/backgrounddocuments/De%20broncodes%20van%20het%20OS-beleid.pdf>.

<sup>38</sup> This draft document is titled '*The broncodes revisited: Aanknopingspunten voor een nieuwe IS-beleidstheorie*'. The author of this report, Frans Bieckmann, was also appointed – with additional funds from DGIS – as a facilitator of the process, specifically for the part that was to formulate a policy theory in the expert working groups.

<sup>39</sup> This document, written by Frans Bieckmann, is titled '*Naar een onderbouwd IS-beleid: Achtergronden bij Singing a New Policy Tune*'.

to how current DC policy could function as a starting point for the formulation of new IC policy theory.

At this point it was decided to put the process on hold for a while in order to rethink the strategy. This was also deemed to be useful in the light of the WRR report, which was to be published in January 2010. In consultation with the DPRN Task Force it was then decided that the two initial tracks which were to be followed in this process – public meetings in which current DC policy was discussed, and an in-depth discussion of IC policy theory among experts in smaller groups – would continue along separate lines. Several public meetings, organised on the initiative of the MDF, are planned for the period of April – June 2010. The thematic working groups, organised under the lead of the ISS, will start in March 2010.

### *c. Global-Connections.nl web portal*

In order to facilitate and support access to expertise and the exchange of information between policymakers, development practitioners and researchers, DPRN has, in close cooperation with the African Studies Centre (ASC), developed a web portal with a search facility to find development expertise in the Netherlands and Flanders. In 2008, the Royal Tropical Institute (KIT) (through its Library and Information Services) also joined the development of the web portal by overseeing its redevelopment into a more user-friendly and interactive Content Management System (CMS).<sup>40</sup>

Activities in 2009 focused on developing web portals with interactive facilities for ongoing DPRN processes as well as finalising the harmonisation between the newly developed CMS and the existing Application Programming Interface (API), and making the registration and search modules more user-friendly. Extensive testing and refining were carried out to make the link between the CMS and the database at the ASC work. This created the conditions for a large campaign to expand and update the database in 2010.

Specific activities that have been carried out by DPRN during the period under review with respect to the web portal include:

- Realising bug fixes for the module which connects the API and the CMS, testing the interface, and making necessary changes for the benefit of users.
- Archiving the web portals of completed DPRN processes (microfinance, the GM soy debate and Understanding Development Better) by making these websites static so as to minimise their maintenance in the future.
- Website development for the DPRN processes that started in 2009 (Agrofuels, Phosphorus depletion, Tax justice, Structure follows strategy and Commercial Land Pressures).
- Active support of the different organisations carrying out DPRN processes in managing their websites, which included content management training for the staff;

---

<sup>40</sup> A CMS facilitates the addition of content (news items, articles, etc.) to a website by people without detailed ICT knowledge and makes it possible to monitor web-related statistics (the number of visitors and how they used the web portal) while also offering additional opportunities for installing network-supporting modalities. When the transformation to the CMS was completed, the KIT provided training to the ICT managers at DPRN and the ASC, in the system's features.

- Regular meetings with KIT about Search4Dev, the repository for non-academic publications (policy documents, consultancy reports, etc.) which can be linked to Global-Connections.nl (see next section).
- Making technical documents available for the benefit of new users and administrators of the CMS: a user's manual and a technical document which explains the configuration and administrative management of the software.

Activities realised in 2009 by the ASC, which maintains the API and hosts the searchable expert database, include:

- Making technical documentation available and realising other conditions for technical support. This included making the API documentation accessible, realising dedicated sever hosting, creating a repository for the files, and setting up a system for making technical documentation available, in which bugs can be registered by means of a bug tracker and in which a feedback system is maintained where users can post comments. The Web service has been made accessible for external programmers who are operating under DPRN, which has made it possible for them to modify scripts.
- Basic functionalities were realised and the associated priorities were discussed with KIT and DPRN and focused primarily on security measures. These included, among other things, the protection of the web service with SSL, as a result of which the IP restriction policy could be lapsed. This means that every person with a web service account is now able to use the service. The different data stored in the database are now also secured individually. Moreover, the functional requirements for a new search interface have been specified as a result of which the presentation of expertise can now be realised independently of the ASC.
- Moderating users who registered at Connecting-Africa.
- Harvesting publications for Connecting-Africa, which resulted in 8,487 new records in 2009.
- Support of DPRN partners in keeping the Global-Connection services operational.

The Global-Connections web portal itself ([www.global-connections.nl](http://www.global-connections.nl), excluding the process websites) had 1,607 unique visitors in 2009, who together visited the site 5,924 times and viewed the individual website page a total of 5,924 times. The process websites (excluding the SNPT website which is hosted by MDF) had a total of 5,571 visitors in 2009, who together visited the websites 10,199 times and viewed the individual web pages of the different websites a total of 41,611 times.

#### ***d. Search4Dev***

Search4Dev is an online library for digital documents from Dutch organisations involved in international cooperation (<http://www.search4dev.nl/>). The website offers quick and easy access to these documents. Search4Dev was set up in 2008 by KIT Information & Library Services in collaboration with the Digital Production Centre of the University of Amsterdam. This makes the publications of Dutch development organisations easy to find, for both national and international audiences. By using international standards and protocols, the publications can also be easily retrieved by search engines and other information services, such as Global-Connections. At the moment, twenty organisations provide access to their publications on Search4Dev. These include Alternative View, the Bernard van Leer

Foundation, Both ENDS, DPRN, the Dutch Committee for Afghanistan–Veterinary Programmes, Euroconsult/BMB Mott MacDonald, Hivos, ICCO, the International Institute for Communication and Development (IICD), KIT, the Knowledge Centre Religion and Development (KCRD), NCDO, PSO–Capacity Building in Developing Countries, SNV–Netherlands Development Organisation, SOMO–Centre for Research on Multinational Corporations, Spanda foundation, Stichting Oikos, The Broker and Voluntary Service Overseas (VSO). Other organisations are actively being invited to submit their digital publications for inclusion.

Currently, 1,204 documents are accessible via Search4Dev and new documents are being added on a weekly basis. Five organisations were interested but could not yet be included because the capacity at KIT is insufficient to include all organisations interested in making their publications accessible through Search4Dev.

#### *e. DPRN website*

The DPRN website is used to provide information on DPRN, its activities and publications. It had 3,433 unique visitors in 2009, who together visited the website 5,343 times, and viewed the individual website pages a total of 22,176 times.

#### *f. Participation in the Worldconnectors initiative*

DPRN is participating in the Worldconnectors initiative, which was set up in 2006 together with the National Commission for International Cooperation and Sustainable Development (NCDO) and the Society for International Development (SID) (see <http://www.worldconnectors.nl>). The aim of Worldconnectors is to increase attention for IC in the Dutch business, policy and science sectors, to engage in cross–sectoral dialogue about the key issues facing the global community today, and to propose alternative views and strategies. Members meet at least four times a year to discuss themes and develop a vision for further steps. The DPRN is taking part both in the Worldconnectors Project Group (Dr Koen Kusters) and the Worldconnectors Steering Group (Prof. Dr Ton Dietz).

The Worldconnectors organised four Round Tables in 2009:

- On 22 March there was a Round Table meeting on the topic of Europe in the World. The Worldconnectors had selected this as their first theme of 2009, in the light of the elections in June 2009. The Working Group involved in this theme included special advisors from ECDPM, FNV and the Dutch National Youth Council. According to the Working Group, the EU is – and should be – a main player in international cooperation and the management of global public goods. The Working group produced a statement with proposals for the reformation of Europe.<sup>41</sup> Several outreach activities were organised in relation to the theme, including a debate on the European elections, organised with LUX Nijmegen.
- The second Round Table took place on 28 May. This Round Table covered two themes; Gender and Diversity and Sustainable World Citizenship. The RT on Sustainable World

---

<sup>41</sup> The statement can be found at:

[http://www.worldconnectors.nl/upload/cms/341\\_2009\\_05\\_21\\_Statement\\_Europe\\_Final.pdf](http://www.worldconnectors.nl/upload/cms/341_2009_05_21_Statement_Europe_Final.pdf)

<sup>42</sup> As a follow-up, the Working Group started to become engaged with other groups in society that are able to implement the strategies formulated in the statement. The Working Group cooperates with Women Inc. and will play an important role at the Women Inc. festival in March 2010.

- In the early morning of 23 September there was a breakfast Round Table, prior to the SID Senate Conference on 'Economic Growth and the Common Good – Effective and Innovative Approaches to Economic Growth and Development', which was co-organised with the Worldconnectors. The breakfast meeting focussed primarily on the new themes to be discussed in 2010.
- Lastly, on 23 November the final Round Table of 2009 was held at the office of the entrepreneurial development bank of the Netherlands (MFO) in the Hague on 'financial systems', with Minister Koenders as a special guest. On this occasion the Worldconnectors discussed with Minister Koenders how the financial system (financial institutions in the Netherlands as well as international financial institutions) can be reformed so as to contribute to a more just and sustainable world. The Worldconnectors see the financial crisis both as a system failure and as an opportunity to embrace a new financial system that is based on values of sustainability. The Working Group had formulated its ideas in a draft statement that was discussed during the Round Table. The Working Group is now actively entering a dialogue with influential actors in the government and corporate sectors in the Netherlands (including large banks and Committee de Wit), to raise some fundamental issues that, according to Working Group, are being insufficiently addressed at this point in time.

### ***g. Support for The Broker***

DPRN Task Force member Prof. Dr Ton Dietz is represented in the Foundation for International Development Publications (IDP), publisher of The Broker, and DPRN Coordinator Dr Mirjam Ros in its Editorial Committee. The Broker is a bi-monthly magazine which aims to contribute to evidence-based policymaking by encouraging exchanges between knowledge producers and development professionals (see <http://www.thebrokeronline.eu>). In 2009 The Broker published six issues, with special reports on health for all, the rise of solar energy, violent conflicts, the power of value chains, and urban networks & governance. The link

---

<sup>42</sup> The statements can be found at: [http://www.worldconnectors.nl/upload/cms/522\\_genderdiversity-ENG-A.pdf](http://www.worldconnectors.nl/upload/cms/522_genderdiversity-ENG-A.pdf) (part A) and [http://www.worldconnectors.nl/upload/cms/523\\_genderdiversity-ENG-B.pdf](http://www.worldconnectors.nl/upload/cms/523_genderdiversity-ENG-B.pdf) (part B).

between DPRN and The Broker resulted in, among other things, the article on phosphorous depletion that triggered the DPRN process on this topic.

### III.2 Results

The expected results for 2009, as mentioned in the 2009 Plan of Operations, were the following:

1. Generating a debate on the organisation and structure of Dutch DC .

*Results:* An issue paper was written based on interviews with key players and opinion leaders, four parallel workgroups were brought together to formulate propositions about the organisation of Dutch IC/DC, and these propositions were compiled to form a synthesis document that provided input to a public meeting held in June 2009. The results of the debate were made available in a meeting report, while the DPRN Task Force wrote a 'Programme of requirements of the organisation of Dutch IC/DC' to inform the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and political parties about possible changes. A comparative review of the architecture of another country was not made, although it was referred to in the various discussions.<sup>43</sup> A website was created for this process (<http://structurefollowsstrategy.dprn.nl/>) via which all the information was made available, but an online discussion (mentioned as a target in the Plan of Operations) did not materialise. Neither was this necessary considering the frequency of live meetings. It is hard to determine whether the targets regarding 50% of DGIS staff and PARTOS members being aware of the DPRN debate and urgency of change have been met. Twenty-one Partos member organisations were present at the meeting in June, which corresponds with 22.5% of the total, but the number aware of the debate is possibly larger. 19 representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs were present at the June meeting. Rather than focusing on the quantity, the DPRN considers it important that people high up at the Ministry have been reached, such as the ambassador for DC and the Minister, who sent a response to the PROVO. In addition to Partos members and DGIS staff, the business community was also prominently present in the debate and its outcomes.<sup>44</sup>

2. Following up on and continuing the debates started in 2008.

*Results:* As reported in Section III.1b, the DPRN continued to facilitate four processes that had started in 2008, namely Microfinance & Business Development Services and the GM Soy debate, which were concluded in 2009, and Value Chain Governance and the Gender Mainstreaming Trajectory, which will continue until the second half of 2010. There was also a follow-up to the Understanding Development Better conference in the form of a paper on development policies since Minister Pronk's tenure. The DPRN created and facilitated interactive websites for each of these processes which were mostly used as sources of information on the topics addressed.

---

<sup>43</sup> The reason for not carrying out this comparative review was the fact that the observing Task Force member from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was of the opinion that the organisational structure of the various countries is not applicable to the Dutch situation due to the different historical and cultural backgrounds.

<sup>44</sup> The four DPRN target groups were represented equally in the working groups. At the meeting 20% of the participants were scientists, 28% policymakers, 36% practitioners and 13% entrepreneurs.

Active online discussion groups did not materialise. The general experience with such forums is that people do not take the time to engage in online discussions. Each of the processes published several outputs like overviews of research activities and policies and/or a policy brief. Policy recommendations were made and included in the process reports.

3. Initiating new processes aimed at ongoing communication, debate and cooperation between experts from different sectors.

*Results:* Thanks to the transfer of underspending from DPRN's first phase to the second phase, DPRN was able to initiate five new processes in 2009 (Section III.1 b and Appendix 2). Websites have been set up for all of these processes, one or more meetings have been organised, reviews of research and/or policies made and recommendations formulated in the form of policy briefs or part of the process reports. Most of these processes are now being finalised in the form of end reports which will include policy recommendations.

4. Facilitating online information exchange and communication.

*Results:* The Global-Connections web portal contains several network-supporting functionalities which for example allow an electronic newsletter to be sent out to people registered with several processes. Online discussions were initiated in several processes but, as explained above, met with little response. The most highly appreciated function of the process websites is their function as an online library of relevant documents. The process websites (excluding the SNPT website which is hosted by MDF) had a total of 5,571 visitors in 2009, who together visited the websites 10,199 times, and viewed the individual web pages of the different websites a total of 41,611 times. A total of 4,950 visitors had visited the Global Connections web portal and DPRN website. They visited the websites 7,340 times and viewed the individual web pages of these websites a total of 28,100 times. The target of at least 100 users of the Global-Connections and DPRN websites per day was not met. Instead there were an average of 48 website visits per day in 2009.

5. Improving information on development expertise and their outputs.

*Results:* In 2009, ICT activities continued to focus on enhancing the interactivity of the Global-Connections web portal, on improving the harmonisation between the CMS and API (with the datastore), and on improving the user-friendliness of registration and search modules. As a result, active attempts to increase the number of experts in the database were suspended as a result of which the number of new records (51) was limited. A plan was designed and preparations made to launch a large-scale campaign to expand the number of records on Dutch and Flemish expertise in March 2010. Attempts to connect experts to their publications are to be discontinued in view of the lack of the expertise and manpower within DPRN, except for Connecting-Africa, for which the ASC is responsible. Another motive that played a role in this decision was that most people use Google Scholar rather than an expert database to search for publications. Instead of this, experts are to be stimulated to add a link to their personal webpage as a way to clarify what they have published. The repository for non-academic publications Search4Dev was filled with 1,204 documents from 20 organisations. It is hard to say whether this is 40% of all non-academic publications,



which was the target. More than 20% of Partos' member organisations now have their publications online via Search4Dev, and a lot more are interested in doing so.

#### 6. Contributing to related initiatives such as The Worldconnectors and The Broker.

*Results:* Various DPRN Task Force members actively participated in Worldconnectors meetings, which held four round table meetings in 2009. In addition, Prof. Dr Ton Dietz was a member of the Worldconnectors Steering Group and Mr Koen Kusters represented DPRN in the Worldconnectors support team and actively contributed to the Worldconnectors' statements. Dr Mirjam Ros acted as a member of the Editorial Committee of The Broker, which met twice.<sup>45</sup>

### III.3 Objectives

As stated in the Strategic Plan 2008–2010, DPRN is committed to stimulating informed debate and a discussion of issues related to the formulation and implementation of development policies, in particular those related to Dutch policies and aid organisations.

These objectives have been met. Cooperative arrangements between the various sectors started with the second call for proposals, which generated 17 proposals in the autumn of 2009.<sup>46</sup> Innovative themes, such as phosphorus depletion, have been put on the agenda and each of the processes provided an impulse for inter-sectoral cooperation which, in most of the cases, is intended to continue beyond the subsidy period (e.g. commercial land pressure and raising tax revenues). Several processes served as a catalyst for additional initiatives such as phosphorus depletion and the agrofuel debate. Again we can conclude, as we did last year, that the new DPRN formula appears to be effective in facilitating the channelling of research-based knowledge in the national debate on development. The expectation is that this will lead to a more effective alignment of development policy and research agendas and the joint formulation of recommendations for research, policy and practice based on the aggregated experience of the three sectors. The development of the Global-Connections.nl web portal helps enhance this role.

### III.4 Feasibility and sustainability

The facilitation and organisation of processes and the web portal is feasible, as proven by the activities realised to date. The DPRN coordination unit, which is monitored by the DPRN Task Force and hosted by the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research-Governance and Inclusive Development department (AISSR-GID) as part of CERES, is responsible for careful preparation and reporting and cooperates closely with ASC and KIT in the development of the Global Connections web portal. In the coming year, an external review in the first half of 2010 will provide a basis for preparations for new institutional arrangements to continue the DPRN formula after 2010.

---

<sup>45</sup> However, she was unable to attend due to a temporary stay abroad and then illness.

<sup>46</sup> Two of which have not been taken into consideration because they did not meet the basic requirements.



### III.5 Relevance

DPRN is fulfilling a need. This has been made obvious by the fact that 71 proposals for DPRN processes were submitted during the second phase (two calls in 2008 and one in fall 2009). The third call in December 2009 also generated considerable interest from Flanders. Thus far, almost 1,050 people have participated in one or more of the DPRN meetings during the second phase. The DPRN and Global-Connections websites also fulfil an important outreach function. Around 3,450 people visited the DPRN website in 2009. This is a slight increase compared to 2008 (around 3,000). In addition, more than 1,600 visitors visited the Global connections web portal and 5,571 the process websites web sites. Together they responsible for almost 70,000 page views on the several websites.

Increased information exchanges between researchers, policymakers, practitioners and other experts are expected to result in more coherence and synergy between research, policies and development practice. The potential benefits are considerable. Although the activities take place in the Netherlands, they may be beneficial to the regions and countries concerned through the participation of researchers and students from these countries (who are working or studying in the Netherlands) and invited speakers and participants from the South. In order to ensure that the DPRN processes are particularly relevant for policy, all processes are being monitored as regards the active involvement of specialists working at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

## IV ORGANISATION

### IV.1 Organisational characteristics

DPRN is a network of researchers, policymakers, practitioners and entrepreneurs which does not, as such, have a legal status. It is affiliated to (but not part of) the Netherlands Research School for Resource Studies for Development (CERES), which acts as a gateway to the scientific community and related research schools and organisations. AIISR, an institute within the University of Amsterdam and part of CERES, is responsible for coordinating the processes and the supportive websites at the Global Connections web portal. The ASC and KIT cooperate on the development of the Global-Connections.nl web portal and the promotion of electronic publishing and dissemination. Under the supervision and with the support of the DPRN coordination unit, several organisations look after the agenda, the logistics and the reporting of the selected processes (Appendix 2). A Task Force made up of various representatives from scientific, policy and development organisations monitors the administrative organisation and internal control of DPRN (see page 5 for the composition of DPRN Task Force). WOTRO Science for Development channels the DGIS funds for DPRN and monitors the implementation of the Strategic Plan and Plans of Operation.

### IV.2 Finances

WOTRO Science for Development awarded a grant of EUR 1,699,038 for the DPRN's second phase (2008–2010), of which EUR 582,263 was allocated as the budget for 2009 (January–December 2009). Of this amount, EUR 581,455 was actually spent. See Appendices 5–7 for further details.

### IV.3 Administration and monitoring

The Task Force is responsible for administrative organisation and internal control. AISSR/GID, a department in the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences of the University of Amsterdam and a member of the CERES Research School, monitors the performance of DPRN, with Dr Mirjam A.F. Ros-Tonen being responsible for the coordination and Ms Kim de Vries for programme assistance. Administrative support has been provided by the former AMIDSt secretariat (Ms Marianne Heelsbergen until June 2009, later replaced by a student assistant, Mr Tijmen de Groot). Mr Koen Kusters acted as DPRN representative in the Worldconnectors Support Team. Mr Joska Landré worked as a student-assistant providing ICT support and was temporarily assisted by Mr Merijn de Bakker.

Amsterdam, 1 March 2010,

Dr Jan Donner  
Chair DPRN Task Force

## Appendix 1 – DPRN target groups

- The various departments of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in The Hague;
- Dutch embassies and consulates abroad, with a varying capacity for development assistance and explicit ‘development orientation’ in 41 partner countries;
- Offices dealing with International affairs in other Ministries;
- Some support activities for international relations of the Dutch parliament and political parties;
- SNV and its offices abroad;
- International education institutions in the Netherlands (including their alumni);
- Six major co-financing agencies, their central offices and offices or contacts abroad;
- Many smaller non-governmental organisations with major or partial activities in developing countries, in particular the 58 MFS organisations and 50 organisations with continuing TMF funding. In addition to development organisations in the narrow sense, these include environmental groups, human rights groups, fair trade groups, international labour solidarity groups, religious support groups, cultural exchange groups, etc. Most of them are organised in Partos (93members) and PSO (46 organisations);
- Organisations subsidised by the NCDO;
- Consultancy companies fully or partly devoted to implementation and advice concerning ‘development’ and their network organisations (MDF, ETC International, BMB Mott MacDonald (formerly Arcadis), etc.);
- ‘Think-tank’ departments of central offices of companies that (partly) work beyond the EU: banks, insurance companies, production companies, trading companies;
- Organisations of development practitioners (e.g. Partos, Nedworc);
- Foreign embassies based in the Netherlands and/or in Brussels;
- Migrant/Diaspora organisations based in the Netherlands;
- Research and graduate schools and their members, including training and teaching groups in Dutch universities and Higher Education and individual research, teaching and ‘think-tank’ institutions;
- NUFFIC and WOTRO/NWO;
- Study groups [‘Werkgemeenschappen’] of scientists, wherever they still exist, which have a regional orientation (e.g. for Africa and Latin America);
- Advisory bodies in between science and policy, like the WRR (Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid / Scientific Council for Government Policy);
- SANPAD and their South African researchers;
- Science Journalists of specialised and popular journals (e.g. The Broker, Internationale Samenwerking, Vice Versa, Onze Wereld, Internationale Spectator) and newspapers;
- Vereniging van Nederlandse Ondernemers (VNO–CNW);
- MVO Nederland.

## Appendix 2 – Overview of facilitated processes and implementing organisations

*Started in 2009, following the second call for proposals:*

### **1. Commercial pressures on land: rethinking policies and practice for development**

A one-year process aimed at providing an evidence base for influencing global, regional, and national policy processes on rural land. The ultimate aim is to enable secure and equitable access to land for the vulnerable poor who face increased commercial demand for their land. The process includes the setting up of online interest groups, the review of relevant literature and key policy documents, the preparation of papers and presentations, the organisation of a one-day workshop, and the facilitation of post-workshop discussions. The process is designed to lay the basis for a pilot initiative that promotes community-private-sector partnerships in at least one developing country.

*Organising agencies:*

Centre for Development Studies, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen (coordination)

Prof. Dr P. (Peter) Ho and Dr H. (Hossein) Azadi

P.O. Box 800

9700 AV Groningen

The Netherlands

E-mail: p.p.s.ho@eco.rug.nl; h.azadi@rug.nl

Telephone: +31 (0)50 – 3637224

International Land Coalition

Mr M. (Michael) Taylor

Secretariat at IFAD

Via del Serafico 107

00142 Rome

Italy

E-mail: m.taylor@landcoalition.org

Telephone: +39 (06) 54 592206

Oxfam Novib

Ms G. (Gine) Zwart

P. O. Box 30919

2500 GX The Hague

The Netherlands

E-mail: gine.zwart@oxfamnovib.nl

Telephone: +31 (70) 3421905

### **2. Phosphorus depletion: the invisible crisis**

A one-year process aimed at increasing global awareness of the depletion of phosphorus, an irreplaceable and indispensable nutrient for plant growth. This issue is being dealt with by an umbrella platform of various actors from different sectors, namely the 'Nutrient Flow Task Group'. The Group investigates possible mitigation options to avoid major socioeconomic

distortions resulting from food insecurity. The process includes the preparation of an urgency paper, four case studies, a stakeholder analysis, an online communication platform, the presentation of a policy memorandum, a seminar at European level, and preparations for a documentary.

*Organising agencies:*

Netherlands Water Partnership (NWP) (coordination)

Mr Drs G. (Ger) Pannekoek  
Westvest 7  
2611 AX Delft  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: g.pannekoek@nwp.nl  
Telephone: +31 (15) 2151728

Plant Research International (Wageningen-UR)

Mr Dr ir. A. L. (Bert) Smit  
Bornsesteeg 65  
6708 PD Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: bert.smit@wur.nl  
Telephone: +31 (0)317 - 480524

WASTE

Mr Drs. G. (Gert) de Bruijne  
Nieuwe Haven 201  
2801 CW Gouda  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: gdebruijne@waste.nl  
Telephone: +31 (0)182 - 522625

**3. 'Singing a new policy tune'**

A one-year process aimed at improving the quality of policymaking in international DC in the Netherlands and thereby revitalising the ways in which policy theories are formulated. The ways in which policy theories are formulated can thereby be revitalised. The process includes the organisation of a series of debates, an assessment of previous policy-formulation initiatives, a web-based discussion forum, and the writing of position papers.

*Organising agencies:*

MDF Training & Consultancy (coordination)

Mr H. (Hans) Rijnveld  
Bosrand 28  
6710 BK Ede  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: hr@mdf.nl  
Telephone: +31 (0)318 - 650060

Institute of Social Studies (ISS)

Mr A. (Arjan) de Haan  
Kortenaerkade 12  
2518 AX The Hague  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: hout@iss.nl  
Telephone: +31 (0)70 4260460

Vice Versa

Mr M. (Marc) Broere  
Postbus 94218  
1090 GE Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: redactie@viceversaonline.nl  
Telephone: +31 (0)20 - 5688790

**4. Supporting developing countries' ability to raise tax revenues**

A one-year process aimed at enhancing the exchange of information and cooperation among relevant actors whose aim is to support developing countries' ability to raise tax revenues and to formulate recommendations on how to address any hindrances. This includes overviews of policies, research and interventions, position paper writing, the setting up of a web portal and the organisation of a seminar and activities aimed at embedding the outcomes in existing initiatives and networks.

*Organising agencies:*

SOMO (coordination)

Ms M. (Maaïke) Kokke  
Sarphatistraat 30  
1018 GL Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: m.kokke@somo.nl  
Telephone: +31 (0)20 - 6391291

Tax Justice NL

Mr A. (Albert) Hollander (Triodos Facet)  
P.O.Box 19170  
3501 DD Utrecht  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: albert.hollander@triodos.nl  
Telephone: +31 (0)30 236 15 00

Oxfam Novib

Ms Drs. T. (Ted) van Hees  
P.O. Box 30919  
2500 GX The Hague  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: ted.van.hees@oxfamnovib.nl

Telephone: +31 (0)70 - 3421621

CIDIN/ Radboud University Nijmegen

Mr Prof. Dr R. (Ruerd) Ruben

P.O. Box 9104

6500 HE Nijmegen

The Netherlands

E-mail: r.ruben@maw.ru.nl

Telephone: +31 (0)24 - 3615800

Oikos

Ms Drs. H.J. (Ineke) Bakker

P.O. Box 19170

3501 DD Utrecht

The Netherlands

E-mail: i.bakker@stichtingoikos.nl

Telephone: +31 (0)30 - 2361500

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Effectiveness and Quality Department

Mr Drs. M. (Mirco) Goudriaan

Postbus 20061

2500 EB The Hague

The Netherlands

E-mail: mirco.goudriaan@minbuza.nl

Telephone: +31 (0)70 - 3485453

**5. Fuelling knowledge on the social and ecological impacts of agrofuel production**

A one-year process aimed at generating intersectoral debate and interdisciplinary analysis of the social and ecological effects of agrofuel production and expansion, with a view to enabling informed decision-making designed to minimise the negative effects. This includes drawing up an inventory and synthesis of research on the social and environmental effects of agrofuel production, taking stock of background data on policies, investment decisions, market trends, shifting land use patterns, food prices and food distribution, organising a multi-stakeholder meeting, translating knowledge into policy relevant and hands-on information and tools and the development of a close-knit national forum on agrofuels.

*Organising agencies:*

Both ENDS Foundation (coordination)

Ms K. (Karen) Witsenburg

Nieuwe Keizersgracht 45

1018 VC Amsterdam

The Netherlands

E-mail: kw@bothends.org

Telephone: +31 (0)20 - 5306600

IUCN National Committee of The Netherlands

Ms H. (Heleen) van den Hombergh



Plantage Middenlaan 2K  
1018 DD Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: heleen.vandenhomergh@iucn.nl  
Telephone: +31 (0)20 - 6261732

AISSR/GID, University of Amsterdam

Mr Prof. Dr A.J. (Ton) Dietz  
Nieuwe Prinsengracht 130  
1018 VZ Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: a.j.dietz@uva.nl  
Telephone: +31 (0)20 - 5254147

Alterra, WUR

Mr Prof. Dr C. (Coen) Ritsema  
Droevendaalsesteeg 3  
6708 PB Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: coen.ritsema@wur.nl  
Telephone: +31 (0)317 - 486517

ETC International

Mr F. (Frans) Verberne  
Kastanjelaan 5  
3833 AN Leusden  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: f.verberne@etcnl.nl  
Telephone: +31 (0)33 - 4326000

Cordaid

Ms D. (Dicky) de Morrée  
Lutherse Burgwal 10  
2512 CB The Hague  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: dicky.de.morree@cordaid.nl  
Telephone: +31 (0)70 - 3126463

Mekon Ecology

Mr. P. (Peter) de Koning  
Zeemanlaan 18  
2313 SZ Leiden  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: pdk@mekonecology.net  
Telephone: +31 (0)6 - 21802768

CML-University of Leiden

Ms D. (Denyse) Snelder

P.O. Box 9518  
2300 RA Leiden  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: [snelder@cml.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:snelder@cml.leidenuniv.nl)  
Telephone: +31 (0)71 – 5277457

Law and Governance Group, Wageningen University

Mr. Prof. Dr O. (Otto) Hospes  
Hollandseweg 1  
6706 KN Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: [otto.hospes@wur.nl](mailto:otto.hospes@wur.nl)  
Telephone: +31 (0)37 – 483399

*Initiated in 2008, following the first call for proposals, still ongoing:*

**6. Value chain governance and endogenous growth: how can NGOs, firms and government achieve social inclusion and poverty reduction?**

A two-year process that aims to improve the development and poverty reduction outcome of policy measures and development interventions in value chain governance. The process includes an academic and position paper write shop, the setting up of a digital library, a policy review of the intervention theories used by firms, NGOs and governments, and the translation of these into intervention strategies through online discussion and an agenda-setting conference.

*Organising agencies:*

Institute of Social Studies (ISS) (coordination)

Prof. Dr A.H.J (Bert) Helmsing  
P.O. Box 29776  
2502 LT The Hague  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: [hemsing@iss.nl](mailto:hemsing@iss.nl)  
Telephone: +31 (0)70 – 4260460

Wageningen University and Research Center (WUR)

Dr S.R. (Sietze) Vellema  
Hollandseweg 1  
6706 KN Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: [Sietze.vellema@wur.nl](mailto:Sietze.vellema@wur.nl)  
Telephone: +31 (0)317 – 484754

Woord en Daad

Mr J. (Jan) Lock  
P.O. Box 560  
4200 AN Gorinchem  
The Netherlands

E-mail: [wd@woordendaad.nl](mailto:wd@woordendaad.nl)  
Telephone: +31 (0)183 - 611800

Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality (LNV) / Directorate Industry & Commerce

Dr R.A. (Roeland) Bosch  
P.O. Box 20401  
2500 EK The Hague  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: [r.a.bosch@minlnv.nl](mailto:r.a.bosch@minlnv.nl)  
Telephone: +31 (0)70 - 3785244

Hivos

Dr A.P. (Allert) van der Ham  
P.O. Box 85565  
2508 CG The Hague  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: [a.vd.ham@hivos.nl](mailto:a.vd.ham@hivos.nl)  
Telephone: +31 (0)70 - 3765500

ICCO-Kerk in Actie

MS W. (Willemijn) Lammers  
P.O. Box 8190  
3503 RD Utrecht  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: [Willemijn.Lammers@ICCOenKerkinActie.nl](mailto:Willemijn.Lammers@ICCOenKerkinActie.nl)  
Telephone: +31 (0)30 - 6927811

Concept Fruit BV

Mr D. (Dave) Boselie  
P.O. Box 94494  
1090 GL Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: [Dave.boselie@agrofair.nl](mailto:Dave.boselie@agrofair.nl)  
Telephone: +31 (0)70 - 7110205

***7. Gender mainstreaming trajectory***

A three-year process on gender mainstreaming that aims to improve policy and practice that is oriented around gender equality. The process includes two thematic meetings based on five electronically discussed position papers, field exchanges with leading gender research institutes and NGO partners in the South, and gender mainstreaming institutional assessment and the use of gender programming and policy laboratory tools.

*Implementing agencies:*

CIDIN / Radboud University Nijmegen (coordination)

Ms Dr A.H.J.M. (Anouka) van Eerdewijk  
P.O. Box 9104  
6500 HE Nijmegen

The Netherlands  
E-mail: a.vaneerdewijk@maw.ru.nl  
Telephone: +31 (0)24-3612750

Ministry of Foreign Affairs /  
Department of Social and Institutional Development /Emancipation (DSI/ER)  
Mr R. (Robert) Dijksterhuis  
P.O. Box 20061  
2500 EB The Hague  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: rg.dijksterhuis@minbuza.nl  
Telephone: +31 (0)70-3485723

Hivos  
Mr Dr A.P. (Allert) van der Ham  
P.O. Box 85565  
2508 CG The Hague  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: a.vd.ham@hivos.nl  
Telephone: +31 (0)70 - 3765500

Oxfam-Novib  
Ms K. (Karimi) Farah  
Mauritskade 9  
P.O. Box 30919  
2500 GX The Hague  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: Farah.Karimi@oxfamnovib.nl  
Telephone: +31 (0)70 - 3421621

*Initiated in 2008, following the first call for proposals, completed:*

### **8. Learning to understand development better**

A one-year process aimed at increasing aid effectiveness through enhancing a solid understanding of the complexity of development processes among civil society organisations and other actors involved in DC . This included the setting up of a Community of Practice (CoP), position paper writing, summaries of policies, relevant books and research findings to be posted on the CoP web portal, a three-day seminar and an internet-based discussion platform.

*Organising agencies:*

MDF Training & Consultancy (coordination)  
Mr H. (Hans) Rijneveld  
P.O. Box 430  
6710 BK Ede  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: [hr@mdf.nl](mailto:hr@mdf.nl)

Telephone: +31 (0)318 – 650060

Institute of Social Studies (ISS)

Dr W. (Wil) Hout

P.O. Box 29776

2502 LT The Hague

The Netherlands

E-mail: hout@iss.nl

Telephone: +31 (0)70 – 4260460

Vice Versa

Ms E. (Evelijne) Bruning

Velperbuitensingel 8

6821 CT Arnhem

The Netherlands

E-mail: redactie@viceversaonline.nl

Telephone: +31 (0)26 – 370 3177

**9. Stimulating business development: another side of microfinance?**

A one-year process including three seminars and ongoing online discussions aimed at investigating the link between microfinance and business development. More specifically the discussions are to focus on the role of microfinance institutions (MFIs) in providing non-financial services to their clients (small entrepreneurs).

*Organising agencies:*

Triodos Facet (coordination)

Mr A. (Alberic) Pater

P.O. Box 55

3700 AB Zeist

The Netherlands

E-mail: a.pater@triodosfacet.nl

Telephone: +31 (0)30 – 6933766

Hogeschool INHolland

Mr K. (Klaas) Molenaar

P.O. Box 558

2003 RN Haarlem

The Netherlands

E-mail: k.molenaar@triodosfacet.nl

Telephone: +31 (0)23 – 541 24 12

**10. Risks and benefits for sustainability and livelihoods of genetically modified soy in Latin America.**

A one-year process aimed at a constructive, informed and science-based debate of the benefits and risks of genetically modified soy in Latin America. The process includes

research with stakeholder involvement (through a steering committee and a conference), scientific and popular reports, and an interactive website with relevant scientific material.

*Organising agencies:*

AidEnvironment (organising agent for Solidaridad)

Mr S. (Sven) Sielhorst  
Donker Curtiusstraat 7-523  
1051 JL Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: sven.sielhorst@solidaridad.nl (as from 1 January 2009)  
Telephone: +31 (0)20 – 5818250

Solidaridad

Mr J.M. (Jan Maarten) Dros  
't Goylaan 15  
3525 AA Utrecht  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: JanMaarten.Dros@solidaridad.nl  
Telephone: +31 (0)30 – 2720313

Plant Research International WUR

Dr P.S. (Prem) Bindraban,  
P.O. Box 16  
6700 AA Wageningen  
The Netherlands  
E-mail: prem.bindraban@wur.nl  
Telephone: +31 (0)317 – 480881

## Appendix 3 – Agenda of DPRN meetings in 2009

<u>Date</u>	<u>Event</u>	<u>Venue</u>	<u>Organisers</u>
12 February	Microfinance seminar 2: What can we learn from the South?	Triodos Bank, Zeist	Triodos Facet, INHolland University of Applied Sciences
19 May	Microfinance seminar 3: the future of microfinance and BDS	Hogeschool INHolland, The Hague	Triodos Facet, INHolland University of Applied Sciences
March–May	8 working groups for the SFS process	Various	DPRN
28 May	Expert meeting on ‘Gender mainstreaming trajectory’	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	CIDIN, HIVOS, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Oxfam Novib
29 May	Seminar on ‘Gender mainstreaming trajectory’	Institute of Social Studies (ISS), The Hague	CIDIN, HIVOS, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Oxfam Novib
15 June	The future organisation of Dutch development and international cooperation	Koninklijk Instituut voor de Tropen (KIT), Amsterdam	DPRN
2–3 July	CERES Summer School (with various workshops organised by DPRN processes)	Radboud University, Nijmegen	CIDIN
8 July	Expert meeting on ‘Commercial pressures on land’	Universiteit van Utrecht (UU), Utrecht	Centre for Development Studies (CDS), Oxfam Novib, International Land Coalition (ILC), Ministry of Foreign Affairs
10 September	Expert meeting on ‘Singing a new policy tune’	Hotel de Bosrand, Ede	MDF, Vice Versa, ISS, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
24–25 September	Research writeshop on ‘Value chain governance’	Institute of Social Studies (ISS), The Hague	ISS, Wageningen University & Research, Woord & Daad, Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality, HIVOS, ICCO, Concept Fruit
1–2 October	Two–day conference on ‘Singing a new policy tune’	Hotel de Bosrand, Ede	MDF, Vice Versa, ISS, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
7 October	Mini–seminar on ‘Phosphorus depletion: the invisible crisis’	Nieuwspoort, The Hague	Netherlands Water Partnership (NWP), WASTE, Plant Research International – WUR
2 December	Seminar on ‘Raising tax revenues’	Het Mozeshuis, Amsterdam	Tax Justice NL, SOMO, CIDIN



Appendix 4 – Participants in the DPRN meetings and their distribution over the various professional categories (2008–2009)<sup>47</sup>

Meeting	Scientists / researchers		Policymakers		Practitioners		Private sector		Other/ Unknown		Total
	Abs.	%	Abs.	%	Abs.	%	Abs.	%	Abs.	%	Abs.
Conference Understanding development better (27–29 August 2008)	38	40%	10	10%	38	40%	5	5%	5	5%	96
Microfinance seminar 1: MFIs and BDS in developing countries (5 November 2008)	14	23%	3	5%	29	47%	15	24%	1	2%	62
Dinner Meeting Value Chain Governance and endogenous growth (25 November 2008)	23	47%	6	12%	12	24%	8	16%	0	0%	49
Stakeholder conference on GM Soy and Sustainability (9 December 2008)	17	23%	5	7%	37	49%	15	20%	1	1%	75
Microfinance seminar 2: What can we learn from the south? (12 February 2009)	11	22%	4	8%	14	29%	17	35%	3	6%	49
8 working groups for the Structure Follows Strategy process	14	24%	11	19%	14	24%	18	31%	2	3%	59
Microfinance seminar 3: the future of microfinance and BDS (19 May 2009)	14	23%	4	7%	20	33%	21	35%	1	2%	60
<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Scientists /</b>		<b>Policymakers</b>		<b>Practitioners</b>		<b>Private sector</b>		<b>Other/</b>		<b>Total</b>

<sup>47</sup> The number of participants in the 2008 meetings may differ slightly from those reported last year since corrections were made after a more rigorous check by Kim de Vries while she was writing her thesis entitled ‘Bridging knowledge divides. Strengthening research–policy linkages in the Development Policy Review Network’.

	researchers								Unknown		
Expert meeting 'gender mainstreaming trajectory' (28 May 2009)	20	43%	4	9%	18	38%	5	11%	0	0%	47
Seminar on 'Gender mainstreaming trajectory' (29 May 2009)	41	41%	4	4%	35	35%	6	6%	13	13	99
The future organisation of Dutch development and international cooperation (15 June 2009)	22	20%	31	28%	40	36%	15	13%	4	4%	112
Ceres Summer School Workshop agrofuels <sup>48</sup> (2-3 July 2009)	24	75%	0	0%	4	13%	2	6%	2	6%	32
Expert meeting on 'Commercial pressures on land' (8 July 2009)	36	35%	22	21%	37	36%	5	5%	3	3%	103
Expert meeting on 'Singing a new policy tune' (10 September 2009)	7	21%	13	39%	7	21%	4	12%	2	6%	33
Research writeshop on 'Value chain governance' (24-25 September 2009)	35	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	35
Two-day conference on 'Singing a new policy tune' (1-2 October 2009)	13	24%	15	27%	13	24%	12	22%	2	4%	55
Mini-seminar on 'Phosphorus depletion: the invisible crisis' (7 October 2009)	15	36%	7	17%	5	12%	13	31%	2	5%	42
Seminar on 'Raising tax revenues' (2 December 2009)	16	41%	10	26%	11	28%	2	5%	0	0%	39
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>1,047</b>

<sup>48</sup> Statistics are available for this workshop only. Workshops were also organised at the CERES Summer School for the Value Chain Governance, Microfinance & Business Development Services, and Gender Mainstreaming processes.

## Appendix 5- Expenditure in the period 1 January 2009 – 31 December 2009

	Budget 2009 [1]	Expenditure 2009	Reason for deviation
<b>A. Overall coordination costs</b>			
<b>1. Personnel</b>			
a. Overall coordination (672 hrs/yr, scale 12)	€ 54.850	€ 49.651	Acquired a permanent position which results in a lower fee
b. Coord. 'Worldconnectors' initiative (336 hrs/yr, scale 10-11)	€ 22.875	€ 15.751	When appointed the coordinator of the Worldconnectors initiative had not yet his PhD, hence a lower salary scale
c. ICT and e-groups support (1008 hrs/yr, scale 9)	€ 53.073	€ 47.883	A student-assistant was employed, hence a lower fee than budgeted
d. Occasional student assistance (max 215 hrs, scale 9)	€ 8.400	€ 0	Campaign for database update and extension planned for 2010; no such activities in 2009
e. Administrative support (336 hrs/ scale 9)	€ 19.965	€ 11.398	Shift from permanent staff to a student-assistant which results in lower fee
<b>2. Other coordination costs</b>			
a. Travelling costs coordinators & Task Force members	€ 1.000	€ 641	Less invoices submitted than expected
b. Meeting costs Task Force (rental meeting room, coffee)	€ 1.300	€ 2.141	Budgeted on the basis of availability of the Pax Christi meeting room, which is cheaper than Hoog Brabant but no longer available
c. Accountant costs	€ 0	€ 0	
d. Evaluation costs	€ 0	€ 0	
<b>SUBTOTAL OVERALL COORDINATION COSTS (A)</b>	<b>€ 161.463</b>	<b>€ 127.465</b>	
<b>B. Organisation costs of DPRN meetings and processes</b>			
<b>1. Organisation of follow-up process on the future of Dutch DC/IC</b>			
a. Personal costs	€ 42.733	€ 51.040	Partly engaged as programme assistant to support overall coordination, hence partly financed from the underexpenditure on overall coordination

	<b>Budget 2009</b>	<b>Expenditure 2009</b>	
b. Material costs	€ 7.667	€ 16.329	A lot more meetings were held than envisaged as a result of organising four parallel working groups, hence there were more costs to rent meeting rooms
<b>2. Continued support to ongoing processes [3]</b>			
a. Understanding development better	€ 0	€ 4.000	Budgeted in 2008; rest payment after all obligations were met.
b. Microfinance and business development services	€ 0	€ 3.679	Budgeted in 2008; rest payment after all obligations were met.
c. GM soy debate	€ 0	€ 4.934	Budgeted in 2008; rest payment after all obligations were met.
d. Value chain governance	€ 50.400	€ 90.000	Difference is paid from the 2008 budget
e. Gender mainstreaming trajectory	€ 50.400	[4]	The payment for 2009 was made early in 2010
<b>3. Support to new processes [3]</b>			
	[5]	€ 44.514	In order to stimulate organisations to respond to the call for proposals it was decided to finance 5 external processes in 2009, anticipating the budget for 2010 (the budget for two processes was already spent on multi-annual processes). This also enabled a more even spread of events during the last two years of Phase II, with the possibility to also award 5 processes in 2010.
a. Tax revenues			
b. Phosphorus depletion	€ 50.400	€ 43.200	The applying organisation applied for a lower budget than the maximum and 10% will be paid when all obligations are met.
c. Agrofuels	€ 50.400	€ 45.000	10% of the subsidy will be paid when all obligations will me met.
d. Commercial pressure on land	€ 50.400	€ 45.000	10% of the subsidy will be paid when all obligations will me met.
e. Singing a new policy tune	€ 50.400	€ 44.055	10% of the subsidy will be paid when all obligations will me met.
<b>SUBTOTAL ORGANISATION COSTS OF DPRN MEETINGS AND PROCESSES (B)</b>	<b>€ 352.800</b>	<b>€ 391.751</b>	
<b>C. Internet and dissemination of information</b>			
1. Global Connections web portal maintenance	€ 30.000	€ 14.298	The decision to shift to a CMS and not to invest in the library function of the database but rather focus on bringing together experts, resulted in

			lower costs for web portal maintenance.
2. Maintenance of the DPRN website (material costs)	€ 500	€ 774	
3. Rental domain names	€ 0	€ 30	
4. Partnership in d-groups	€ 0	€ 0	
5. Maintenance of a repository for non-academic publications (activity 3)	€ 22.500	€ 40.500	The subsidy for 2009 and 2010 was paid in one instalment.
6. Dissemination of information (printed matter)	€ 10.000	€ 3.028	More electronic dissemination of information rather than in the form of hard copies.
7. Incidental external services (ICT advice, language correction)	€ 5.000	€ 3.610	Less language revision and ICT advise needed.
<b><i>SUBTOTAL INTERNET AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION (C)</i></b>	<b>€ 68.000</b>	<b>€ 62.240</b>	
<b>TOTAL A –C</b>	<b>€ 582.263</b>	<b>€ 581.455</b>	
<b>Over/underspending</b>		<b>€ 34.198</b>	
<b>TOTAL GENERAL</b>		<b>€ 615.653</b>	
<b>Received NWO/WOTRO subsidy in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>€ 615.653</b>	
<b>Balance</b>		<b>€ 0</b>	

[1] In accordance with budget in "Optoppingsaanvraag".

## Appendix 6 – Expenditure in entire period 1 January 2008 – 31 December 2009

	Budget 2008 [1] [2]	Expenditure 2008	Budget 2009 [1]	Expenditure 2009	Balance 2008-2009
<b>A. Overall coordination costs</b>					
<b>1. Personnel</b>					
a. Overall coordination (672 hrs/yr, scale 12)	€ 52.600	€ 42.230	€ 54.850	€ 49.651	€ 15.569
b. Coord. 'Worldconnectors' initiative (336 hrs/yr, scale 10-11)	€ 22.105	€ 13.702	€ 22.875	€ 15.751	€ 15.527
c. ICT and d-groups support (1008 hrs/yr, scale 9)	€ 50.144	€ 21.204	€ 53.073	€ 47.883	€ 34.130
d. Occasional student assistance (max 215 hrs, scale 9)	€ 8.200	€ 0	€ 8.400	€ 0	€ 16.600
e. Administrative support (336 hrs/ scale 9)	€ 18.835	€ 9.453	€ 19.965	€ 11.398	€ 17.949
<b>2. Other coordination costs</b>					
a. Travelling costs coordinators & Task Force members	€ 1.000	€ 301	€ 1.000	€ 641	€ 1.058
b. Meeting costs Task Force (rental meeting room, coffee)	€ 1.300	€ 2.398	€ 1.300	€ 2.141	-€ 1.939
c. Accountant costs	€ 0	€ 0	€ 0	€ 0	€ 0
d. Evaluation costs	€ 0	€ 0	€ 0	€ 0	€ 0
<b>SUBTOTAL OVERALL COORDINATION COSTS (A)</b>	<b>€ 154.184</b>	<b>€ 89.288</b>	<b>€ 161.463</b>	<b>€ 127.465</b>	<b>€ 98.894</b>
<b>B. Organisation costs of DPRN meetings and processes</b>					
<b>1. Organisation of follow-up process on the future of Dutch DC/IC</b>					
a. Personal costs	€ 41.597	€ 14.506	€ 42.733	€ 51.040	€ 18.784
b. Material costs	€ 7.803	€ 580	€ 7.667	€ 16.329	-€ 1.709

	Budget per individ. process	Budget 2008	Expenditure 2008	Budget 2009	Expenditure 2009	Balance 2008-2009	Balance per individ. process
<b>2. Continued support to ongoing processes [3]</b>							
a. Understanding development better	€ 48.270	€ 49.400	€ 36.000	€ 0	€ 4.000	€ 9.400	€ 8.270
b. Microfinance and business development services	€ 49.100	€ 49.400	€ 44.190	€ 0	€ 3.679	€ 1.531	€ 1.231
c. GM soy debate	€ 49.341	€ 49.400	€ 44.407	€ 0	€ 4.934	€ 59	€ 0
d. Value chain governance	€ 100.000	€ 49.400	€ 0	€ 50.400	€ 90.000	€ 9.800	€ 10.000
e. Gender mainstreaming trajectory	€ 137.000	€ 49.400	€ 46.500	€ 50.400 [4]		€ 53.300	€ 90.500
<b>3. Support to new processes [3]</b>							
a. Tax revenues	€ 49.460	€ 0	€ 0 [5]		€ 44.514	-€ 44.514	€ 4.946
b. Phosphorus depletion	€ 48.000	€ 0	€ 0	€ 50.400	€ 43.200	€ 7.200	€ 4.800
c. Agrofuels	€ 50.000	€ 0	€ 0	€ 50.400	€ 45.000	€ 5.400	€ 5.000
d. Commercial pressure on land	€ 50.000	€ 0	€ 0	€ 50.400	€ 45.000	€ 5.400	€ 5.000
e. Singing a new policy tune	€ 48.950	€ 0	€ 0	€ 50.400	€ 44.055	€ 6.345	€ 4.895
<b>SUBTOTAL ORGANISATION COSTS OF DPRN MEETINGS AND PROCESSES (B)</b>		<b>€ 296.400</b>	<b>€ 186.183</b>	<b>€ 352.800</b>	<b>€ 391.751</b>	<b>€ 70.996</b>	
<b>C. Internet and dissemination of information</b>							
1. Global Connections web portal maintenance		€ 30.000	€ 21.472	€ 30.000	€ 14.298	€ 24.230	
2. Maintenance of the DPRN website (material costs)		€ 500	€ 0	€ 500	€ 774	€ 226	
3. Rental domain names		€ 1.000	€ 3	€ 0	€ 30	€ 967	



4. Partnership in d-groups	€ 18.500	€ 0	€ 0	€ 0	€ 18.500
5. Maintenance of a repository for non-academic publications (activity 3)	€ 42.500	€ 38.250	€ 22.500	€ 40.500	-€ 13.750
6. Dissemination of information (printed matter)	€ 10.000	€ 1.579	€ 10.000	€ 3.028	€ 15.393
7. Incidental external services (ICT advice, language correction)	€ 5.000	€ 0	€ 5.000	€ 3.610	€ 6.390
<b><i>SUBTOTAL INTERNET AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION (C)</i></b>	<b>€ 107.500</b>	<b>€ 61.304</b>	<b>€ 68.000</b>	<b>€ 62.240</b>	<b>€ 51.956</b>
<b>TOTAL A –C</b>	<b>€ 558.084</b>	<b>€ 336.775</b>	<b>€ 582.263</b>	<b>€ 581.455</b>	<b>€ 222.117</b>
<b>Over/underspending</b>		<b>-€ 36.775</b>		<b>€ 34.198</b>	
<b>TOTAL GENERAL</b>		<b>€ 300.000</b>		<b>€ 615.653</b>	
<b>Received NWO/WOTRO subsidy in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>€ 300.000</b>		<b>€ 615.653</b>	
<b>Balance</b>		<b>€ 0</b>		<b>€ 0</b>	

[1] In accordance with budget in "Optoppingsaanvraag".

[2] Figures for 2008 differ from the 2008 progress report due to corrections made in UvA's financial books after reporting.

[3] This table only mentions the total payments made per process in each calendar year. Appendix 6 specifies the allocation of the total forwarded subsidies to specific budget items. The different items in the DPRN budget that is included in DPRN's Strategic Plan 2008-2010 are averages that serve as a guideline. Process organisers are allowed to adapt these to their specific processes in a budgetary neutral manner. Since payments are made as a lump sum, it is impossible to allocate personnel and material costs per process to specific years and this can only be done for the subsidy period as a whole (which do not fall within one calendar year).

[4] Payment booked early in 2010.

[5] One process was advanced from the budget for 2010

## Appendix 7 – Breakdown of expenditure per external process (2008–2009)

	Budget 2008	UDB	MF & BDS	GM soy	Value chain gov. av/yr (2.5 yr)	Gender mainstr. av/yr (3 yrs)	Budget 2009	Raising tax rev.	Phosphor depletion	Agro- fuels	Comm. land pressure	New policy tune
	1 yr	1 yr	1 yr	1 yr				1 yr	1 yr	1 yr	1 yr	1 yr
1. Convenor costs	€ 10.080	€ 13.430	€ 1.600	€ 5.100	€ 16.206	€ 3.000	€ 10.200	€ 7.160	€ 15.342	€ 16.250	€ 15.000	€ 25.500
2. Organisational assist.	€ 9.417	€ 7.916	€ 14.400	€ 23.854	€ 600	Incl. in 1	€ 9.983	€ 5.100	€ 1.743		€ 6.000	€ 8.000
3. Moderator e-group	€ 12.000	€ 8.874	€ 7.200	€ 8.383	€ 4.312	€ 2.333	€ 12.250	€ 3.820		€ 8.775	€ 6.000	€ 15.000
4. Making overviews etc.	€ 9.600	€ 4.379	€ 6.000	€ 9.246	€ 10.930	€ 18.333	€ 9.800	€ 31.780	€ 35.725	€ 17.550		
5. Meeting moderator	€ 500	€ 24.895	€ 1.583	€ 1.000		€ 1.833	€ 500	€ 750		€ 650		€ 36.000
<i>Subtotal personnel costs</i>	<i>€ 41.597</i>	<i>€ 59.494</i>	<i>€ 30.783</i>	<i>€ 47.583</i>	<i>€ 32.047</i>	<i>€ 25.500</i>	<i>€ 42.733</i>	<i>€ 48.610</i>	<i>€ 52.811</i>	<i>€ 43.225</i>	<i>€ 27.000</i>	<i>€ 84.500</i>
6. Meeting venue	€ 1.000	€ 16.570	€ 2.025	€ 1.250	€ 896	€ 5.000	€ 1.000	€ 1.300	€ 400	€ 800	€ 2.000	€ 28.950
7. Trav. & accom. costs Speakers	€ 2.500	€ 0	€ 4.688	€ 9.187		€ 13.333	€ 2.500	€ 2.500	€ 6.008	€ 6.000	€ 14.000	
8. Speaker fees and attentions	€ 1.000	€ 22.744	€ 1.976,25	€ 180	€ 2.200		€ 1.000	€ 2.050			€ 2.000	€ 12.000
9. Printed matter etc.	€ 500	€ 2.162	€ 1.177	€ 4.096	€ 1.410	€ 1.833	€ 500	€ 200	€ 166	€ 950	€ 2.000	€ 4.000
10. Catering	€ 2.500	Incl. in 6	€ 6.892	€ 1.500	€ 3.112	Incl. in 6.	€ 2.500	€ 300		€ 300	€ 1.000	
11. Other costs	€ 303	€ 969	€ 329		€ 335		€ 167	€ 1.500		€ 5.525	€ 2.000	€ 10.000
<i>Subtotal material costs</i>	<i>€ 7.803</i>	<i>€ 42.445</i>	<i>€ 17.086</i>	<i>€ 16.213</i>	<i>€ 7.953</i>	<i>€ 20.166</i>	<i>€ 7.667</i>	<i>€ 7.850</i>	<i>€ 6.574</i>	<i>€ 13.575</i>	<i>€ 23.000</i>	<i>€ 54.950</i>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>€ 49.400</b>	<b>€ 101.939</b>	<b>€ 47.869</b>	<b>€ 63.796</b>	<b>€ 40.000</b>	<b>€ 45.667</b>	<b>€ 50.400</b>	<b>€ 56.460</b>	<b>€ 59.384,44</b>	<b>€ 56.800</b>	<b>€ 50.000</b>	<b>€ 139.450</b>
<b>DPRN</b>		<b>€ 48.270</b>	<b>€ 47.869<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>€ 49.341</b>	<b>€ 100.000</b>	<b>€ 137.000</b>		<b>€ 49.460</b>	<b>€ 48.000</b>	<b>€ 50.000</b>	<b>€ 50.000</b>	<b>€ 48.950</b>
Other contributions		€ 53.669	€ 0	€ 14.455	€ 0	€ 0		€ 7.000		€ 6.800	€ 0	€ 90.500
					<b>€ 100.000</b>	<b>€ 137.000</b>						

Source: Fin report    Fin report    Fin report    Oper. budget    Oper. budget    Rev. oper. budg.    Oper. budget    Oper. budget    Oper. budget

<sup>1</sup> Subsidy was 49,100, but this was not completely spent.

