

Bridging the Technological Divide
Brief Report
on the
ACP-EU Policy Workshop
on Research and Technology for Development
University of Ghana, Legon
January 29 –31, 2001

The ACP-EU Policy Workshop on Research and Technology for Development aimed at setting the stage for a renewed policy dialogue on Science and Technology (S&T) between Europe and partners in the South. On the basis of five country studies (Dominican Republic, Ghana, Senegal, Uganda, and Vietnam) and a methodology paper, a framework for policy dialogue was designed. Forty researchers, policy makers and representatives from civil society and private enterprise met during three days and agreed to collaborate on practical measures to improve conditions for S&T development in their respective countries. The agreement is laid down in the Legon Statement on Science and Technology for Development in ACP Countries to be officially presented to the respective authorities. This brief report elaborates on discussions, which lie at the base of the respective statement and ten action points to realize its contents.

Background

The policy workshop is part of the project Research and Technology Development (RTD): support to the ACP-EU Policy Dialogue. This project is implemented by the European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM) in Maastricht on behalf of the European Commission (DG-Dev) and funded by the Netherlands Government (DGIS/DCO-CO). The project aims at developing a methodology for a RTD Policy Dialogue in developing countries and with donors, especially the EC, EU Member States, Norway and Switzerland. For this purpose, four country studies were done and workshops organised in Europe (for discussion with EC and EU Member States). A web-based Observatory was established, to gather and share relevant information. The policy workshop in Ghana was the 'Southern workshop' – a gathering of Southern experts on S&T policy management – to discuss and disseminate findings from the studies and set a common agenda for policy dialogue in developing countries and with the European donors. The workshop was organised jointly by Ghana University's Institute for Statistics and Socio-Economic Studies (ISSER) in Legon and ECDPM.

Participants

Some 40 participants, representing stakeholders in both the South and Europe attended the workshop. The following stakeholder categories were present: (i) researchers and policy makers (from the Dominican Republic, Ghana, Senegal, Uganda, and Vietnam); (ii) civil society representatives; (iii) business networks; (iv) regional organisations; (iv) EU donors; and (v) resource persons. For a complete list of participants see Appendix 2.

Programme of the workshop

The programme of the Workshop was agreed between the researchers of the country studies, the representatives of the EC and the organising institutes (ISSER and ECDPM). The programme had three components (for the complete programme, see Appendix 3)::

- *Policy review:* statements by policy makers from the case countries, including key note addresses by the Vice Chancellor of the University of Ghana, the Minister of State for Industry and Technology of Uganda, and the Delegate of the European Commission in Accra;

- *Research review*: presentations and discussion of key-issues in S&T policy dialogue in the case countries, from a methodological perspective;
- *Advocacy*: formulation of the Legon Statement on Science and Technology for Development in ACP countries (see Appendix 1), the presentation of the Statement to the Press, to the European Commission and to the National Authorising Officer in the Ministry of Finance, Ghana.

The workshop was held at the University of Ghana in Legon (Accra), which provided its excellent conference facilities of the Noguchi Memorial Institute for Medical Research. The sessions were chaired by two eminent experts in the fields of *Science and Technology* (Professor Walter S. Alhassan, Director General of the Ghana Council for Industrial and Scientific Research, CSIR); and of *Policy Dialogue* (Dr Carl Greenidge, Director General, Technical Centre for Agriculture and Rural Development, CTA).

A Press Conference was held with six journalists at the University of Ghana.

The Chairpersons presented the Legon Statement at the meeting of European Delegates in Accra on February 1, 2001 (in the company of Mr Robert-Jan Scheer, DG-Dev of the European Commission), and to the National Authorising Officer of the Government of Ghana.

Discussions

Three days of remarkably well informed and involved discussions cannot be rendered sufficiently in a brief report. A selection therefore is made of the most salient issues. Following the Legon Statement on Science and Technology for Development in ACP countries, these can be defined as follows:

1. How promote an open dialogue on S&T policies for development?

A strong case was made for the necessary linkage between S&T and general development policies. Mainstreaming was a word often used by participants. Research needs to be a cross cutting concern, to be incorporated in on-going programmes. This is particularly true for co-operation under the Cotonou Agreement (Art. 30D). Through the involvement of different actors in designing specific co-operation strategies, the Agreement allows for the inclusion of researchers as representatives of civil society. This general role of researchers permits them also to make a case for S&T priorities in the selected country co-operation programmes (National Indicative Plans, NIPs) or regional strategies (regional Indicative Plans, RIPs). It was stressed that involving Governments at the highest level increases the 'visibility' of S&T. Involving the private sector in the dialogue was considered to be ever more important.

2. How to use the policy dialogue for setting a S&T policy agenda?

The case for a S&T paragraph in the RIPs and NIPs still needs to be made. Regional organizations, national governments and the EC have yet to emphasise the importance of national and regional S&T capacities for self sustained development in ACP countries. The Commission has downgraded the priority of S&T and subsumed it under the general policy priority of Institutional Development. National governments vary widely in their priorities regarding S&T. In the case countries (Dominican Republic, Ghana, Senegal, Uganda and Vietnam) official interest could be raised through a lobby by the research community. Each country team therefore committed itself to approaching the relevant authorities to try and get the theme on the agenda for the upcoming negotiations with respect of the NIPs with the EC. Once on the agenda, national S&T dialogues could lead to further specifying of priorities.

3. How prepare capacity for country studies?

The participants accepted the proposed framework for the country studies developed by Professor Wiebe Bijker of the University of Maastricht. The latter collected their relevant comments and suggestions in order to include these in an updated version of the methodology paper. He argued that results of the four country studies showed that a practical methodology for

diagnostic study was available and could be applied in other countries. He concluded that the case studies had demonstrated that

- S&T policy dialogues were effective whenever they were organized;
- the S&T domain was strong enough to start a public debate to set policy priorities;
- the private sector could be involved, provided the right conditions were created; and
- consensus on S&T priorities could be generated both nationally and internationally

The team of researchers, who carried out the country studies, could become the base for the training of new researchers to do comparable studies in other interested countries. A first start could be made in the COMESA region, for example through a joint venture with the Ugandan team. In addition, other research networks could be approached to link up. These studies could be done as part of a larger effort, for example the Research Bridging Fund that was proposed at the Legon workshop. This fund (Euro 20 million) could allocate the resources required to do case studies in preparation for S&T policy priority setting.

4. How can information on experience with S&T Policy Dialogues best be shared?

The meeting discussed the formation of an ACP Informal Working Group on S&T and requested CTA to become the focal point of such a group. Its Director General, Dr Carl Greenidge, accepted this request. DG Dev was requested to consider support for an ACP Information Centre on S&T. In addition, it was recommended to create regional Observatories. Participants from Ghana and Uganda were requested to draw up proposals for these Observatories. The workshop foresaw also interest for such Observatories in Francophone Africa and in the Caribbean. Involving different stakeholders was seen as essential in order to bring the needed information together in a so-called 'one basket' approach. The workshop recommended that the project's RTD Observatory on the oneworld.net/thinktank website needed to be re-vamped and expanded.

5. What can European donors do to promote information dissemination?

Representatives from Austria, Denmark, France, Netherlands, Sweden and the UK participated actively in the workshop's debates. They showed substantial interest in a structural framework for a S&T Policy Dialogue. The workshop concluded that donors could assist, in particular in the following ways:

- providing funding for assessment studies of the national policy dialogues and agendas on RTD in countries, which they already assist;
- providing support for in-country S&T policy dialogues;
- co-funding of regional Observatories (in Ghana, Uganda, Francophone Africa, and the Caribbean); and
- co-funding of the establishment of an Information Centre on S&T.

Most importantly, the donors could provide political support in Brussels, by instructing their Permanent Representatives at the EC in line with the Legon Statement. Linking with INCO STD programmes was strongly recommended. ECDPM offered to provide support to information dissemination through a special issue of its *Capacity.org* newsletter.

6. How to integrate S&T Priorities in the on-going EU-ACP policy dialogue?

The workshop recommended that case studies and the results of the in-country policy dialogues could be transmitted to policy makers involved in the ACP-EU consultations leading up to the RIPs and NIPs. The EC representatives stressed the fact that civil society and academic representation is now part of the regular consultation process. It was therefore recommended that country teams provide follow-up of the Legon meeting in their own countries. In addition, contact with the EC Delegates needs to be made to provide a linkages between these national initiatives and the EC.

7. How can institutional capacity be built in ACP countries to be an equal partner in the policy dialogue with the EU?

The workshop concluded that the key to success lies in institutional capacity development in ACP countries. The present programme has initiated a small network at the national and international

levels. It was hoped that the institutions which have done the case studies could become the basis for a focused institutional development effort. At the regional level, Observatories could provide institutional support. Regional organizations such as COMESA and CARIFORUM could be approached. At ACP level, CTA might be interested to assist in giving institutional support for the dissemination of information on S&T. In Europe, ECDPM could provide support to ACP-wide capacity mobilisation activities. The Centre could be actively involved in rendering assistance in explaining the Cotonou Agreement, in collaboration with ACP institutions.

8. How can an ACP view on S&T policies best be articulated?

ICT and biotechnology are only two out of many issues in the current S&T debate, yet they evoke considerable interest. The case of Vietnam shows that participation in such hi-tech can be promoted through adequate government policies allowing for private investment in technology development. In the case of Africa, the private sector (especially the SME) is neither interested in, nor adequately organized for technology development. Policy dialogue with the private sector will therefore be a drawn-out process, requiring stamina and good-will, as well as long term funding. Networks that promote technology development by the private sector (like Interface) have only recently emerged and still depend on a few champions. Examples in Uganda and Ghana do show that some enterprises are willing to play ball. However, the Vietnamese situation of tax-credits is far removed from the political reality in most African countries.

The workshop felt that the wider issues of S&T capacity development are often overlooked. The need for adequate high school courses in mathematics and science, for university based training in engineering and sciences, for support to agricultural or agro-industrial research, etc. are often forgotten. It is only by bringing these issues to the fore – as part of a concentrated campaign to raise interest in S&T -- that an ACP view on the need for such policies can be realized.

The foregoing discussions (reflected in the Legon Statement), the establishment of a Research Bridging Fund, the creation of Information Centres and Observatories, could all contribute to an ACP-wide priority for S&T. However, participants of the workshop agreed that we are still a long way off from such a consensus. It was argued that only by involving ACP Heads of State can progress be expected; through ownership at the highest level, a visibility for the topic can be achieved. Thus, policy co-ordination could be realized and the necessary legislation be achieved (as was the case in the Dominican Republic). ACP scientists need to undertake a concerted lobby action to convince their Heads of State, and act together to strengthen the negotiation position in national or international forums. Most participants agreed that a regional approach is called for and that organizations like COMESA, ECOWAS and CARICOM be approached and urged to give to the inclusion of an S&T paragraph in RIPs.

9. How can the findings of the present studies best be disseminated to be effective?

The workshop recommended that the present studies be presented to the respective authorities at the national regional and international (EU) levels. In addition, the EU Informal Expert Group on RTD will be presented with the results of this workshop. The Swedish Government informed the meeting of provisional plans for a Conference on Advanced Knowledge Systems in international development co-operation to be held in Lund towards the end of 2001. At this conference, the results of the country studies and the conclusions of this workshop could be presented and progress on S&T policies debated. The project's Observatory on the oneworld.net/thinktank website could be expanded to become a meeting place on the Web, especially if it is linked to Observatories (like the proposed one in Uganda) and the work to be undertaken by CTA.

Ten action points resulting from the workshop

The workshop compiled a list of 10 urgent actions to be undertaken this year. In summary, the participants

1. decided to undertake appropriate action to *ensure the widest possible distribution of the Legon Statement on S&T for Development* to science communities, regional (research) networks and appropriate authorities in their respective countries/ regions and at appropriate events such as the forthcoming DFID workshop in South Africa.
2. resolved to *lobby* – together with the national S&T communities in their respective countries –
 - with appropriate regional organizations (such as COMESA and ECOWAS) *to ensure the inclusion of S&T in EC's Regional Indicative Plans*;
 - with the National Authorizing Officers and the EC Delegations in their respective countries *to ensure the inclusion of S&T in EC's National Indicative Plans*.
3. planned to approach the National Authorizing Officers in their respective countries *to write letters to the EC expressing interest for a Research Bridging Facility* (of 10 to 20 million Euro to be funded by the EC) and requesting for a feasibility study at short notice.
4. requested *CTA in Wageningen to function as focal point for an ACP Working Group on S&T* – with participants from the ACP countries and Vietnam.
5. asked *EC DG-Dev to finance an international information dissemination centre on S&T*.
6. undertook *to develop an ACP Observatory on S&T for Development* to collect and share information on latest developments in S&T and their applications.
7. urged Sida and SAREC *to go ahead with the preparations of a conference on Advanced Knowledge Systems in Development Co-operation*, tentatively scheduled for November 2001.
8. advised ECDPM and Maastricht University *to revitalize the current Thinktank on RTD*, in particular as a mechanism for information distribution leading up to the proposed Swedish conference.
9. recommended ECDPM *to focus the April 2001 edition of its publication Capacity.org on building capacity for dialogue on S & T for Development*.
10. encouraged ECDPM *to distribute its information packages on the Cotonou Agreement* (so-called Infokits) to all participants and to additional contacts to be provided by participants.

*This workshop report was compiled by Louk Box, Heather Baser and Rutger Engelhard.
ECDPM, Maastricht, 20 February 2001.*

Appendix 1:

LEGON STATEMENT ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT IN ACP COUNTRIES

31 January 2001

**ACP-EU Policy Workshop
on
Research and Technology for Development**
University of Ghana, Legon
January 29-31, 2001

Bridging the technological divide

A technological divide increasingly separates rich and poor nations. Most developed nations devote 2.5-4 per cent of their GNP to research and development. In the developing world generally and in countries in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific (ACP) particularly, the average is only 0.5 per cent. This huge investment gap is illustrated by several indices such as the number of scientists and engineers in research and development. In Europe and Central Asia, there are 2,534 scientists per million people. This contrasts with only 15 in Nigeria and 3 in Senegal. The average figure for ACP countries is less than 10. Another striking indicator of technological output is the number of patent applications. In 1997, 800,000 applications were filed worldwide. Only 38 came from sub-Saharan Africa, of whom 23 from one country, Kenya.

Economic development is most likely to occur in societies that succeed in linking their knowledge base to innovation systems. Knowledge, indigenous and external, needs to permeate all aspects of social life and production. The above statistics clearly illustrate the challenge provoked by the technological divide.

The developing countries have a long history of research collaboration with Europe. The importance of Science and Technology (S&T) collaboration has been recognised in resolutions by the European Parliament such as the proposal by Michel Rocard, the former President of the Development Committee, to create a European Foundation for Research and Development. In addition, European Union policy statements and the recently signed Cotonou Agreement have confirmed the commitment to long standing S&T partnerships between developing countries and EU Member States, Norway and Switzerland.

The European Commission (EC) is presently formulating an S&T development policy to strengthen such partnerships. In this context, five country studies (Dominican Republic, Ghana, Senegal, Uganda and Vietnam) were undertaken to assess national S&T policies, including policy dialogues that led up to them. The studies were discussed during an ACP-EU workshop on S&T.

The workshop acknowledged the crucial role that S&T plays in economic development. Therefore, policy makers need to accord higher priority to S&T on their national and regional development policy agendas. *Policy dialogues involving different stakeholders are crucial in the*

¹ The ACP-EU Policy Workshop on RTD (Legon/Accra, 29-31 January 2001) was organized by the Institute of Statistical, Social and Economic Research (ISSER) in Accra and the European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM) in the Netherlands and co-funded by the Government of the Netherlands.

development of such policy agendas. The workshop accepted a methodology for assessing national S&T policy dialogues and noted its results in the various countries.

Recommendations

1. Greater recognition should be accorded to the critical role of an *open dialogue* in the preparation of S&T policies for development.
2. ACP countries are therefore urged to formulate *national S&T policy agendas* through enhanced national policy dialogue. The dialogue is seen as an open learning process that ensures ownership and continuity of the S&T policy agenda. All stakeholders need to be involved, including the private sector, civil society, the grassroots, the research community and policy makers.
3. ACP countries are recommended to undertake *studies* that analyse the S&T landscape. By promoting participation of stakeholders in such studies, ownership of the results is enhanced. The countries are encouraged to refine and apply the methodology mentioned before and to promote training and capacity building to do such studies.
4. ACP regions are recommended to establish an *S&T Observatory* (clearing house) to collect and share information on latest developments in S&T and their applications. The Observatory will have antennae in each region to link with the private sector, civil society and regional networks.
5. The EC is recommended to finance a study for the establishment of a mechanism for *information dissemination on S&T*, recognising the importance of advanced knowledge management systems for development.
6. The ACP States and the EC are recommended to ensure *due recognition for S&T priorities* within the chosen priority areas in the national and regional support strategies, which form the basis for national and regional indicative programmes. In practical terms, EC Delegates and the ACP National Authorising Officers are urged to include S&T as an agenda item in their policy dialogue in the months to come.
7. The EC is recommended to establish a *research bridging facility* along the lines of similar existing mechanisms for the private sector. This Facility could provide seed money to activities designed to bridge the gap between policy makers, end-users and researchers. The aim of the Facility would be to generate the conditions and to develop the capacity for S&T in ACP countries. A feasibility study should be completed in 2001 preferably by Southern researchers and in co-operation with regional research networks and end-users. The Facility could promote capacity to undertake S&T diagnostic studies and national and regional policy dialogues in developing countries.
8. An ACP *Informal Working Group for S&T* should be established for mobilising intellectual and political support. This group could be composed of regional representatives and include policy makers, end-users and researchers. The ACP participants in the workshop requested the Technical Centre for Agriculture and Rural Development (CTA, Wageningen) to function as focal point for this Working Group.
9. The Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency (Sida) is planning an international conference on *Advanced Knowledge Systems in Development Co-operation*. It is recommended that the results of the feasibility study for the recommended research bridging facility be presented at this conference in the presence of a strong ACP delegation.

Appendix 2:

List of participants

		e-mail addresses
Chair	Dr Carl Greenidge (Director CTA, Wageningen)	cbgreenidge@cta.nl
Chair	Professor W.S. Alhassan (Director CSIR, Accra)	walteralhassan@hotmail.com
Key note speakers		
Uganda	Dr A. Rwendeire (Minister of State for Industry & Technology)	psl@infocom.co.ug
Senegal	Gisele d'Almeida (Entrepreneur)	ims@tpsnet.sn
Europe	Amos Tincani (EC-DG Dev)	amos.tincani@cec.eu.int
Researchers for ACP countries		
Uganda	Dr Alex Tindimubona (Director NURRU)	astex@imu.l.com
Vietnam	Dr N.T. Ha (Director Technology Strategies NISTPASS)	ha@ism.ac.vn
Vietnam	Dr N.T. Thu (Dept Director Planning MOSTE)	ntth@moste.gov.vn
Senegal	Dr Moussa K. Cisse (ENDA)	energy2@end.sn
Dom Rep	Dr Antonio Almonte Reynoso (Director INDOTEC)	indotec@codetel.net.do
Dom Rep	Dr Francisco Checo (Director CIECA)	fr.checo@codetel.net.do
Ghana	Dr J.O. Gogo (Director STEPRI)	jogogo@usa.net
Ghana	Professor W.A. Asomaning (Dean of Science, Univ of Ghana)	n.a.
Ghana	Professor A. Ayensu (Director INSS, Accra)	n.a.
Ghana	Dr. Ellen Bortei-Doku Aryeetey (Head Social Research, ISSER)	ebortei@ghana.com
Ghana	Professor Dr Kwadwo Asenso-Okyere (Director ISSER)	n.a.
Ghana	Professor Marian Addy (Dept. Biochemistry, Univ of Ghana)	ewurama@ug.edu.gh
Ghana	Dr Yao Graham, Third World Network	n.a.
Ghana	Dr Rexford Osei (Minsitry of Environm. S&T, Accra)	barnes@africaonline.com
Ghana	Mr. D. Barnes (Chief Director, Min. of Environm., S&T, Accra)	barnes@africaonline.com
Ghana	Dr Ferdinand Tay (ag DG Nat. Dev. Planning Commission, Accra)	n.a.
Ghana	Mr S.M. Abu-Bakar (GRATIS, Accra)	gratis@ighmail.com
Africa	Professor Uzo Mokwunye (Rector UN INRA)	n.a.
Africa	Joan Pilcher, COMESA	jpilcher@comesa.int
Representatives from the European Commission		
Europe	Mr Robert Jan Scheer (EC DG Dev)	robert.scheer@cec.eu.int
Ghana	Mr. Klaus-Dieter Gautsch (EC Delegation Accra)	klaus.gautsch@delcomgh.org
Ghana	Mr Alessandro Mariani (EC Delegate Accra)	alessandro.mariani@delcomgh.org
Representatives from EU Member States		
Denmark	Mr Kurt Klitten (Danish Embassy, Accra)	accamb@accamb.um.dk
UK	Dr Susan Chandler (DFID, Dept. International Development)	s-chandler@dfid.gov.uk
Austria	Dr Stephan Neuhaeuser (Dept. General Intern'l Affairs- Science)	stephan.neuhaeuser@bmbwk.gv.at
Sweden	Dr Ros-Mari Balów (SAREC, Dept. Research Co-operation)	ros-mari.balow@sida.se
Sweden	Dr Anita Sandström (SATEC, Head Division University Support)	anita.sandstrom@sida.se
France	Denis Decraene (French Embassy, Cooperation Attaché, Accra)	denis.decraene@diplomatic.gouv.fr
Resource persons		
Netherlands	Professor Wiebe Bijker (University Maastricht)	w.bijker@tss.unimaas.nl
UK	Dr Guy Poulter (NRI)	r.g.poulter@gre.ac.uk
Organizing Committee		
Ghana	Professor Ernest Aryeetey (Dept Director ISSER)	aryeetey@ghana.com
Netherlands	Professor Louk Box (University Maastricht)	louk@delarivebox.nl
Netherlands	Mrs Heather Baser (ECDPM)	hb@ecdpm.org
Netherlands	Mr Rutger Engelhard ECDPM)	re@ecdpm.org

Appendix 3:

ACP-EU Policy Workshop on RTD Programme

Legon (Ghana), 29-31 January 2001

Chairpersons

Professor Walter S. Alhassan, Director General CSIR, Legon/Accra, Ghana
Dr Carl B. Greenidge, Director General, CTA, Wageningen, The Netherlands

Monday, 29 January 2001		
Exploring RTD policy environment in ACP countries		Chair: Walter S. Alhassan
09.00	Registration	
09.30	Welcome by the Ghanaian host	Prof Kwadwo Asenso-Okyere (Director ISSER, Legon)
09.40	Welcome by the EC host	Mr Alessandro Mariani (EC Delegate, Accra)
09.50	Opening of the workshop	Prof Ivan Addae-Mensah (VC Univ of Ghana)
10.15	Presentation of workshop programme	Ernest Aryeetey (Deputy Director ISSER, Legon)
10.30	Who is who: short introductions	
11.00	Coffee break and photo opportunity	
11.30	RTD Policy Priorities in ACP countries (key-note speech)	Dr Abel Rwendeire (Min. of State for Techn, Uganda)
12.00	Short summary statements on national RTD policies by invited RTD policy makers from Dominican Republic, Ghana, Senegal and Vietnam	J.O. Gogo (Director S&T Policy Centre, Ghana) Modou Mboup (Délégué aux Affaires S & T, Senegal) N.T. Thu (Director Planning, MOSTE, Vietnam) A. Almonte Reynoso (Dir. INDOTEC, Dom Republic)
13.00	Common elements in national RTD Policies	Summary by the chair
13.15	Lunch	
Towards a RTD Policy Agenda of ACP countries		Chair: Carl B. Greenidge
14.30	Technology networks and end users in ACP countries	Gisele d'Almeida (Entrepreneur, Senegal)
15.00	RTD Policy Priorities in ACP countries	Discussion
16.00	Tea break	
16.15	RTD under the Cotonou Agreement	Amos Tincani (EC/DG-Dev, Brussels)
16.45	Informal meeting of the ACP working group	Chair: Carl Greenidge
16.45	Informal meeting of the EU working group	Chair: Louk Box
18.00	<i>Informal drinks</i>	

Tuesday, 30 January 2001			
National Policy Dialogue on RTD		Chair: Carl B. Greenidge	
09.00	Introduction to the day's programme	Ernest Aryeetey	(ISSER, Legon/Accra)
09.05	Informal working group ACP countries	Chair: Carl Greenidge	
09.05	Informal working group EU countries	Chair: Louk Box	
10.00	RTD Diagnostic Studies and National Policy Dialogues	Louk Box	(University of Maastricht)
10.15	Key conclusions from RTD Diagnostic Studies:		
	(i) interrelations policy making process and policy dialogue	Nguyen T. Ha	(NISTPASS, Vietnam)
	(ii) the pro-forma national policy dialogue	Moussa Cissé	(ENDA/Energy, Senegal)
	(iii) national policy dialogue as learning process	Ernest Aryeetey	(ISSER, Ghana)
	(iv) public and private sectors in national policy dialogue	Alex Tindimubona	(NURRU, Uganda)
	(v) dismantling of agricultural research	Francisco Checo	(CIECA, Dom Republic)
11.15	Coffee break		
11.30	Towards a framework for the national policy dialogue on RTD	Wiebe Bijker	(University of Maastricht)
12.00	RTD Diagnostic Studies and National Policy Dialogues	Discussion	
12.45	Lunch		
Towards a RTD Policy Action Plan of ACP countries		Chair: Walter S. Alhassan	
14.00	National Indicative Plans, the Cotonou Agreement and RTD	Amos Tincani (EC DG Dev)	
14.30	Regional Indicative Plans, the Cotonou Agreement and RTD	Carl Greenidge	
14.45	Informal meeting of the ACP working group	Chair: Carl Greenidge	
14.45	Informal meeting of the EU working group	Chair: Louk Box	(Univ. of Maastricht)
16.00	Tea break		
16.30	RTD under the Swedish EU Presidency	Ros -Mari Balow	(SAREC, Stockholm)
16.50	RTD Policy Action Plan of ACP countries	Discussion	
17.20	Conclusions from an EC perspective	Amos Tincani	(EC/DG-Dev, Brussels)
Wednesday, 31 January 2001			
Formulation of an ACP Policy Action Plan on RTD		Chairs: Carl B. Greenidge/Louk Box	
09.00	Introduction to the day's programme	Ernest Aryeetey	(ISSER, Legon/Accra)
09.10	Formulation of an RTD Policy Action Plan of ACP countries	Carl Greenidge	
09.10	Formulation of RTD Policy Action Plan of European countries	Louk Box	(University of Maastricht)
10.30	Coffee break		
11.00	RTD Policy Action Plan of ACP countries	ACP working group	
11.15	RTD Policy Action Plan of European countries	EU working group	
11.30	Discussions		
12.30	Lunch		
The Legon Statement on RTD		Chair: Walter S. Alhassan	
14.00	Presentation of the Legon Statement on RTD	Carl Greenidge	
14.15	Discussion on the Legon Statement on RTD	Discussion	
15.00	Closing comments		
16.00	Press Conference		