THE BIRTH OF AN EVALUATION SOCIETY
MEDIA FREEDOM AND THE THREAT OF IMPUNITY IN UGANDA
A DAY IN THE LIFE OF AN IOB MASTER’S STUDENT COMBINING FIELDWORK WITH CARING FOR HER BABY DAUGHTER
IOB OPENING CEREMONY SPEAKER STEVE KILLELEA ON WHY PEACE WILL DRIVE PROSPERITY
VLIR-UOS FUNDING UNCERTAINTY IMPACTS IOB’S PREPARATIONS FOR UPCOMING ACADEMIC YEAR
For the first time in the many years of this Alumni magazine’s existence, Eva Vergaelen was not able to devise, revise and supervise what went into this publication. I was thus asked to step into the process of preparing it as a one-off collaborator and am grateful for having had the opportunity of doing so. Having now familiarized myself somewhat with the alumni network I have been able to experience first-hand what an enterprising group of students IOB has managed to attract over the years and the different ways in which their time here – although in a sense only a passing through – helped shape the paths they tread, both professionally and personally.

Words of thanks are in order for a number of people. First and foremost among these is Sara Dewachter who is very much the mastermind and diligent silent partner behind this edition of the Exchange to Change in that she both came up with the ideas for most of the content and set up the initial contacts.

Then to the contributors who consistently met their deadlines despite having to fit the writing of their pieces around multiple other pressing commitments (not to mention continent-hopping) I hope the feedback you get from our readers on what you’ve written inspires you to keep sharing your ideas on platforms such as this.

Finally, I’d like to thank everyone I interviewed for putting up with my quizzical expressions and inquisitorial questionings: hearing about the things that drew you to, or perhaps (temporarily) drove you away from development as an area of enquiry and of action, helped remind me that for each us “[our] story is our escort; without it, we are blind. Does the blind man own his escort? No, neither do we the story; rather it is the story that owns us and directs us”.*

Wishing you all a fruitful academic year, and a pleasurable, informative read.

Anna Gagiano, editor ad interim

---

* The quote is from Anthills of the Savannah by the late Chinua Achebe (he passed away in March of this year and is considered by many to be the father of African literature).
Dear Readers

Allow me to come back to one of the topics treated more extensively in a previous Exchange to Change: IOB recently adopted a research reform in which it committed to focussing on the multiple levels and actors involved in development policies and how these policies interact with wider development processes. In a way, this focus is an open door for students of development. A particular development action or policy is indeed almost literally the door through which many of us enter the field, for example when performing an evaluation or formulating policy advice. One can then also quite evidently discern the different levels and actors involved in policy making, from the department of finance to the field-level officers. One of the central points of concern in development policy practice is also the way in which these different levels or different policy actors interact. The Paris Declaration’s concepts of “harmonisation” and “alignment” serve as highlights here for issuing one of the standard policy recommendations: harmonise! align! The obvious advantage of such a harmonisation or increased alignment is however closely matched by the obvious difficulty of realising it in the field. Development action appears to be a positional good for those who “deliver” it: engaging in it – and realizing it – is only advantageous to the extent that no one else can walk away with the success-story. And hence the plea for harmonization and alignment seems to be a case of trying to square the circle.

What we did learn this year at (and with) IOB is that the multi-level and multi-actor perspective on development is not only applicable to developing countries, it can readily be applied further upstream the development aid chain too. Indeed, as you will be able to read further-on in this new issue of Xtc, the Federal Government of Belgium decided unilaterally to cut 1/3 of the VLIRUOS budget, the budget that also finances, inter alia, most of the scholarships that allow students from the least developed countries to travel to Antwerp and study at IOB. The budget cuts fitted, according to the Belgian government, within a logic of transfer of competencies to the Flemish and the Francophone region. However, the unilateral character of the measure quickly led the Flemish government to contest it, and to unveil the measure as a simple budget cut, in line with the budget cuts many other European countries seem to be destined to execute, and in line with the budget cuts many other development administrations seem to be destined to swallow.

And hence academic development cooperation –and the scholarships available to IOB students – were bound to be sandwiched in-between the Federal and the Flemish levels of policy-making. We might observe then that not only development policy, but all kinds of policy-making are positional goods. Especially in the case of shared competencies, democratically elected political actors have every interest in demonstrating their capability and willingness to act, and is there indeed a better measure of this than doing better than others?

Thus, in the absence of any mechanism of harmonization, IOB risked losing a crucial asset to finance one of the elements that makes its Masters’ programmes unique: a mixture of students from more than thirty countries, from the South and the North, from the West and the East..... Luckily, however, for us, and hopefully for many future generations of our students, this story does have a happy ending: eventually, a mechanism of harmonization did crop up: the European Union, closely monitoring the European version of Structural Adjustment Policies, announced that it would look at Belgium’s total public debt, not just the federal debt. And hence the multiple tiers of government – federal, regional, communal – would have to come to an agreement about a sensible division of responsibilities in curbing public deficits. Eventually, the (after all tiny) problem with the budget for academic development cooperation was solved in the slipstream of this process.

Thus, the European Union made harmonization a deadly necessity, overriding all positional concerns... It makes one think again about the harmonization/alignment problem in developing countries, and how to come to terms with it.

Tom De Herdt
IoB Research Day 2013
Alumni Presentation by Tekalign Gutu

IOB’s annual research day took place on Tuesday 21 May and as noted by the Research Commission chair Filip Reintjens during his welcome, it was the first time this had taken place since IOB moved out of its Thematic Group structure and formally became one unified research group. As ever, it demonstrated the broad palette of research IOB engages in, and proved a good forum for the exchange of ideas – not only amongst staff but also with alumni (see the Alumni News section towards the back of this magazine for both a list of the individual presentations as well as a link to the recordings). IOB was pleased to note that a number of alumni not only tuned in to listen to the speakers via live stream but also posed a number of interesting questions (which were then read aloud by Sara Dewachter) via the online forum.

A very special slot in the programme was of course reserved for the alumnus whose paper had been chosen from all those who applied to present at the research day.

Tekalign Gutu studied economics at Addis Ababa University, and then worked as a research assistant at Oromia agricultural research institute about 160 km from the capital. After completing the coursework component of a Masters in agricultural economics, he came to IOB to study for a Masters in globalisation and development. He subsequently completed the thesis component of his initial Masters and worked as a project coordinator for an NGO called Food for the Hungry International. Then he took up his current job at IFPRI (International Food Policy Research Institute), a position he feels his IOB degree went a long way toward helping him secure in that it gave him an in-depth understanding of what regional thinking really means. During his visit for the Research Day, we managed to sit down together for a short interview, which you can read in what follows.

First of all, how does it feel to be back in Antwerp?
I am very happy to be back here after 2 years. I missed the city, the people, the IOB staff. The weather is perhaps a bit more difficult having just come from sunny Addis, but it certainly helps to remind me that I am on a different continent! The first thing I did when I arrived back was to call some friends as I had brought some injera (traditional Ethiopian flatbread) with me and they had been looking forward to catching up with me over some drinks and some good food.

What was it like to be selected and to present your work at the Research Day?
For me personally coming here and presenting my work really inspired me a lot. It makes you feel like you can really do something, and it’s great to be in this kind of supportive environment. Members of the senior management at IFPRI also congratulated me on the success of being selected, also because disseminating the research we produce is of course very important. I also got lots of comments, and questions from other alumni from all over the world after my presentation. Sometimes this was just in the form of “I’m proud of you” or “good to see you again amongst the IOB family”, but still this appreciation encourages me even more to think I’m doing fine as it is so I can do more than this. But it’s also just a good opportunity in itself, to return to IOB after having left to go and do something else. It’s been really nice and I’m really feeling very happy.

How would you describe the research you presented to a non-academic?
Sometimes it is difficult for a lay person to understand but research is simply there is a problem so we need to try to find a solution for that problem, but it’s not about finding some miraculous answer. I sometimes explain my current contribution by invoking the concept of business. I come from Africa...
where there is poverty and low productivity so I am trying to find out whether countries can benefit from buying fertiliser by joining hands, buying from Europe etc and whether the business of procuring fertiliser is feasible for a country or farmer or not and whether countries can benefit from coming together. A group of high level officials jointly agreed in 2006 that the region needs to increase its use of fertiliser and asked my organisation to look at how they could make this happen. So we are trying to find out what these countries require in order to implement strategies that would make things better by reducing costs, increase consumption of fertiliser etc, that is the whole idea.

One of the issues related to the conditions for success which came up in the feedback on your presentation related to more political considerations – the constraints of making it work in terms of issues like corruption. What are your thoughts on this?

I touched on this in my presentation, but if I had to say a bit more about it I would say the political dimension relates especially to the kinds of collaboration and integration you are able to achieve. Collaboration entails agreement – for example agreement to integrate your roads, railways etc – and this requires countries to modify/reformulate policies or harmonise regulations, to stop collecting certain taxes or granting certain subsidies – political commitment is crucial since the implications of these changes/sacrifices/compromises might be politically sensitive. Other practical examples: sometimes political considerations trump economic ones in terms of the decision of where to source fertiliser from, where political ties are. Corruption was not a big focus during the feasibility study we carried out, but in relation to the management of ports, there were a few interesting points that came up that showed the ways in which fiscal policy in fact encouraged both corruption and economic inefficiency and the shifting of costs onto consumers.

How do you more generally see the role of institutions such as IFPRI in the struggle towards finding sustainable solutions to ending hunger and poverty?

As highlighted in my presentation, IFPRI is a highly reputable organisation internationally which really works on poverty, hunger, and malnutrition not only in Africa, but all over the world. Our mission is both to conduct research and produce policy relevant output. The emphasis is thus on evidence-based research which can then be used to influence policy. We compare poverty across countries and regions to see how things are in different economic regions and what lessons can be learnt in this way. For instance we are currently carrying out an extensive literature review of what Africa could learn from CAADP implementation. We also contribute in fairly concrete ways – for example the heads of state of a number of African countries are expecting new CAADP (Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme) targets for 2015 which we are working to redefine, a task we hope to complete by the end of next year. We are developing four targets, related among other things to market institutions, climate change and improving productivity and production, in order to create policies which Africa can benefit from.

What about the issue of the (non)environmental friendliness of fertiliser use?

Currently the kind of fertiliser most African countries import is not the harmful kind which can affect/deplete the soil: they are more or less environmentally friendly. Studies show this is currently not such a big issue, although this may change. Soil testing needs to take place on a regular basis in order to ascertain what the best kind of fertiliser would be to use in order to increase crop productivity.

What are your future aspirations?

After joining IFPRI I realised that studying in a Western country had broadened my thinking horizons. Coming to Belgium was my first trip to Europe (although I had previously travelled to Japan and Thailand as well as many African countries) and I think the experience helped me realise that I want(ed) to study further: to do a PhD to upgrade my knowledge and contribute more as a skilled person, as an African citizen, not only to IFPRI but to whichever research institute or other organisation I end up at.
In the context of larger negotiations related to budget cuts, in 2012 the federal government of Belgium pushed for the devolution of academic development cooperation competencies to the regional level, planning a “fade-out” scenario over a period of 4 years. It wasn’t clear at all, however, whether the Flemish Government was in fact willing to take over any commitments that had been made to VLIR-UOS. For this reason there was initially no certainty as to whether VLIR-UOS would receive funding in 2013, how much it would total and who it would be granted by.

When, at the beginning of May 2013, the federal government announced that only 67% of the anticipated budget would be made available, the only option for VLIR-UOS to ‘save’ the 541 scholarships for students from developing countries was indeed to try to convince the Flemish government to take these on. The Flemish government had its own political and policy agenda though. While it was reassuring to note that never during the many months of negotiation was the added value or continued existence of academic development cooperation called into question, it remained a challenge to navigate through the constant uncertainty. All of which it was feared would lead to significant reputational damage for Flemish higher education institutions.

Only two months later, in mid-July, was it officially and quite unexpectedly confirmed that the budget of VLIR-UOS would rise to 100% after all. As a result of this uncertainty IOB was forced to think about short-term solutions and alternative plans of action. Although an effort was made to attract more students from the North, we also had to bear in mind the fact that a massive decrease in student numbers from the South would make our programs less attractive for students from the North in that one of the characteristics that makes IOB unique is precisely the fact that we are able to offer degrees and courses to a geographically diverse student population. Drastically altering our traditional student demographic (something which is in any case not possible at the drop of a hat) would thus also detract from the interactive multicultural nature of our courses. It should also be pointed out that the vast majority of our applicants (623 out of 734 in this past year) also compete for the VLIR-UOS scholarships and only very few of these applicants can count on alternative sources of financing.

IOB thus decided to promote its courses as much as possible among other candidates from the North and South: deadlines were extended and extra promotional material was distributed widely. A reduced number of students would mean that we would need to revise the number of subjects we were be able to offer and this would in turn mean that we would have to cancel or combine certain units, which would have knock-on effects in terms of overall course content. Furthermore a reduction in students from the South would threaten our ability to fulfill our commitments towards the Ministry of Education which provides the institute’s core funding for doing precisely that.

Besides education-related concerns, the uncertainty concerning the scholarships also caused various practical problems. Firstly, IOB
Apart from the short term implications outlined above, a number of other longer term projects had to be temporarily put on hold. These included for instance the development of an online application tool to simplify the administrative side of the selection procedure for future candidates; and the search for a long term sustainable solution to our student housing problem in Antwerp.

Finally the uncertainty about the scholarships also formed an obstacle for the promotion of our Masters programmes for the 2014-2015 academic year. What should we do in terms of composing, printing and distributing brochures? We could hardly convey information about potential scholarships if we had no certainty as to whether these would actually be awarded.

It is thus probably understandable that the preparations for the 2013-2014 academic year were far less smooth than usual. However, we also heaved a collective sigh of relief when the federal government in July surprised us all with the news that the rest of the VLIR-UOS budget had at last got approved after all. And this includes not only IOB itself, but certainly also the 30 students who had been awarded a scholarship and who had been on tenterhooks for months on end.

organizes an English language course in August and September every year for students whose language background makes this necessary. Most of the participants that attend this language course are VLIR scholarship recipients. We rely on external teachers for this task but we found ourselves in the position of not being able to give them any assurance that the course would be able to take place this year. Secondly, a number of activities in the introduction week also require planning in advance – for instance the introductory weekend in Bruges for which we already made advance bookings in a hostel. And last but not least the hunt for student housing of course also became a lot more challenging. We usually start securing rooms from the end of June/ beginning of July, but because at that stage we still weren’t sure who our future students would be, we weren’t able to do this within the habitual timeframe. By the time we were finally given assurance about the availability of the scholarships, a number of previously available rooms had already been rented to other candidates. Having to delay visa applications also resulted in the (risk of) the late arrival of the scholarship recipients in whose countries the visa application process often takes exceedingly long.


![Country of origin of scholarship recipients in the last 5 years](image_url)

total students: 146
What's in a number? Read the asterisk

In October 2013 Wim Marivoet will defend his PhD thesis entitled “The Congo Puzzle, Evolving livelihoods and poverty in the Democratic Republic of Congo (1970-2010)”. In a recent interview he discussed some facets of his academic trajectory and how this has influenced the approach he has taken to his research on the DRC.

Starting an interview with a unashamedly leading question on “Africa’s statistical tragedy” is perhaps not the most orthodox approach to kick-starting a discussion, but in this case it in fact proved a tolerably successful entry point. When asked whether, in his opinion, statistics are closest to a) facts b) guesses c) lies d) sorcery (I thought it only fair that my leading question be structured in multiple choice format so as to at least cover the full gamut of options) Wim points out that he is in fact currently working on this very issue. In the second chapter of his PhD dissertation, which he is currently revising, he examines the reliability issues that need to be considered relative to the survey data and country statistics his research draws on. Entitled “Reliable, challenging or misleading: a qualitative account of survey data and country statistics in the DRC”, he is including it in order to anticipate potential concerns relating to the quality of the data he has chosen to use and provide a focused qualitative account of the most salient issues he feels need illumination in this regard.

Given the large number and heterogeneity of researchers and organisations involved in generating data (which serves a check and balance function) he is, however, less inclined to option c) than to option b); though he feels the latter can perhaps best be rephrased slightly more elaborately as “guessimates with a weak basis”, at least in case of the DRC. He mentions the fact that Morten Jerven’s Poor Numbers, a recent book which deals with this issue in some depth though with a far broader geographical scope, demonstrated quite convincingly the ways in which “GDP is the result of multiple estimations using poor and fragmented data mentioned only in asterisk get compiled into international datasets which other researchers then use at face value, when apparently in case of the DRC and Sub-Saharan Africa more generally they are rather just proxies for a certain reality, even though they might have an official stamp from a major international organisation”.

A case in point is the most recent Human Development Index (HDI) scores which placed the DRC in the bottom position, something which set off a discussion in Kinshasa. As a matter of fact, many local experts maintained that this was due to the use of an outdated national account system to estimate GDP, an opinion not shared by the footnotes of the World Development Indicators. But only after intense email traffic between Washington, New York and Kinshasa, was Wim able to demonstrate through various simulated calculations that the official macroeconomic data were in fact still based on the old national account system, and footnotes were later-on modified to reflect this state of affairs. However, when based on the preliminary estimates of the newer national account system, GDP would be 57% higher and the country would move up from the last to the fourth last position in terms of HDI. This looks like a meagre change, but last or not has huge importance in terms of publicity and fundraising. So can we only be truly rigorous if we examine the particulars of the figures we use? He is categorical on this count: “There is no data without metadata. When one engages in any kind of quantitative analysis the conclusion will always be that you need to read it and analyse it in accordance with the history of how it has been derived, devised or computed.”
When one engages in any kind of quantitative analysis the conclusion will always be that you need to read it and analyse it in accordance with the history of how it has been derived, devised or computed. Taking into account the kind of data and how it has been sampled – that remains essential. Perhaps your story becomes a lot more fluffy on account of this and of course it’s always nice to have something more clear cut, to be able to maintain that a given conclusion holds without any doubt. Nonetheless, fully exploring the methodological difficulties, the problems that arise in analysing data, is a vital intermediary step. In a sense my PhD consists primarily of an attempt to come to grips with these sorts of limitations and to frame these issues within a broader welfare analysis. My intended contribution is thus primarily to summarise what is happening, and to create some structure in something which is inherently confused and chaotic – to add a few careful and steady-handed lines to the canvas of available knowledge, without necessarily believing I have come up with some sort of unassailable categorisation of how things stand in the DRC”.

However, his more critical standpoint towards statistics is not necessarily the one he started off with but rather something he began to take on during the course of his later studies and subsequent research. In his first degree in commercial engineering he was generally encouraged to have a fairly unquestioning attitude towards numbers and depart from a positivist standpoint, so the shift from economist to social scientist that has taken place during his years at IOB has been gradual but pronounced. It has led to his comparative research on economic welfare in the DRC being given more “social twists” and anthropological nudges than is typical in pure applied economic research. Prior to starting the PhD he was doing a desk study on the profiling of poverty in Kinshasa (which was based on the pilot phase of the 1-2-3 survey, one of the largest and in fact one of the only major budget surveys in the DRC). This allowed him to gain extensive experience with processing this kind of data. Working directly with the responses of the household head, rather than with aggregated country statistics, became a way to get beyond and behind some of the issues more typically quantitative work faces, and also a way to have more control and oversight of what one is actually measuring and what the figures actually mean.

The year and a half he spent in the DRC during the latter half of his PhD was also helpful in this regard. “Moving to Kinshasa was ideal in the sense that it is such a melting pot - the whole country is represented there and that makes it really possible and interesting to share information. For instance the information comprised in the nationally representative surveys I used could be easily cross-checked informally with the people around me. Besides testing my existing ideas, it was also a great way to trigger fresh ones – through daily contact with for example the sentinel (person protecting the compound) and other people. Understanding how people think, how they behave and what they deem important helps add texture to your thinking. And the directness and immediacy of this kind of information is also a useful source of, albeit unofficial, triangulation given the reliability issues you brought up earlier”.

Engagement, vigilance and humility clearly remain important to him, and these values will no doubt help him in future undertakings – whether within the academy or beyond.
The birth of an evaluation society

Khalil Bitar graduated from the IOB in 2012. He is the co-founder and director of the Palestinian Evaluation Association (PEA), an initiative he tells us a little about in answer to a number of questions we posed to him.

What first aroused your interest in M&E?
When I graduated from City University of London in the United Kingdom in June 2009, where I studied International Politics, I had no previous knowledge of M&E. I was always, however, interested in research, which I see as having many similarities to the field of evaluation. Upon returning to my home country of Palestine, I started working as the M&E assistant at an international organization called “AMIDEAST” (where I am in fact still employed). Here I have learnt more about M&E and was gradually promoted to the position of M&E Manager at the same organization. I had a supervisor who influenced me greatly and made me really motivated about M&E.

What is the added value of evaluation societies?
To my mind, evaluators play a sensitive and significant role in any society. They have the moral obligation (by choosing to work in this field) to speak truth to power and to be the voice of reason when evaluating any project, programme or policy. In this sense, evaluators working in developing countries have even heavier loads placed on their shoulders. Sometimes the success or failure of a much-needed intervention is directly linked to evaluators’ observations, advice, and critique. For this reason, evaluators must talk to each other, collaborate, and learn from each other in order to be successful at what they do. In addition, working to improve evaluation capacity in any country, especially developing countries like Palestine, becomes a necessity. This is why we need an active Palestinian Evaluation Association that can help facilitate such activities.

How difficult is it to start an evaluation society? What are the main stumbling blocks?
It is very easy and extremely hard at the same time to establish an evaluation association! While it was not very difficult building a website for the evaluation society, making people aware of its existence, and registering the association locally (via government procedures) was a lot harder. Six months after having had the idea to establish an evaluation association we have to work hard every day (on a voluntary/unpaid basis) to sell the idea of the association to stakeholders. The latter are usually employed in a full-time M&E position and usually do not stop for a moment to think to talk to other people who are working in the field and to learn from them and to link with them. The main stumbling block, in my mind, is to make people really believe in the idea, and to make them willing to invest time to make the association a reality. It is very easy to build a non-active association that you have registered with your name, but does nothing. This what we are trying to avoid and this is the hard bit.

There seems to have been a lot of initiatives around evaluation societies of late. How important is external support for an evaluation society?
You are right. Lately we have observed many new initiatives which aim to support and strengthen the Voluntary Organizations for Professional Evaluation (VoPEs). Efforts made by EvalPartners and the International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation (IOCE) are important examples. I think the international community has seen the importance of investing in building strong M&E capacities. External support is certainly essential for any evaluation association. We are all members of one group, the evaluation community.
What are the first steps in the process of setting up an evaluation society?

I must say that after talking to members and founders of various national VoPEs in many industrialised and developing countries, it has become clear to me that establishing a national VoPE differs from one country to another. EvalPartners and IOCE have released an excellent publication illustrating case studies on the establishment of various VoPEs in different countries. In the case of Palestine, it was done by talking to people here in Palestine and around the world, especially using social media. We posted about the idea of establishing the Palestinian Evaluation Association (PEA) on various social media outlets, asking evaluators to advise us on how to establish an active VoPE. This is how many people came to know about PEA and became supportive of its establishment which, I believe, helped make it a reality. What really helped make people pay attention to the PEA is that its establishment came directly after Palestine was accepted as a non-state member of the United Nations as this attracted extra attention and support.

Is it difficult to get actors from different sectors (governments, universities, consultants, donors) to trust one another? How do you approach this?

Yes. As the founder and director of the PEA I regularly have to meet with representatives from the government, local and international NGOs, universities, and consultancy firms who often have little trust in one another. Nonetheless, I believe this is normal and might have been partly caused by the lack of a forum where members from these different entities could talk and discuss various issues that could gradually build trust among them. I usually stress this point and aim to advise representatives of all entities to join the PEA in order to gradually build such trust and establish a dialogue around the areas that concern us all.

What would you see as a sort of milestone of “maturity” for the Palestinian evaluation society?

There are several milestones of maturity needed for the PEA. Most importantly mobilizing resources to hold an annual conference where members meet and present papers concerning evaluation.

“The main stumbling block, in my mind, is to make people really believe in the idea, and to make them willing to invest time to make the association a reality. It is very easy to build a non-active association that you have registered with your name, but does nothing. This what we are trying to avoid and this is the hard bit.”

What role can/should parliaments play in the process of setting up and maintaining national M&E systems?

In Palestine the parliament is not active and has not met at all for the past five years due to the political situation. In many countries, however, parliamentarians have started playing an important role in this process. I really hope that the same will happen in Palestine, although I do not see this happening any time soon, unfortunately.

You recently attended the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET) executive training program. What was that like and how did that influence your thinking?

The month I spent in Ottawa was truly a great experience, which, I believe strongly advanced my M&E knowledge and expertise. In addition, I had an amazing chance to meet and link with many colleagues from all around the world. During IPDET I had the chance to organize a roundtable discussion about the Palestinian Evaluation Association which was really productive and colleagues who attended the discussion were highly engaged and gave me useful feedback.

What would you recommend to fellow alumni who are interested in helping their local M&E systems?

I would strongly recommend that my fellow IOB alumni take an active roles in their local evaluation associations/societies if they exist. If they do not exist, I would recommend starting such an association/society with other IOB alumni!
In Uganda, a power struggle between the long-serving leader and an army general determined to depose him from power has exposed the threats to press freedom and laid bare President Museveni’s increasingly absolute rule.

On May 20, 2013, The Daily Monitor, Uganda’s largest and most influential independent newspaper, published a leaked confidential memo authored by the Coordinator of Intelligence Services, Gen. David Sejusa—Tinyefuza, alleging that President Yoweri Museveni was grooming his son Muhoozi Kainerugaba to succeed him. The general, who has since fled into exile in London, further alleged that there was a concealed assassination plot targeting those opposed to this succession plan. Muhoozi, a brigadier who’s also the commander of the Special Forces, an elite component of the country’s military brass, has in recent times enjoyed rapid promotion through the ranks. This has fuelled speculation that his hurried rise is intended to prepare him to take over power from his father.

After the publication of Gen. Sejusa’s dossier, police stormed the offices of The Daily Monitor and The Red Pepper, a local tabloid, declaring both areas crime scenes. Production at the two media houses was halted for eleven days. The police also switched off Daily Monitor’s sister radio stations, KFM and Dembe FM. They were later re-opened after numerous condemnations from the international media, diplomatic community and an infamous behind-the-scenes agreement between media owners and the government.

The closure of the country’s largest media organisations left only one newspaper, the government-owned New Vision, in operation. This created an opening for the regime to exploit its mouthpiece to justify its authoritarian actions. The government has since continued to perpetuate a narrative that the two media outlets have been irresponsible and careless with their decision to publish a memo that has the capacity to cause unrest and discontent within the military.

This matter is of particular concern to me as a journalist who has devoted my career to covering issues related to justice, human rights abuses and good governance. For starters, I joined the Daily Monitor in 2008; first as an intern student in my final year at Makerere University, and later as a full time employee. Throughout my career at the Daily Monitor, I came to learn that reporters and readers have and continue to propel this newspaper to greater heights because they believe in the values it stands for: independence, truth, accuracy, courage and balanced reporting. The newspaper has faced many threats which, instead of weakening its stand, should have strengthened its resolve to fight for reforms, to expose injustice in all its forms and to uncover plunderers of public resources. What makes the recent closure historic is the willingness of the top management to sacrifice the core values that have made the newspaper what it is today. This, of course, has been done in order to safeguard their business interests.

It is important to note that this is not the first time that President Museveni has closed media houses for criticising his government. In 2005, he ordered the closure of KFM after the station published a report alleging that the incompetence of the Ugandan government had led to the death of South Sudan’s first President, John Garang. General Garang died in a Uganda Presidential helicopter crash together with a number of senior officers from the Ugandan military. Journalist Andrew Mwenda, the then talk-show host who was later fired from the station, alleged that “Garang’s security was put in danger by...
Museveni’s Government by putting him, first of all on a junk helicopter, second at night, third passing through Imatong Hills where [Joseph] Kony is”. According to the Independent Magazine, the government in 2010 again closed four independently owned radio stations and suspended their operating licenses for what it called “flouting rules by inciting people, mainly the central Baganda tribe, against President Yoweri Museveni, his government and against other tribes”. In 2007, Kitti FM, a popular local radio station located in Northern Uganda, was taken off the air 30 minutes after opposition leader Kizza Besigye had started speaking on the radio’s talk-show. In the same year, the Uganda Broadcasting Corporation, a public broadcaster, was forced to terminate its popular talk show program, Tonight with Tegulle, after it hosted Dr Besigye without government approval.

Succession Debate
The on-going suppression of independent media in Uganda carries a number of implications. First, it is intended to prevent the media from spearheading the debate about President Museveni’s succession plans. Since 2012, various Ugandan media platform have been awash with stories alleging that Muhoozi’s rise and placement to Command the Special Force, considered the fulcrum of the Ugandan military, is a ploy to circumvent the law and have him take over from his father as president. Those opposed to this arrangement argue that Uganda is not a monarchy for Museveni, and that being the President’s son does not privilege Muhoozi to automatically inherit power. Not until the publication of Sejusa’s memo, Museveni had successively managed to keep this debate out of the public domain. He has often argued that he prefers the matter to be discussed by the ruling party’s Central Executive Committee (CEC), which falls under his full control. Nevertheless, the publication of Sejusa’s letter has so far achieved a number of things; first, it has effectively shifted the succession debate from Museveni’s personally controlled power corridors of State House to the public domain. The President’s decision to suddenly promote his son through military ranks, and the closure of media houses, have become hot topics in Uganda, dominating not only print and broadcast outlets but also social media networks such as Facebook and Twitter. This kind of reaction is not what Museveni had anticipated.

That said, it remains unclear if Museveni – an army general himself who captured power in 1986 after a five-year guerrilla warfare – plans to contest in the 2016 presidential election again. According to the country’s constitution anyone aged over 75 is barred from becoming President, but Museveni’s age has itself become a subject of debate in Uganda. He has refused to be categorical about his birth date, arguing that neither himself nor his uneducated parents knew the exact date he was born.

Donor’s Double Standards
The events that followed the media closures in Uganda should perhaps serve to open the hearts and minds of Ugandans. Ugandans ought to learn that it’s them—not Europeans or Americans—that should fight for the future of their country. Although some elements in the donor community have openly expressed their frustration with Museveni’s personalization of military and politics in Uganda, many questions about their engagement with the Kampala regime remain unanswered: For instance, why have the U.S.A and other Western countries continued to support the Museveni regime well aware of its brutality and violent suppression of democratic voices? Why should the EU and USA continue to fund Uganda’s military given its gloomy human rights records? Why have the donors failed to use their leverage over Museveni’s administration to compel him to embrace democracy and respect for independent media? The answers to the above-mentioned questions lies in the manner in which Museveni has outfoxed the...
international donor community, portraying himself as an ally of the American-led war on terror, on one hand, while domestically presiding over a repressive regime, on the other.

Since the early 1990s, Uganda has been fast-tracked as a major American ally in the geopolitics of Sub-Saharan Africa following Osama bin Laden’s decision to seek a safe haven in neighbouring Sudan. Currently, Uganda provides the largest contingent in the American-backed African Union peacekeeping mission in Somalia (AMISOM); it is providing a base for a combat-equipped American special forces unit coordinating the fight against the Lord’s Resistance Army in central Africa; and it has been supplied with four drone aircraft by the U.S.A. as part of a $45m military aid package to boost the counterterrorism capabilities of Uganda and Burundi, the only two countries that have contributed AMISOM troops to battle the Al Qaeda-backed Al-Shabab militants in Somalia. At the regional level, the Pentagon has poured more than $82 million into military aid for six sub-Saharan African countries, with more than half of that going to Uganda.

While some countries might be glad of the U.S.A.’s military aid, in Uganda this aid has come at a cost to democracy and human rights. For instance, while consciously turning a blind eye to setbacks in Uganda’s democracy and poor human rights record, the Obama administration has continued to pour military aid into Uganda, as well as eulogize Museveni’s regime for sending peacekeeping troops to Somalia, and for helping Somalia’s weak interim government, which relies heavily on Uganda and Burundi peacekeepers to stave off the threat posed by Al-Shabab. In sum, the West has fallen prey to Museveni’s posturing in Somalia. Their obsession with the so-called war on terror has led them to believe that, by contributing peacekeepers to Somalia, President Museveni is a rational actor who’s concerned with the restoration of democracy and human rights in that country. Have they either forgotten or chosen to ignore the fact that he is the same person closing media houses, banning opposition rallies and incarcerating his critics at home? Over the years, Museveni’s regime has sought for space to insulate itself from international pressure and scrutiny over numerous corruption scandals involving the misuse of foreign aid. And becoming an ally of the West in its war on terror has provided the best avenue for the regime to achieve this. For instance, last year, the Ugandan auditor general issued a report which showed that £26.9 million donated by the UK to fight poverty had been transferred from Prime Minister Amama Mbabazi’s office into private bank accounts. Enraged by this high-level corruption and impunity the United Kingdom on November 16, 2012, announced that it was cutting all aid to the Ugandan government. Sweden, Ireland, Norway and Denmark followed suit. This scandal followed a report published in The Daily Mail last year, which showed that part of the $113m funds UK donated to Uganda in form of budget support had been used to buy a $48m Gulfstream jet for the President, even as 30% of the population continue to live below the poverty-line. Surprisingly, the donor cut in budget support was short-lived and most donor countries have since resumed funding the government’s budget, even though there are still no guarantees in place that the regime would exercise more financial prudence and hold its corrupt officials more accountable.

In this context, it can be argued that, although the West has often condemned the Uganda government’s crackdown on media and opposition rallies and, on a number of occasions, threatened to suspend aid as a result of graft, lack of democracy and human rights abuses, Washington’s engagement with President Museveni in its so-called “war on terror” is a much bigger priority. This explains the muted reaction from the West after the closure of the media houses by the regime in Kampala. It is also correct to say that, in Uganda’s case, the attempt by the west to curb the spread of terrorism in Africa, has forced them to diverge from their core principles of promoting democracy, good governance and human rights.

Gerald Bareebe can be reached on email via geraldbareebe at gmail.com.
Three IOB alumni join the institute as members of staff

During the upcoming academic year, the IOB will be welcoming a number of new members of staff. Our readers might be especially interested to note that two of the new doctoral assistants, and one of the lecturers, are in fact alumni (in the sense that they completed a Master’s degree either at IOB or one of its forerunner institutions). On the pages that follow, you can read up a bit more about these three individuals’ paths (back) to IOB.

Loresel Abainza

Loresel Abainza joins the IOB as doctoral assistant in September 2013. She was appointed to the vacancy related to International development, globalisation and poverty.

Tell us a little about your background and your path to IOB (for both the masters and the PhD).

Funnily enough my career in fact started off not in the field of development but between the private, profit-oriented walls of large corporations. This is not surprising given the fact that my college education and training were related to business administration. While working as an operations assistant in a large universal bank, however, I decided to change my career path because I realized that I was not doing something I felt was meaningful and was instead only working for the benefit of the already rich and able stockholders of the company.

I saw the diversity of the field of economics and its relevance in providing sound policy advice to the government so that is the subject I pursued in my graduate education. Then I engaged myself in different kinds of employment which included teaching and development work. During a teaching fellowship at the University of the Philippines I learned a lot from my mentor, Dr. Gerardo Sicat, in terms of teaching style. It was also this experience which allowed me to feel the fulfillment of being a teacher through both the positive and negative feedback of the students.

My teaching duties however remained a peripheral activity as most of my time was spent engaging in development work through the tobacco control organization that I used to be part of. Our work involved a range of evidence-based policies which were proven to be effective worldwide. The underlying purpose of the campaign to reduce tobacco use was to improve the health conditions of smokers, particularly of the vulnerable groups including the poor, women, and the youth with spillover effects on economic and social welfare also anticipated.

My position requires handling multiple tasks, from technical to administrative, even logistical at times. The advantage of having this diverse responsibility is that it enables one to be familiar with the different facets of development work, particularly the different institutions and actors involved and their respective biases with regard to policies that will be put in place. As I immersed myself more into the realm of development, the more I enjoyed and appreciated its nature. I find the work challenging, frustrating yet fulfilling - challenging because fortuitous events may happen and you have to think of creative ways in order to achieve the goal that was originally set in the project; frustrating because in most cases, people are resistant to change; and fulfilling because you know that your work will have positive impact on the lives of other people.
My less than a decade long exposure to development work has helped me garner insights from the field. It may sound naïve but I used to think that as long as you have hard facts and rigorous studies, convincing policymakers about your policy proposal would not be that difficult. But what I forgot to bear in mind was the role of human agency and of the institutions involved. For instance, when we were doing a legislative advocacy campaign in the house of congress for a bill on sin taxes and health warnings, no matter how sound our policy proposal was, the members of congress not in favor of our proposal did not change their standpoint. We soon found out that those legislators indeed had a link with the big tobacco companies in terms of their election campaign sponsorship. I think this is where the challenge comes in – i.e. when you want to propose a change, how are you going to maneuver in a situation where you have institutions that support corrupt behavior and actors who have biases for personal gains? Or sometimes, even if the institution as such is not flawed but the actors are full of personal biases, how do you implement change? In all of the trainings, seminars, and workshops I’ve attended these issues were always present. And it’s always a challenge to address them due to the different complexities involved.

It then came to a point where I felt the need to advance my studies in the field of development. This time, I chose an international training to take advantage of the knowledge spillover that I expected to gain through the classes and discussions. I was lucky enough to obtain a scholarship from IOB. The reason for choosing IOB was twofold: first, the classes are designed for practitioners, second, the composition of the class is varied – i.e. developing countries are well represented and there are students from developed countries as well.

After IOB, I took a short term consultancy contract with the Asian Development Bank. Although the environment is conducive for those who seek professional growth, I tend to feel more comfortable and fulfilled doing a mix of teaching and research. When I learned of the research assistant vacancy at IOB, I immediately applied because the PhD training is very much aligned to the career path I wanted to pursue.

**What are your specific plans for (and perhaps fears about) the PhD and after the PhD?**

I am very much aware that earning a PhD is not easy. I’ve seen some colleagues who have struggled in the process of writing their dissertation. I understand that sometimes even if you’ve carefully planned everything, unexpected things happen. I think one just needs to have the right attitude so that the journey is still enjoyable and the goal achieved. Although I may have some apprehensions here and there regarding the PhD, I am more focused on the fact that I have the chance to do something like this. In other words, rather than being frightened of whether or not I can do it, I prefer to spend my time thinking of the ways in which I can do it. Right now, I am actually excited about the fact that once again, I will be teaching, doing research, and continuing my academic education.

As regards my PhD study plan, I intend to investigate further what I wrote about in my Master’s dissertation at IOB. This dealt with migration, trade, and development. This time however, I am thinking of focusing on migration and poverty, employing both qualitative and quantitative research methods. On a general level, I am interested in topics pertaining to migration, remittances, poverty, trade, financial globalization, and climate change. But the advance courses I am considering taking are related to poverty, globalization of labor, and econometrics. To some extent I have mixed feelings about the teaching tasks that I need to fulfill as part of the PhD training. On the one hand I’m excited that I’ll be given the opportunity to teach again but the thought that I may not be effective and that I may fall short of expectations lingers. I think I just need to organize the lessons and think of a better method to deliver it. I hope that I would be of help to the new students especially since the classes that I will be handling are introductory and mainly of a tutorial format. I also want to learn from the students so I can improve my teaching approach in the future.

When I finish my PhD training, I plan to pursue a career in the academy, teaching and engaging in policy dialogue through research.
X2C: So you started life as a civil engineer/architect and even though you slowly gravitated towards working in development, your initial training in this field has always remained either on the background or foreground of what you engage in professionally.

FDM: Indeed. Directly after completing my civil engineering degree in Leuven in 1998, I spent a couple of months interning with a local architect in Pondicherry, India, and this was my first taste of living and working in the South. But it was only in 2003, after I completed a degree in Conflict and Development in Ghent, that I lived abroad again and actually worked in development, this time in Rwanda where I worked for a Belgian NGO called Protos that focuses on water and sanitation.

X2C: And what was that initial experience of working in development like for you?

FDM: While working at a local level was very interesting, the work remained technical and largely in the line of what I had studied before, so after 2 years when my contract finished I decided I wanted to study further. It was at that stage that I enrolled for the Masters in Development Evaluation and Management at IOB.

X2C: So it seems you were keen to devote more attention to the development evaluation aspects particularly. Why was that?

FDM: Well in Ghent I’d been given the broad picture in terms of the historical and political aspects of development, but in the course of my work in Rwanda I quite quickly came to the conclusion that there was a lack of evidence-based development action and that was something I wanted to understand and explore, in view of applying the gained knowledge afterwards. That period at IOB in general was a very stimulating year for me from an intellectual point of view: the interactive nature of the course and the interaction with a peer group who all have their own, experienced views on things, and almost none of whom came from a Western context, was very enriching.

X2C: And the day after graduating you began work as a development cooperation attaché for Belgium?

FDM: Yes, besides the more in-depth knowledge I gained regarding development evaluation, what was particularly valuable about the course at IOB was the fact that it
gave me an excellent overview of the new aid paradigm. I studied at the time that the Paris Declaration period was just beginning, and what I learned about it turned out to be perfect preparation for the exams one has to take at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to become an attaché.

X2C: What are all the countries you’ve been posted to?

FDM: Morocco was the first country I was sent to and here the link to my previous work cropped up again, in the sense that I was in charge of sectoral work in water and sanitation. What made it particularly interesting was the fact that it was an atypical experience within Belgian Development Cooperation, Morocco not only being a middle income country but one with a very strong sense of ownership, something you, as a donor, both appreciate and adapt to. There is a sense of quite strong equality between two partners, which is especially interesting in the context of the Paris Declaration with its introduction of more policy dialogue and new aid modalities. This experience was very much in contrast to the one I had in Burundi, my next post, where the situation was markedly different – because of the different degree of dependence on aid, but of course also because of it being a post-conflict setting, because of capacity issues, unreliable data etc. On the other hand, some of these factors did allow donors such as Belgium to more easily integrate a political dimension into their work, and this translated into a very productive connection between political dialogue and policy dialogue.

X2C: Which aspects of working as an attaché did you find most challenging?

FDM: Publically, you can’t always be as critical as you would like to be. When you work for an NGO, as I had done previously, you are in close contact with the population and with NGO collaborators, and as such you appear to have more freedom to be critical of the behaviour of both the recipient country you’re in and of donors. When you’re inside the system that changes, and you lose some critical leverage – though you may maintain it behind the scenes. Moving closer to power puts you in the uncomfortable situation of working with governments that are at times under critique from civil society or other actors. That’s the thing I found difficult: finding the delicate balance between critical distance on the one hand, and on the other hand making compromises in order to have
constructive policy dialogue, to advance and to obtain results.

**X2C**: So by returning to an academic context that critical distance is something you hope to reclaim?

**FDM**: In a sense, yes, because there you are in the comfortable position, one might say, of not being confronted with the realities of the practical field. You don’t have to link everything to concrete compromises, but nevertheless you can still be involved in a very interesting, relevant way. You also have the time and resources to reflect on things in detail, something that is not possible when you’re caught up in meetings and negotiations. That being said, and because I have this practical experience to draw on, I hope the research I produce will be fairly in touch with, and applicable to, the day-to-day realities of the field. My research will also be a way for me to look back at the five fairly intensive years I spent as an attaché – years that were full of continuous interactions, with sometimes frustrations, sometimes happiness about things that either staggered or moved forward. My aim is to put on paper what I see to be the major problems and major lessons, to distil my vision of the way bilateral direct cooperation works and to try to get to the bottom of things, while using scientific methods. Besides a geographical focus on one or more countries from the Great Lakes region, in terms of theoretical frameworks I’m interested in looking at new institutionalism. And also at the whole debate around political economy analysis, which is a tool less frequently used by a donor like Belgium, and the results of which are very hard to formalise in the grey literature type of documents you produce in the field – even though it is essential to have information on the influence of both formal and informal processes in order to be able to have a well informed discussion about it.

**X2C**: Since you’ve worked as a civil engineer/architect and are going to be affiliated with the Conditional Finance for Development research line among others, for my final question I can’t help but ask you whether you think “the new aid architecture” is a good metaphor.

**FDM**: Yes, it’s not badly chosen, but I would say it’s more like “free jazz” architecture in that aid is much more complicated. While architecture follows very clear schemes, in the new aid paradigm you have some directions, but once it’s put into practice it leads its own life, at very different levels (international, national, local) and within different channels. The sense of clear overview, present at the level of architecture, you often lose in development.

**X2C**: Okay, maybe one final, final question after all then. Why did you choose to return to the IOB for your doctorate?

**FDM**: I kept following the work that was being done by IOB after I left and I saw it being translated into practical and policy guidelines and directives coming from headquarters, e.g. the focus on the portfolio approach and other examples which look at how Belgium as a smaller donor can implement the PD in the most effective way possible. This process of IOB’s work seeping through official procedures and policy documents and of research results being put into practice, is something I find that I’d be interested in contributing to.

**X2C**: Well, all that remains to be said then is thank-you and welcome back to IOB!
X2C: So you are an IOB alumnus in a sense, but not quite... tell us a little about your how you ended up in the field of development studies.

SV: Sure. Following my undergraduate general law degree I had to complete my civil service (an alternative to military service), so I ended up spending 20 months volunteering at the branch of Amnesty International based here in Antwerp. While I was there I decided I still had sufficient time to study something else at the same time so ended up enrolling at what was then called the College for Developing Countries, which is one of the two institutes that were later merged to become IOB. So in a sense my professional career gravitated towards conflict and development issues, before it had even begun. When I subsequently joined Amnesty’s international secretariat in London, my interest in Africa increased even further because I was a human rights researcher on Rwanda and Burundi.

X2C: Did you find it emotionally taxing work?

SV: Yes, it was quite confrontational. This was especially the case for the year I spent in Rwanda in 1996, because the genocide was there every day from morning till evening and this made it psychologically quite hard because it’s there in your work and in your non-professional relationships.

X2C: Did you feel you were able to negotiate sensitivities adequately or did it remain uncomfortable throughout?

SV: It remained uncomfortable but at the same time it was a good practical training exercise for the kind of course I will be teaching in the Research Methods II module on development as a multi-actor process, because it forced me to negotiate the whole time. Since I was at that time a UNDP programme officer, I was part of an international organisation which has its own agenda, though he was already affiliated to the institute part-time, Dr. Stef Vandeginste joined the IOB teaching staff full-time on 1 September 2013, having been appointed as a lecturer in Multi-level Governance and State Reconstruction in Central Africa.
incentives, limitations etc. etc. so I had to constantly interact and negotiate with inter- and nongovernmental partners or adversaries in some cases.

**X2C:** So a number of elements of your professional experience are going to be put to good use in the courses you teach.

**SV:** Indeed. For the course entitled “From violent conflict to state reconstruction”, which I offered even before I joined the institute full-time, I basically draw on my own academic activities over the past 10 years or more which are related to the peace process, transitional justice, human rights, and political transitions – areas that I have worked in both as an academic researcher but also via consultancies and other policy related work for NGOs.

One particularly memorable experience in this regard was doing a strategic conflict assessment for DFID on Burundi that was closely related to the 2010 elections. It was a very inspiring and insightful exercise into how different actors try to avoid or reduce the destabilising effects of an election in a post-conflict setting, and that comes very close to my teaching in this particular module.

For the one of the qualitative modules I’m teaching on text and discourse analysis I imagine that my legal background, which unfortunately is sometimes considered to be somewhat less relevant in development studies, will be useful because what lawyers have as their only tools and sources are texts.

**X2C:** How do you find it going from an academic to a policy context and back again?

**SV:** Not easy. Filip Reyntjens wrote a short book called “Trois décennies comme chercheur-acteur au Rwanda et au Burundi” and indeed, whether you like it or not, you’re constantly doing, in particular at IOB, is being a researcher and an actor. You need the real world in order to be able to reflect on it and when saying you need the real world I mean you need to sort of experience it. So you need to know how it feels to work inside a ministry of Foreign Affairs or a development cooperation agency or an NGO in order to usefully analyse all of that from an academic perspective.

But at the same time and perhaps that’s more the activist in me speaking, you also want to contribute. We all have a sort of starry-eyed idealism within us (in my case it’s still alive, though perhaps not as kicking as it used to be).

---

**Law, Power and Peace (Droit, Pouvoir et Paix):** Stef is currently setting up a website that will serve as a research resource/digital database on Burundi. It will contain a large collection of primary sources that are generally difficult to track down, ranging for instance from the different versions of the constitution that have existed since Burundi’s independence in 1962, various peace agreements, the electoral programmes of different political parties to the speeches of various presidents etc. It will be accessible via the IOB website, but we will keep you updated as to its official launch. Stef has also been and will continue to sit on the editorial board of the Afrique des Grands Lacs yearbook series and he would like to reiterate the invitation to alumni to submit contributions to this. A call for papers will be launched later this year.
20 years ago) so you want to receive and give back. Yet you need to keep some distance and that can at times be very difficult.

So it’s a matter of finding the right balance between being involved and engaged and committed and at the same time being able to critically reflect upon what even your direct partners – be it the UN or the Belgian or Burundian government – are doing, for instance, in the field of transitional justice, human rights, peace negotiations etc.

**X2C:** Do you ever find it daunting when you think about the fact that the policy advice we give, which is based on research we’ve done, will be put into practice and that we therefore bear a certain responsibility without ever being able to fully predict the consequences of what we advocate?

**SV:** I think that’s certainly part of the difficult side to the kind of work we do as academics. The “easy part” – mind the inverted commas – is to try and explain what has happened.

We frame things, we use labels, we sort of analyse developments in law and in policy and practice and well, you know, we can disagree and that is intellectually interesting and stimulating but still it’s the easy part and not really daunting in terms of the consequences of our work. But when it comes to translating those insights into advice and more prescriptive terms then it becomes very tricky.

If for example MPs in Burundi ask me “what should we do in terms of truth and reconciliation in our country?” there’s a lot I can say from a comparative point of view or from my legal background or referring to some best practices, but I’m not able to predict what consequences it will have in terms of destabilisation of the negotiated peace or of spoiler behaviour.

Recommending any kind of action on how to deal with the past may undermine the still somewhat fragile peace process that has been mildly successful so far, so it’s daunting in a way. And still at the same time for a white male Belgian researcher it remains a very comfortable position because I can give advice but the consequences will not affect me personally, directly, physically or financially.

Another consideration for me, and perhaps it’s just part of the process of getting older (and, who knows, wiser), is that my inclination to prescribe and recommend and issue do’s and don’ts has decreased compared to the early ‘90s. At the time, working as a human rights activist was very clear because it seemed as if the world was on the whole moving in a sort of politically liberalising, democratising direction.

So we thought we all knew what was going to happen and what needed to happen and that meant that it was very easy and comfortable to say well do this and don’t do that and if you adopt a human rights perspective to look at the world you have this very nice legal framework that generally supports your own ethical or ideological preferences.

20 years later, as we all know, there is a lot less certainty about the future of international relations or the next stage in a political transition process.

Today I am a lot less certain about what I could usefully recommend to societies undergoing transition.

**X2C:** Well in the mean time, good luck with settling in and (gently) helping our youthful students dispel their illusions...
Dr. Stef Vandeginste’s future research agenda includes the issue of unconstitutional changes of government. He would like to establish a research community/outreach network with IOB alumni who are interested in collaborating with him on this topic, which has been the subject of interesting developments at the level of the African Union (AU) both in political terms and in legal terms. There is an international treaty related to it: The African Charter on Democracy, Elections and Governance which entered into force in February 2012. 19 states have ratified the Charter so far, but they also need to implement it so there’s definitely a need for academic and broader civil society action related to putting it into practice. Interestingly in terms of actual practice the AU condemns military coups, imposes sanctions on those responsible, and works to prevent them from standing in elections etc whether that state has ratified the Charter or not.

While the notion of an unconstitutional change of government as it is currently defined remains somewhat problematic (for instance in terms of its inbuilt pro-incumbent bias), it’s interesting that it’s the AU and the African continent as a whole that’s taking the lead in defining this idea and dealing with it from a multi-level governance perspective. Usually the decision as to whether something is unconstitutional or not is a typically national issue, a matter of national sovereignty, whereas here a club of not necessarily very democratic leaders have agreed on a Charter and have thereby handed over a decision on what was until very recently an emphatically national matter to the intergovernmental level.

But what counts as an unconstitutional change of government? A military coup is a fairly straightforward case but what about a popular revolution against a perhaps not all that democratically elected government? What about flawed elections or the non-respect of presidential term limits? “These are all interesting questions and debates which I would want the IOB alumni research network to participate in and consider in more detail in terms of the entire political, legal and intergovernmental environment in their respective countries and what implications this can and should have at the national level. Because in the context of political transitions, whether in a post-conflict setting or not, there is an interplay between different levels at which political governance is being dealt with the national sovereign interrelating with the intergovernmental level but also with donors for instance, who may also have a very particular position on democratic elections and on rule of law. Though I’ll formulate a more detailed request in due course some of the things I’d want to hear about from alumni would be what the status of ratification is in their country, what that notion of unconstitutional changes of government means in their domestic law and their domestic policy, whether there has been any lobbying and outreach done by local civil society, what they see as problematic aspects in terms of the definition and the sanctions, whether they consider it to be a relevant topic for their particular country, whether they would be willing to engage in lobbying either for amending the concept or for having the treaty ratified by their parliament – these kinds of things”.

If you’re interested in doing some background reading on this topic, Dr. Vandeginste had an article published in the Journal of African Law earlier this year (it’s entitled “The African Union, Constitutionalism and Power-Sharing” http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0021855312000146) which looks not only at the law but also at the actual policy and practice of the AU, more specifically the Peace and Security Council of the AU and how it has imposed sanctions in response to unconstitutional changes of government.
he interfaculty course Debating Development will once again be offered in the 2013-2014 cycle. This year’s series is entitled "Development and Food: What’s on the menu?" and is thus thematically linked to a major campaign related to food security which is being run by one of the organizing organizations (11.11.11, which is the coalition of NGOs, unions, movements and solidarity groups in Flanders). Among other things the debates will look at the issue of whether we are we heading toward a global food crisis, as predicted by the United Nations, given the fact that emerging economies’ demand for food is on the rise and the food supply is being further pressurized by extreme weather events; and whether new and improved modes of food production and marketing could save the day. A more detailed description of the individual sessions can be found below, and are listed in chronological order:

8/10: Small scale agriculture or agricultural industry: who will bring us enough food?
The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) estimates that worldwide 870 million people were chronically undernourished in 2010-2012. The vast majority of these people live in developing countries. Additionally, processes of urbanization, population growth and changing consumption patterns in upcoming economies are boosting food demands worldwide. Is the global food system capable of feeding all these mouths? In this debate Dr. Vandana Shiva, an Indian environmental activist and eco-feminist, and Alexander Woolcombe of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, will discuss which agricultural model, small-scale or industrial, is most sustainable and appropriate to feed the world.

15/10: Food aid in conflict zones: curse of cure?
Is the delivery of food aid in conflict zones a life saver or does it rather contribute to or even exacerbate existing tensions? In their mission to alleviate human suffering during complex emergencies, aid agencies claim to be neutral actors. However, anecdotal evidence suggests that food aid is often stolen and actually contributes to the provisioning of fighting parties. And what about the impact of food aid on the local economy? Do humanitarian arguments outweigh the risks and consequences of food aid in conflict zones? In this debate, Zlatan Milisic of the World Food Program (WFP) will argue in favour of food aid in conflict zones whereas Simon Levine (ODI) will go deeper into the challenges and unintended consequences.

22/10: Insertion into global food value chains: boon or bane developing countries?
Thanks to globalisation, global food production networks and trade have spread and fragmented: now more than ever, producers, buyers, wholesale sellers and consumers of food are physically separated, operating in different corners of the world. Growing attention to food safety standards, labour conditions and the environment are changing the ways these value chains operate and are governed. As developing countries become active participants in increasingly modernised food value chains, especially on the production side, questions arise about the welfare implications this participation brings. Our keynote, Miet Maertens (KU Leuven) has conducted research which suggests that high-value food supply chains may hold significant benefits for rural households in developing countries. Arne Schollaert (Oxfam WW) will bring to the table critical questions about the concentration of power in modern food value chains and the far-from-optimal conditions under which producers participate.

29/10: Donor or competitor? European Agricultural Development Cooperation in Africa
The European Union is one of Africa’s biggest partners in agricultural development and has a longstanding commitment to tackling global hunger. In its 2011 “Agenda for Change” it placed the development of sustainable agriculture, food security and nutrition high on the agenda and through a variety of budget lines, such as the 1 billion euro Food Facility and the 230 million euro Action Plan on Food Security, it has put some of its money where its mouth is. But is it enough to make a difference? To answer this question we have invited Jean Pierre Halkin (European Commission) to comment on the EU’s role and actions in African agriculture development cooperation. He will also discuss how the development department coordinates its actions with other EU departments such as agriculture and trade. This EU policy will then be discussed by Jeske van Seters (European Centre for Development Policy and Management) who is the organisation’s deputy manager on food security. She specializes in regional markets for agricultural development and food security in Africa, aid for trade, and the institutional architecture and policies for EU external action.
5/11: The financialisation of food: opportunities and risks
We frequently hear about the fact that food price trends have harmed consumers, especially in poorer regions of the world where hunger and undernutrition have always been severe problems, and have caused social unrest. While nobody doubts the impact of traditional demand side (e.g., changing consumption patterns in emerging economies) and supply side factors (e.g., natural disasters), the effect of speculation by investors in food-related derivatives may be less clear-cut, and is hence more controversial. In this debate we move beyond the very technical and rather blunt question of whether or not excessive financial speculation has been the key driver of food price rises and volatility, to a broader discussion of the role the financial sector plays, or could play, in global food markets. Our keynote speaker Myriam Vanderstichele (SOMO) will give an overview of the different modes and instruments through which the financial sector increasingly participates in food markets and point to a number of risks this ‘financialisation’ of food poses. Discussant Michel Vermaerke (Febelfin), will then critically react and highlight a number of beneficial effects and possible opportunities associated with financial sector participation.

12/11: Ethical issues in genetically modified food: values and risks of biotechnology
In May 2011 a group of activists entered a piece of land in Wetteren, Belgium, where a genetically modified potato field trial was being carried out in order to protest against the uncritical use of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) for food commercialisation. This protest reflected wider concerns about the extent to which the proliferation of genetically modified food leads to farmers’ dependency on large multinational companies, in a situation where GMOs’ risks for environment and public health are unclear and regulatory frameworks are still lacking. At the same time, a number of prominent scientists emphasise the potential of GMOs for increasing food security worldwide. In this debate, Louise O. Fresco (University of Amsterdam) and bio-engineer Barbara van Dyck will touch on these and other critical issues as they discuss the benefits and pitfalls of GMOs.

19/11: How ‘fair’ is Fair Trade Food?
Although Fair Trade Food still only represents a minor proportion of total food product sales, its recent growth and diversification have been remarkable. Especially among North American and European consumers there is much public support for the claims of Fair Trade Food: it guarantees farmers fair prices, a higher level of income security, and better labour conditions, thereby reducing poverty. However, these claims can be questioned. Does Fair Trade Food really alleviate poverty, to a greater extent than ‘traditional’ ways of producing food? To what extent does it benefit the “poorest” producers? Are there alternatives? In this debate, Sushil Mohan (University of Dundee) who is the author of ‘Fair Trade Without the Froth’ will enter into discussion with Lily Deforce (Fairtrade Max Havelaar Belgium).

26/11: ANNO 2030: what to serve when you have nine billion mouths to feed?
With our global population set to reach close to 9 billion by 2050, the hunt is on to find new and sustainable ways to still the hunter-gatherer instincts that are driving a growing middle class around the world to these very inefficient sources of protein in the form of pre-packaged sirloin or sausage. Currently 70% of the world’s arable land is devoted to growing feed for livestock, and livestock furthermore emits 20% of all greenhouse gases. Since only 5 % of the population in industrialized countries seems to be amenable to vegetarianism, other breakthrough solutions are required. In this debate we try to think out of the box by inviting two international experts on alternative sources of proteins. Our first speaker, Mark Post (Maastricht University), received international attention when he served the world’s first test tube burger in August this year. Using stem-cell research, he wants to move the meat industry out of the farm and into the lab. Our second speaker, Arnold van Huis (Wageningen University) firmly believes that eating insects is a healthy and delicious way out of a global food crisis. As the primary author of “Het insectenkookboek” he tries to break the Western taboo on the consumption of insects and will surely convince you to try a grasshopper or two.
Australian Steve Killelea is a philanthropist turned peace advocate. He is an accomplished entrepreneur in high technology business development and at the forefront of philanthropic activities focused on sustainable development and peace. In 2000, he set up The Charitable Foundation, which is one of Australia’s biggest overseas aid providers. A few years later, he founded the Institute for Economics and Peace, a think tank dedicated to building a greater understanding of the inter-relationships between business, peace and economics with particular emphasis on the economic benefits of peace. Here he was able to draw on his analytical skills by developing an Index that measures the peacefulness of different countries. It’s called the Global Peace Index and it has become the world’s pre-eminent measure of national peacefulness. Steve is a regular speaker at global forums on conflict, peace, governance and development, and this year he has been invited to speak at the official opening ceremony of the IOB academic year.

In what follows, you can read up on some of the thinking that will inform Steve’s presentation.

The transition to a sustainable global economy will necessitate international co-operation and integration on an unprecedented scale. The major problems facing the nations of the world are global in nature, and thus require global solutions. This in turn requires peaceful co-operation because without it there cannot be the necessary levels of trust to reach a sustainable agreement. Peace is an essential prerequisite because without peace we will never be able to achieve the levels of co-operation, trust, inclusiveness and social equity necessary to solve our challenges, let alone empower the international institutions necessary to address them. But if peace is an essential prerequisite for solving our sustainability challenges and improving our economic and social wellbeing, then having a good understanding of peace is essential. This poses the question: How well do we understand peace? Fifty years ago peace studies were virtually non-existent. Today, there are thriving peace and conflict centres in numerous universities around the world. But most of these are focused on the study of conflict rather than on the understanding of peace. A parallel can be drawn here with medical science. The study of pathology has led to numerous breakthroughs in our understanding of how to treat and cure disease. However, there is more than that to health. It was only when medical science turned its focus on the study of healthy human beings that we understood what we need to do to stay healthy—the right physical exercise, a good mental disposition and a healthy diet. This could only be learnt by studying what was working. In the same way, the study of conflict is fundamentally different from the study of peace.

Over the last century we have moved from having departments of war to departments of defence and we are now seeing the emergence of organisations that are lobbying for the creation of departments of peace within governments. While these changes are beneficial in improving our understanding of peace, peace is not yet seen as germane to the major academic disciplines, nor is there a methodological approach to the cross-disciplinary study of peace. There are no courses on the literature of peace in any of the literature departments of the major universities, yet there are profound works on peace. Similarly, there is no university chair of peace economics in any major economics faculties, yet most business people believe that their markets grow in peace and that their costs decrease with increasing peacefulness.

The simplest way of approaching the definition of peace is in terms of harmony achieved by the absence of war, conflict or violent crime. Applied to states, this would suggest that the measurement of internal states of peace is as important as those external factors involving other states or neighbours. This is what Johan Galtung...
(1985) defined as ‘negative peace’—the absence of violence. The concept of negative peace is immediately intuitive and empirically measurable, and can be used as a starting point to elaborate its counterpart concept, ‘positive peace’. Having established what constitutes an absence of violence, is it possible through statistical analysis to identify which structures, institutions and social attitudes create and maintain peace?

Measurement is the key to understanding any human endeavour, and peace is no different. If we do not measure peace, then how can we know whether our actions are either helping or hindering us in the achievement of a more peaceful world? Only by measuring and understanding the patterns of peace can we move to a better understanding of how it can be improved.

The Global Peace Index (GPI) was developed in 2007 by the Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP) as one of the first rigorous attempts to measure the relative levels of the peacefulness of nations. By aggregating and generating a comprehensive and reliable data set which measures direct violence, the GPI adds to the current stock of harmonised cross-country data. Since 2007 it has informed policy-makers, academics and civil society organisations about the objective state of direct violence in countries, covering over 99% of the world’s population. The purpose of this research is to better understand the cultural, economic and political conditions associated with peaceful environments.

Until recently, the GPI focused on measuring ‘negative peace’, which was described by Johan Galtung as the ‘absence of violence’ and the ‘absence of the fear of violence’. Hence, the GPI utilises 23 indicators of safety and security in society, militarisation, and ongoing domestic and international conflict to determine the multi-dimensional nature of negative peace in 158 countries. This means that nations with a high ranking in the GPI are considered more peaceful because they are relatively safer and more secure than countries lower in the rankings.

In contrast to negative peace, Galtung described a second dimension called positive peace. Broadly understood, positive peace is derived from preventative solutions which are optimistic and facilitate a more integrated society. According to Galtung this results in ‘co-operation for mutual benefit, and where individuals and society are in harmony’. From this conceptual basis, IEP defines positive peace to be the set of attitudes, institutions and structures which when strengthened, lead to a more peaceful society.

This resulted in the development of the ‘pillars of peace’ - an eight-part taxonomy which categorises the data sets that are statistically significant with the GPI. Conceptually, this emphasises the importance of a holistic set of institutions which work together to systematically shape the environments that lead to peace. It is important to understand that this framework is not deriving causality between any of the attributes of the pillars of peace; rather, they work as an inter-dependent set of factors where causality and strength of a relation will change depending on the individual set of a country’s specific political, economic and cultural circumstances.

[1] The definition of violence is adapted from the World Health Organisation (WHO): ‘the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, destruction of property, maldevelopment, or deprivation’ (WHO 2002: 4).

A day in the life of an IOB Master’s student
combining fieldwork with caring for her baby daughter

Patricia Pérez, 35, is Swiss-Ecuadorian with Asian roots and has lived in seven different countries, so it’s probably not surprising that she likes to think of herself as a “citizen of the world”. She spent the summer writing her Masters dissertation (an evaluation of a Conditional Cash Transfer Program from a gender perspective, more specifically looking at the paradox of using of women’s reproductive role to achieve development and how this conceptualization of social programs based on traditional gender roles perpetuates gender inequality). When we heard that she was not only engaging in field work, but doing so in combination with caring for her baby daughter, we were curious to discover how she managed to combine these things and asked her to write up an outline of how she spent her first day. She notes that “combining my studies with caring for a young child has increased my time management skills and taught me to put aside some ‘bad habits’ I used to have such as sleeping, eating at regular hours, and having free time for myself. However, all this is worth it when I see my little one smiling at me. Moreover, my mother taught me that anything is possible if there is the willingness to achieve it. So very soon I will be the proud holder of a Master’s diploma and at the same time have my best accomplishment ever: my daughter Emeline”.

We are ready to go, let’s start the adventure!

After over 20 hours of travelling, we arrive in Quito and go to bed straight away. The next day goes as follows:

6:00 Emeline wakes up (apparently she has never heard of jet lag, lucky girl! I feed her and prepare myself for the day.

7:00 Breakfast: ‘magically’ everything is ready (thanks to my mum).

7:30 I go to the bus station and head to Quito. The view is amazing, lots of volcanoes and mountains wrapped in mist accompany my ride.

8:30 Time to work, plenty of things to do, where to start first? I schedule my activities for the day.

9:00 First interviews with the beneficiaries of the program I am working with during my field research.

12:00 Lunch time, time to meet informally with old friends and the children of CENIT.

13:00 I start with the organization of the internal evaluation. I plan the workshop and the meetings for the coming days.

15:00 Meeting with the local staff to discuss my field research.

16:00 Time to go home and see my little treasure.

18:00 I am finally home, but for someone else this means ‘action time’! Before playing with Emeline, she helps me to prepare the documents for the coming day.

19:00 I give her a bath, her milk and then it is time to sleep.

20:00 My sweetheart sleeps and I can read some documents I took home.

22:00 I take a shower and finally go sleep.

22:01 ZZZZZZZZZZZZZ.
A long-held tradition within IOB is to hold a multicultural dinner, where staff and students are invited to taste the traditional dishes of the currently enrolled group, and this year was no certainly no exception. The timing was absolutely perfect: students had just finished module III and defended their end-of-module papers in the week of the 27th of May. The dinner was held on the evening of the 1st of June in the university cafeteria Agora. The student committee proposed an entrance fee of 7 euros per person, regardless of whether you had cooked or not. This democratic price system was established with the aim of refunding all the expenses of those students who cooked, and this system worked out very well.

The dinner itself turned out to be a great success! Studying at IOB gives you the wonderful opportunity to travel each and every day to far away countries through the experiences and stories students share with each other. The multicultural dinner definitely added texture, sweetness and spices to these daily trips we undertake. The buffet tables at Agora were set up in such a way that each table represented a continent. We had the Asian table with food from a range of countries: Philippines, Indonesia, Taiwan, Vietnam and Bangladesh. The African continent was represented by Kenya, Ghana and Ethiopia. Latin America brought forward local dishes from Brazil, Peru, Nicaragua and Ecuador. Europe had to settle for the Netherlands and Belgium. Given the range of countries represented, one can only imagine what a delicious feast erupted! The student committee would like to thank all the students who helped with the event and took time and effort to cook these divine traditional dishes!

If just reading this is making you want to head in the direction of the kitchen for a snack, check out the recipes below which detail two of the dishes that were served on the night: one savoury and one sweet.

By Sebastian Van Hoeck

Andrea Azevedo shared with us her recipe for Brigadeiros:

**Ingredients**
- 1 can of sweet condensed milk
- 2–4 table spoons of cocoa power
- 2 tablespoons of butter
- chocolate sprinkles

**Cooking Instructions:**
- melt roughly 1 tablespoon of butter in a non-stick pan on medium-low heat
- once the butter has melted, add the entire can of condensed milk
- add the chocolate, mixing it with the condensed milk until it is fully incorporated
- stir with a wooden spoon; you will need to stir for at least 15 minutes (but sometimes it can even take up to 40 minutes). Stir in circular movements and include whatever sticks to the sides so that it does not stay there and burn. The Brigadeiro mixture will get thicker and thicker and will reduce in volume – you’ll know it is ready when either you divide it in half with the spoon and it stays parted for a few seconds or you scoop some of it with the wooden spoon, turn the spoon upside down, and it stays there for a moment before falling back into the pan
- spread the thickened content of the pan onto a plate and wait for about 30 minutes for it to cool off
- to make the little balls, spread a little bit of butter in your hands, making sure to get your fingers too. Using a small spoon, scoop up some Brigadeiro batter, put it in your hands, and roll it into a little ball
- roll the ball on the chocolate sprinkles to cover it completely
- place your Brigadeiro in a baking cup
- repeat--should yield about 25 Brigadeiros
Alumni News
By Sara Dewachter

Prizes:
We would like to congratulate the following alumni for the fact that the excellent work they have done has been recognized by virtue of a prize or award:

**IOB alumnus Joseph Asunka (International Training Programme ‘Making the PRSP work’ 2005) wins prestigious award**
Joseph Asunka, a political science graduate student, has been selected to receive one of the Charles E. and Sue K. Young Graduate Student Awards for 2012-13. The awards recognize outstanding graduate students for exemplary academic achievement, research, and service to the campus and the community. These are highly select awards with only about half a dozen students being selected from across the entire university each year. In addition to a $10,000 fellowship, the awardees are recognized at a gala dinner in the autumn. (from: [http://www.polisci.ucla.edu/news/joseph-asunka-wins-prestigious-graduate-student-award/](http://www.polisci.ucla.edu/news/joseph-asunka-wins-prestigious-graduate-student-award/))

**IOB alumnus Gerald Bareebe wins 2013 Trudeau scholarship**
The Trudeau scholarship supports brilliant social sciences and humanities doctoral students who are researching and sharing innovative ideas that will help solve issues of critical importance to Canadians. IOB alumnus Gerald Bareebe has been awarded one of these Trudeau scholarships. He will be working on “Personalization of Power and Developmental Patrimonialism: The Case of Uganda and Rwanda. Can democratic institutions survive the personalization of power?” (from: [http://www.fondationtrudeau.ca/en/themes/publications/2013-trudeau-scholarship-announcement-official-release](http://www.fondationtrudeau.ca/en/themes/publications/2013-trudeau-scholarship-announcement-official-release))

Have you also been awarded a prize or published your research, or are you keen to share your policy advisory work or policy briefs? Then please let us know so we can share your work with other alumni through our magazine, website or facebook group!

Alumni community:
Going abroad and looking to meet up with former classmates, but you don’t have their current email address? Looking for (a) fellow IOB alumnus/a in your region or because you started a job in a different city/country? Update your personal data so IOB and other alumni can keep in touch and so you can look up your old classmates! You can check out the IOB Online Alumni Community at [http://alumniiob.ua.ac.be](http://alumniiob.ua.ac.be).

Upcoming meet and greet in The Philippines
An alumni seminar will be organised in Manilla at the beginning of November 2013 (date and location to be confirmed). The seminar will be hosted by prof. German Calfat. It will include several presentations by IOB staff/ PhD students/ alumni and Philippine researchers. A social event will also be organized. A formal invitation to attend the seminar will follow in the near future.

Publications (Alumni authors in bold):
**Tata Precillia Ijang & Cleto Ndikumagenge (2013)**

**Geenen, S., Fahey, D. and Iragi, F. (2013)**

**Holvoet, N., Inberg, L. and Sekirime, S. (2013)**

**Glaister, L. and Holvoet, N. (2013)**

Online seminars:

Alumni survey:
In 2010 the IOB for the first time organized a survey amongst its alumni to find out more about their level of satisfaction with their studies at IOB, their work experience afterwards and how IOB could facilitate a stronger alumni network to nurture exchange and cooperation between both IOB staff and alumni and alumni themselves. Since new IOB alumni join the IOB family every year and since many people's careers, countries of residence and expectations of alumni services change over time, we are planning to launch a new IOB alumni survey at the end of 2013. It is important for us to get a good idea of what you expect from us and to map IOB students’ professional careers in order to be able to improve the IOB experience both in and beyond Antwerp. For this reason we would really appreciate it if you would take the time to fill in the questionnaire! Every alumnus/a will be sent a personal invitation to participate in the survey. A link will also be made available on our website: [http://www.uantwerpen.be/iob](http://www.uantwerpen.be/iob). Many thanks in advance for participating!

Summer school
The recent summer school hosted by IOB entitled ‘The Politics and Economics of Aid’ was also largely made available through live-stream sessions for those that were unable to attend. You can check out the seminars at [http://www.ua.ac.be/main.aspx?c=POLECAID&n=112290](http://www.ua.ac.be/main.aspx?c=POLECAID&n=112290).

The summer school was attended by a number of current IOB students. Ogwang Allan Young shared his impressions as follows: “From my point of view as a development practitioner, the summer school has helped me understand the dynamics and realities of foreign aid and the aid supply chain. I have learnt how historical relationships and diplomatic and political interests greatly influence the choice of aid modalities and aid allocation. I have furthermore learnt that the economic and political environment (policies) of aid recipient countries greatly determines the effectiveness of aid. However, it remains important to be realistic about development indicators, ideas, perceptions, and the contexts in which aid is provided and implemented. I would certainly recommend this summer school to anyone involved in international development work either in academia or as a practitioner.”

The group of summer schoolers was also kindly received in Brussels by alumni Guggi Laryea (World Bank) and Laura Sullivan (Action Aid).

Facebook
IOB has its own facebook page and its own facebook alumni group(s). There is a separate facebook group for some countries (e.g. Uganda, the Philippines, etc.) and some academic years (e.g. 2011, 2012). If you feel like joining or starting up a group, then please let us know. Also, don’t forget to join the IOB alumni group (Iob Ua) and like our page (Institute of Development Policy and Management - Development Studies). [http://www.facebook.com/iob.ua?fref=ts](http://www.facebook.com/iob.ua?fref=ts)