

Forward-Looking Mid-term Review of Norwegian Support to Research in Angola 2015-2018

Final Report



Project: Forward-looking midterm-review of Norwegian support to research in Angola 2015-2018
Client: The Royal Norwegian Embassy in Luanda
Period: March – June 2017

Review Team:

Mr. Vegard **Bye**, Scanteam, team leader

Ms. Gabriela **Cohen**, team member

Ms. Vibeke **Skauerud**, team member

Quality Assuror:

Mr. Arne **Disch**, Scanteam

Contents

1	Executive Summary.....	1
2	Introduction and Background.....	3
3	Framework Conditions for Scientific Research in Angola.....	5
4	CEIC-CMI and Research-Based Knowledge	7
4.1	Research.....	7
4.2	The Annual Reports	7
4.3	Other Academic products	9
4.4	The Academic Value-Added of CMI.....	9
5	Contributions to Angola’s Political and Public Debates.....	10
5.1	Improving Dissemination Impact.....	11
5.2	Contribution to Public Debate	11
5.3	Impact of CEIC Knowledge Production on Political Power.....	13
5.4	Relevance of the Programmes	13
6	CEIC’s academic achievements	15
6.1	Capacity Building at CEIC	15
6.2	CMI Contribution to CEIC Capacity Building	17
6.3	CEIC Status as Social Science-Based Knowledge Centre.....	17
7	Effectiveness of the Agreements	20
7.1	CEIC Core agreement.....	20
7.2	CMI-CEIC Cooperation Programme	20
7.3	Effectiveness of CEIC Achievements	20
8	Programme Management.....	22
8.1	Financial Management	22
8.2	Risk Management	23
9	Future Support to Socio-Economic Research in Angola.....	25
9.1	Situation of Socio-Economic Research.....	25
9.2	Research Support from other countries	26
9.3	Models for Funding Socio-Economic Research	27
9.4	Quality Research of Relevance for SDG Development.....	30
9.5	Recommendations	30
	Appendix A: Terms of reference	32

Appendix B: Questionnaire	36
Appendix C: List of interviews	38
Appendix D Tables	41

1 Executive Summary

The research institute *Centro de Estudos e Investigação Científica* (CEIC) at *Universidade Católica de Angola* (UCAN) has received financial support from the Norwegian Embassy in Luanda since 2006, and since 2008 there has been research collaboration with the Norwegian partner Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI). For the current phase covering mid-2015 to mid-2018 (April 2018), CEIC's core agreement with the Embassy has a budget of NOK 8.6 mill while the budget of the CMI-CEIC collaboration is NOK 20 mill.

The achievements of an academic institution like CEIC must be assessed within a realistic context of academic and scientific conditions in Angola. With a history of only fifteen years of independence with peace, Angola has yet to build the most basic standard of higher education, and even more so of scientific research. It is interesting to note that the Norwegian funding of CEIC and its academic collaboration with CMI, totalling more than NOK 85 million during these 11 years, covers the greater part of this post-war period. This has not been sufficient for CEIC to reach *financial solidity and sustainability*, still (2016) depending for 70% of its budget on the Norwegian funds. There has been no significant movement towards a more diversified and sustainable funding situation during the latest phase of the programme. Lacking public funding for research, the only real funding alternative would be to carry out more commissioned tasks for the private sector, with the risk of ending up in another questionable dependency.

The academic promotion strategy established at the outset of the programme has to a large extent been followed. The academic outputs of the CEIC-CMI collaboration have more or less been produced as planned, though with certain delays. The academic impact of these products is rather uncertain, and will depend on CEIC's ability to carry on after the end of the present programme, and on the opportunities offered to its researchers of continuing their academic careers.

CEIC's flagship publication is its Annual Economic Report, followed by the Annual Social and Energy reports. Particularly the first of these enjoy a remarkable prestige in Angola as the most prominent – and many observers say the only – independent source of analysis of the Angolan economy. These publications, partly based on other research done in partnership with the CMI, is what gives CEIC such a unique position in public and political debate in Angola: *CEIC is undoubtedly recognised as the leading social science-based knowledge centre in Angola*, an objective of the programme that basically was the situation even before this third phase was initiated. CEIC's voice is clearly heard and appreciated in the media, in civil society and even in the debate between political parties, thus playing an important role in Angola's opaque policy-making system. Yet, we came across several ideas for a possible further improvement of the dissemination impact.

CMI is a crucial and highly appreciated partner for CEIC. It is not easy to assess exactly how much value added CMI brings to the table. In terms of scientific methodology, access to scientific literature and an international academic network, and also mentoring of Master and PhD candidates, CMI does make a real difference. Whether this support is cost-effective compared to other alternatives is difficult to judge. What we may conclude is that *academic sustainability* has not been reached after nine years and NOK 37 mill worth of CMI support.

In a country with serious lack of transparency and critical discussion about the economy and the social performance of the government, now also preparing itself for the first change of

national leadership in 38 years while finding itself in a deep economic crisis, it would be a serious blow to lose this voice. While it is fully understandable that the Norwegian Embassy is unable to continue carrying the dominant responsibility for CEIC and the partnership with CMI forever, it is very positive to note the willingness to carry on supporting economic and social research in Angola. The challenge now is to find a modality for doing so on a more competitive basis, in a situation where there is hardly any other institution in Angola with the necessary academic credentials to do serious research, and without any public institution so far being capable of managing a research programme in these fields. This report proposes two possible models for this: (i) a combination of an independent Norway-initiated research board with strong international participation, and a financial management under the responsibility of the UNDP (a solution that provokes serious doubts from CEIC as well as CMI); or (ii) aligning with a possible EU-initiated research support system, presently under preparation (a solution that will hardly be attractive if it is based on government-dependent fund management). Liaising with the EU's preparation of a research support mechanism would anyway make sense, either by rendering the first model more realistic or by providing the Norwegian Embassy with an alternative organizational framework for future support. It is at this time premature to conclude which of these approaches is the more realistic.

Apart from the model of future Norwegian support to economic and social research in Angola, the following recommendations from this Mid-term Review may be highlighted:

- There is a need to strengthen CEIC's overall management, including building a stronger strategic planning function;
- In this connection, financial and administrative management needs strengthening through capacity building as part of future agreements; contracting an audit company that is compliant with international standards and produces annual Management Letters; producing consolidated annual financial reports that identify the funding from each separate donor; and increases project management and coordination capacity within the CEIC team.
- CEIC should focus on developing a realistic and long-term funding strategy, though avoiding – as difficult as it may seem – the two pitfalls of commercialization, on the one hand, and political dependence, on the other;
- CEIC should develop a more pro-active media strategy;
- Considering CEIC's crucial role in public and political debate about socio-economic development and possible alternatives in Angola, it is important to ensure its continued functioning. Until a more broad-based funding model is developed, there is likely to be a need for Norwegian bridge funding – but this should come with clear expectations regarding CEIC's future management and funding;

2 Introduction and Background

The Royal Norwegian Embassy in Luanda has provided core financial support to the research institute *Centro de Estudos e Investigação Científica* (CEIC) at *Universidade Católica de Angola* (UCAN) since 2006, and since 2008 has also financed a research collaboration programme between CEIC and the Norwegian partner Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI). For the current phase covering mid-2015 to mid-2018 (April 2018), the core agreement with CEIC has a budget of NOK 8.6 mill while the budget of the CMI-CEIC collaboration is NOK 20 mill.

The total support to the two institutions over these years has been NOK 87.25 mill (in nominal value), with NOK 50.15 (57%) going to CEIC and NOK 37.1 mill (43%) going to CMI.¹

This Midterm Review (MTR) is to address the following objectives (see Annex A, TOR):

- 1) To conduct a midterm review of the CEIC-CMI Research Programme 2015-2018;
- 2) To conduct a midterm review of the CEIC Core Programme Support 2015-2018, and
- 3) To assess the feasibility of future support to research in Angola, primarily in the areas of economics, social sciences and natural resource management.

The purpose is first to assess the state of implementation of the main objectives of the programmes:

- That CEIC-CMI has produced high quality and relevant research-based knowledge;
- That programme results are well integrated in Angola's political and public debates;
- That highly competent research personnel in various social sciences has increased
- That CEIC is recognized as the leading social science-based knowledge centre in Angola

The second purpose is to assess the adherence to the programmes' review criteria:

- Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency as described in the two enclosed agreements (ref. Annex B – Outcomes and outputs to Grant Letter for AGO 2542)
- Any other issues the researchers identify of relevance for a successful accomplishment of the programmes

The third purpose is to consider the feasibility of future Norwegian support.

An Inception Report was submitted to the Embassy on 19 April. Field work in Angola took place between 21 April and 4 May, with separate debriefings presented to the Embassy and to CEIC on the final day of the mission. A questionnaire had in advance been sent to a considerable number of stakeholders, in some cases responded to in writing, through telephone interviews or by face to face interviews (see Annexes B and C). While the response rate could have been higher, the team believes it got a view of how CEIC is perceived by Angolan and foreign stakeholders.

Regarding the feasibility of future Norwegian support, which the Embassy wants to be based on a principle of academic competition, the team collected information on the academic potential of the most relevant alternative institutions in Angola, about Government of Angola (GoA) plans, and about other possible foreign donors to the same purpose.

¹ Figures are based on information provided by CMI and CEIC. According to the Embassy's calculation, the total figure is 85.86 mill up to 30 April 2017.

3 Framework Conditions for Scientific Research in Angola

CEIC's work will be analysed in the context of conditions for social science research in Angola.

The general standard of Angolan universities is low, even by African standards. According to the 2017 African University Ranking, UCAN has a clear lead position among Angolan universities, although the overall standing is quite modest, number 101 among 200 listed African universities.² Measured by the number of published scientific papers, Angola ranks number 40 among African countries (total number of independent countries being 54), with 0.25% citations compared to the best performer, South Africa³.

An EU mission recently carrying out a diagnostic study of higher education and research in Angola, found that "Angola has so far been quasi absent from international funding opportunities such as Erasmus+"⁴. Seven Angolan applications were presented in 2015 for the first round, of which one was successful. The EU report claims that only one PhD degree has so far been produced in Angola. It is probably true that Angola has no conditions today to compete at an international level in terms of academic research, unless they do so in collaboration with an external academic institution, such as CMI.

There is, however, general consensus among our non-academic respondents – and most of our handful of academic respondents – that CEIC is by far the best, and most add the only, serious research institution in Angola doing economic and social research.

The Head of the National Directorate for Science and Scientific Research, a PhD-level biologist, holds a somewhat peculiar view, that analysis based on the putting together of secondary data is not really scientific research. On this basis, he also questions CEIC's academic standard. According to this criterion, however, much work by European social science institutions would not qualify as research. There is a clear difference between research methodologies in the exact sciences vs. social sciences in this regard, particularly when speaking about *applied* social research which is what CEIC is doing. The ambition underlying the CMI-CEIC collaboration is to support research that is relevant and useful for Angola's needs, and strive for gradual progress towards international academic standards.

Regarding *academic freedom* in Angola, the view is that in general terms there is such freedom. The CEIC researchers have not experienced any problem in this regard, although they know that this freedom stops when it comes to criticism of the President of the Republic. It is relatively straightforward to carry out surveys in Luanda; if it is in the slum areas (*musseques*) a permit from the neighbourhood committee is required. According to CEIC Director, however, the Angolan government has no interest in supporting *critical research*, or research that may be questioning the very foundations of its own policies. For that reason, channelling financial resources for social science research through an Angolan state institution will be very hard as long as strict criteria of political non-intervention are demanded. The most important

² UniRank: Top 200 Universities in Africa: <http://www.4icu.org/top-universities-africa/> The seven highest ranked universities in Africa according to this list are South African, with University of Cape Town on the top; 13 of the 20 top are also South African; the only two other Angolan universities on the list being Universidade Agostinho Neto (no. 175) and Universidade Metodista de Angola (no. 177). This list, admittedly, offers a very gloomy picture of higher education in Angola.

³ Bart Fonteyne and Patrício Langa: "Identification and formulation mission of EU support to Higher Education in Angola (March 2017) – hereafter referred to as "The EU Diagnostic Study", Table 19, p. 27

⁴ Ibid., p. 18

benefit of this programme has precisely been that it has allowed CEIC to carry out autonomous and independent applied research.

The need for such research in Angola is beyond doubt. In the economic field, it is mentioned that the Central Bank has no independent status, meaning that it has no credibility as an autonomous source of economic analysis and hardly as a source of economic data. The National Statistics Office (INE) is in much of the same position, particularly when it comes to analytic capacity. It must be said, however, that both these institutions and the Ministry of Planning have individual professionals with academic integrity and courage to present credible data and analysis, but their ability to do so often depends on the existence of an institution like CEIC.

4 CEIC-CMI and Research-Based Knowledge

The products of the programme have been the following:

- Annual Economic Report
- Annual Social Report
- Annual Energy Report
- Briefs
- Reports
- Macro-economic model
- Academic articles (peer reviewed or not)
- Media appearances, conferences etc

4.1 Research

Table D.1 shows that the planned 2015-2017 scientific outputs have been produced more or less according to schedule. Their contributions to intended outcomes varies, however.

For Project 1 (inequality), no academic products have so far been produced. Two products scheduled to be delivered by the end of the project may contribute as expected, but this is impossible to determine at the present time.

For project 2 (economic diversification), the one article produced and the one to be finished will probably result in the project reaching the intended outcome.

In Project 3 (macro-economic model), the model has been produced, it has been subject to quite extensive sharing and consultations, and may be expected to have a significant impact when evaluating the macro-economic policies of Angola's government institutions. The model is expected to be reflected in the next Annual Economic Report.

Project 4, 5 and 6 may make potential contributions to intended outcomes. The sustainability of this depends on the opportunity of local researchers to follow up the research. Currently it is not possible to assess the academic quality of these outputs.

The academic impact of all these projects will be clearly enhanced to the extent that local researchers make use of the results in future teaching and publications, but this may depend on continued external academic and financial support, given the quite uneven academic level among the CEIC researchers. Of course this will depend on the future of CEIC as such.

As to the *visibility of CMI in Angola*, many respondents have noted that there is collaboration with Norway. Some are familiar with CMI's name, but there is limited knowledge of what CMI is producing or exactly what their contribution to CEIC's research consists of.

4.2 The Annual Reports

The *Annual Economic Report* is CEIC's flagship publication, characterized by one prominent economic journalist as "the main independent source of economic analysis in Angola". It is a solid piece of work, printed in 1000 copies and available online, presented at an annual event on the same day each year (21 June), covering such items as (based on the 2015 issue):

- The world as a framework for Angola's economy
- Budget policy
- Monetary and exchange policy
- General level of economic activity

- Diversification of the economy
- Analysis of the Angolan economy's competitiveness in the context of accession to SADC Free Trade Zone
- Income distribution as an alternative model of growth
- Employment and productivity
- Inflation
- Growth perspectives
- Recapitulation of the principal economic events in 2015
- Monography of the economy of one province (in 2015: Zaire)

The 2015 Report offers a very comprehensive empirical overview and discussion of the various aspects of the Angolan economy, based on and critically discussing data from official national and international sources, ample references to state-of-the art international economic literature, with good graphical presentation. A noted weakness, seen from an academic point of view, is that there is very little theoretical discussion, and only exceptional application of econometric methods.

The Annual Social Report is also an important product, rich in data and graphic illustrations, although considerably less known. The 2015 Report (the latest so far published, in June 2016) is purely empirical, with hardly any reference to international social science literature.

This is the table of contents:

- Citizen participation in management and control of social policies
- Population, life conditions and poverty
- Commitment with health
- Commitment with education
- Situation of family and child in the light of the General Population and Housing Re-Census in 2014
- Social assistance
- Family agriculture and nutrition security in the face of climatic constraints in the Province of Cunene
- Contribution from the civil society actors
- Monography of peri-urban Luanda (Cacuaco, Cazenga and Belas)

These reports are launched at the same annual event, considered as a very important public event in Angola, at least previously in the presence of the country's political and diplomatic elite, with great media attention, leading to ample coverage in the national news media.

The Annual Energy Report is the least known, with least impact. This report is produced without the support from CMI, since this was not included in the third CMI-CEIC agreement. Still, the report, has much valuable information and analysis, at times rather superficial (e.g. when discussing renewable sources of energy). The latest Energy Report (2016) has the following table of contents:

- The petroleum macro-economy
- The renewable energy sources
- The world petroleum market – evolution of prices, changing strategies and structures and consequences for the future
- Petroleum and gas in Angola
- The electric sector in Angola
- Summary of the principal energy events in 2016

4.3 Other Academic products

The most academically prestigious products are the *peer-reviewed journal reports*, of which four are supposed to have been produced by the end of the programme period: one for project 1, one for project 2, and two for project 4.

The macro-economic model, as noted above, is clearly an important academic product, with potential practical application.

We return to a general assessment of CEIC standards under Section 6.3.

4.4 The Academic Value-Added of CMI

How much does the CEIC research capacity and actual results benefit from the collaboration with CMI? As a well-established research institution by European standards, CMI has relevant skills in terms of research methodology, including academic drafting capability, and in access to and overview of international theoretical literature. Regarding knowledge of Angolan reality, it is obvious that CEIC has a better overview of Angolan data, but CMI must be considered as one the main non-Angolan knowledge centres about Angolan economic and social issues. It is this combination that gives the partnership real meaning. We have no basis for drawing strict conclusions about *attribution* impact of this relationship, but there is no doubt that significant *contribution* has been produced.

There is a language dimension here since English is the predominant academic language. English knowledge is a challenge for many Angolan academics. One important asset of the collaboration for CEIC researchers is the training offered by CMI in English report drafting.

On the other hand, CMI researchers need to be able to work in Portuguese as a prerequisite for doing research in Angola. According to CMI, all CMI researchers apart from the economists can work in Portuguese, while the Angolan economists are the best English speakers. Still, limited knowledge of Portuguese is clearly a drawback when working with Angolan researchers, and/or doing research on Angola.

There may have been a certain difference of view between the two partners when it comes to the sharing of academic responsibility and credit for academic outputs. The Annual Reports are definitely CEIC products and are rightfully presented as such. CEIC recognizes, however, that CMI collaboration with these reports have enhanced their quality through joint collection of data and collaborative analysis. CMI may have a slightly enhanced and more visible role in the Reports about to be published this year.

For the joint academic reports, CMI researchers feel that the academic level can be uneven, which may imply that the CMI co-writer contribution is greater than credited. But in the spirit of this being a competence transfer programme, the CMI researchers should see this as what is to be expected from the Norwegian partner.

5 Contributions to Angola's Political and Public Debates

The dissemination effect of the CMI-CEIC collaboration is summarized in Table D.2.

Regarding CEIC's dissemination achievements, it is the opinion of practically everybody interviewed that CEIC is by far the most important conveyer of non-official economic and social analysis in Angola. The following is a quite representative statement: "CEIC is THE source for independent economic analysis in Angola, very frequently used to substantiate political arguments, with almost unquestioned credibility". Another person noted that "CEIC has opened new terrain (...) and may even have contributed to the expanded space for academic debate in general in Angola."

The three annual reports are the publications most frequently referred to. The Economic and Social reports are normally presented in at least the province subject to that year's in-depth study, resulting in a monography. One view was that such out-of-capital presentations should be more frequent. Whenever a national and Luanda-based institution like CEIC shows up in a provincial capital, the visibility there is tremendous, and the dissemination impact accordingly.

One way of measuring visibility is website visits, where table 5.1 shows CMI and CEIC visits over the most recent six-year period:

Table 5.1: Number of Website visits⁵

Website visits	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
cmi.no.angola ⁶	1457	2500	2248	2629	2065	1440
Ceic-ucan.org	6077	5594	4846	3018*	9781**	8641***

* 46% of visits from abroad

** From 121 countries, non-Angolan visits representing 68%

*** From 85 countries, non-Angolan visits representing 40%

The number of visits to CEIC's website, and particularly the number of countries of origin for the visits, is quite impressive. A speculative note is whether the peculiar high number of countries visiting the CEIC website in 2015, and their dominance compared to visits originating in Angola, may be explained by the sudden drop in oil prices the previous year, provoking curiosity about the effect on Angola's economy.

The number of downloads of specific CEIC products is as follows: ⁷

Year	2014	2015	2016
Downloads	741	2273	3615

Downloads from the CMI website⁸ are more limited, and the impact of products from the latest programme period – produced quite recently – seems to be quite marginal. Of the eight CMI briefs produced in 2016 and 2017, annual number of downloads per publication has

⁵Based on information received from Francisco Paulo, CEIC, and Eyolf Jul-Larsen, CMI, respectively

⁶ As of 2016, CMI's Angola page was split between one page dealing with the CEIC programme, and one page with CMIs Angola resources (not necessarily limited to the CEIC programme).

⁷ Based on information received from Francisco Paulo, CEIC

⁸ Based on information received from Eyolf Jul-Larsen, CMI

varied between 10 and 80 (mostly on the lower side of this interval), with the total number of downloads for 2016 and 2017 being 347. This is a falling rate compared to publications from previous programme periods, when annual downloads around 1,000 per publication were not unusual.

5.1 Improving Dissemination Impact

CEIC recognizes that there is room for improvement in the active promotion and use of the annual reports.

One option is to have thematic presentations for journalists and other specially interested, in order to go deeper into the material than what is possible in the general presentation.

Another reflection, from one of Angola's veteran journalists, is that the impact of CEIC's research, and particularly that of the Annual Reports, would be significantly higher if CEIC had been more pro-active in the promotion of its findings. "There is no journalist culture in Angola of actively searching for alternative information and analysis, compared to the government narrative", he says. "For that reason, the CEIC researchers – who in many cases have important stories to tell – have to offer their findings more selectively and directly to journalists". This recommendation is also echoed by another journalist, working for the government controlled press.

What may be the answer to this challenge is to make more use of UCAN's communication department to do promotion work. And the potential demand is there: there is no serious journalists in Angola who are not aware of CEIC. The opportunity for increased use of the CEIC findings is therefore obvious.

In 2008 and 2012, the Annual Report was translated to English, financed by Open Society, with the objective of making an independent analysis of the Angolan economy internationally accessible. If the financial means are made available, that could be an interesting option to consider again, or at least translate a summary or extracts, perhaps of all the three reports.

Several respondents believe the quality of CEIC's publications has improved over the years, both in terms of academic rigour, design, publication in English (still very few), and not least digital and on-line accessibility. There is quite probably a clear CMI footprint here.

5.2 Contribution to Public Debate

The CEIC Director does not hide his open criticism of government policies in his frequent public appearances and in his articles. As an example, he has a bi-monthly column in the arguably most prominent economic weekly in Angola, *Expansão*. In his article on 21 April 2017, at the beginning of the election campaign, he poses some very direct questions to the designated MPLA presidential candidate João Lourenço. He shows the contradiction between the main slogan of MPLA's latest electoral campaign in 2012 ("improved growth with better distribution") and the actual policies pursued with minimal or even negative distributional impact, and asks: "where is the courage to attack the vested interests of the elite?" He gives the answer himself: "The great opportunity for improved distribution of the economic growth existed between 2003 and 2008 (the first five post-war years with 15.5% average annual economic growth – the world's fastest; comment added here). But it was lost in favour of the official doctrine of rent-seeking, concentrating most of the capital accumulation among the

economic groups of the MPLA regime”.⁹ On this basis, he recommends that the crucial issues of the 2017 election campaign should be poverty, inequality and corruption, proposing that dos Santos’ designated successor already may have indicated a certain criticism of his mentor for not having done what he promised to do with these tremendous challenges for the country.¹⁰

Professor Alves da Rocha is also often the first independent voice to be consulted by the media when there are serious doubts about official economic figures.¹¹ And quite frequently, he meets with former colleagues now in prominent government positions when discussing such matters. This was the case when the official Radio Nacional de Angola asked him to comment on the latest Human Development Report, and tried to balance with a statement from the National Planning Director Milton Reis, himself ex-CEIC researcher, still Professor at UCAN and intimately familiar with the CEIC publications.¹²

CEIC publications, and particularly the Annual Economic Report, are quite frequently used in political debates, as a source of independent and critical analysis, difficult to question given its high credibility in the country. But there is still a gap to cover between the academic and the political world, to make sure that political debates make more systematic use of the independent research that actually exists. In order to achieve this, there seems to be a job to do from both sides of the gap, bearing in mind a political culture in the country that is not very open to the use of research-based knowledge.

Comparisons have also been made between CEIC’s reports and those coming from the most prestigious international institutions (IMF, World Bank etc.) International reports are often attacked and/or ignored precisely for being non-Angolan, and therefore for not understanding the local context, for having a foreign political agenda, or similar. CEIC cannot be attacked or questioned for such reasons – paradoxically except for its links to CMI. This adds to its credibility and relevance – and thus its impact – in the public and political debate in Angola, particularly when it comes to analysis and polemics. Data are often the same, and IMF and World Bank data are of course frequently quoted in CEIC publications. But it is the adaptation to the Angolan context, and the causal analysis of economic and social problems in the country, that may make the real difference.

However, it is claimed by many, politicians and public opinion makers hardly read academic reports, and there is very limited practice of having political advisors to do such groundwork. Politicians mostly seem to base their arguments on what they hear or read through mass media. This makes it even more important for CEIC to have a pro-active promotion and dissemination strategy with the media.

⁹ In 2014, the oil price stayed at well over 100USD/barrel during most of the year until the dramatic fall to around 60USD/barrel in the fourth quarter of the year. In an otherwise expansionary 2014 state budget (the security sector increased its share of the state budget to 16.4%), government expenditures in social sectors were dramatically cut: the education budget was reduced by 23.6% (budgets of public primary schools fell by one third); health sector expenditures were reduced by 14.5% (figures taken from OPSA’s analysis of the State Budget, OGE, 2014).

¹⁰ Alves da Rocha: “A pobreza e as desigualdades em Angola devem ser os temas centrais das candidaturas a Presidente da República”. *Expansao*, Luanda, 21.04.17

¹¹ See e.g. article in *Expansao*, 28.04.17: “Economia afundou 3,6% em 2016 pelas contas do INE”, where da Rocha is consulted about the heavy contradiction between claims by the Ministry of Planning about marginal growth in 2016 (0.1-0.6%), and hitherto unpublished data from the National Statistics Institute about serious recession (3,6%) the same year

¹² Rádio Nacional de Angola, evening news programme, 30.04.17

One prominent independent opposition politician says she frequently uses both the Economic and Social Reports in political debate, perceiving the CEIC publications to be the only trustworthy sources in the country. She says that OPSA (*Observatorio Politico Social Angola*) has the same degree of visibility and even credibility, but they only produce a report on the state budget. Some CSOs like ADRA and Mosáico are producing good and interesting material (and they also participate in the production of the CEIC Annual Reports), but they are not capable of marketing them effectively towards politicians.

5.3 Impact of CEIC Knowledge Production on Political Power

It is difficult to gauge the impact of CEIC publications on the top political hierarchy in Angola, but two anecdotes, told by persons with access to primary sources, may be illustrative.¹³

After the launching of one of the latest Economic Reports, President dos Santos asked one of his advisors whether the economic situation in the country really was as critical as claimed in the report, and afterwards to go systematically through the document and report back to him.

The other is that the public university, Universidad Nacional Agostinho Neto (UNAN), got a request from the President's office whether they would be able to set up a research centre "similar to CEIC". In that case, they were told, money would not be a problem. However, what would probably not be "similar" in such a case would be the autonomous and independent character of the research being produced. *"The government would only pay for research that it controls itself, where conclusions are not at odds with its own policy"* is a statement heard from several respondents.¹⁴

A voice from the Ministry of Planning (himself with background from CEIC and still linked to UCAN as professor), claims that the CEIC publications do have influence on public decisions, as well as on the formulation of social projects for the non-government sector.

It is important to note that the oil companies that responded to our survey share the same positive assessment of CEIC's work.

5.4 Relevance of the Programmes

CEIC is arguably the only independent academic institution in Angola producing quality, research-based knowledge on the three research areas covered. The need for that kind of knowledge in a country with so much polemic about its economic and social record, so limited transparency in the handling of public information, and so many limitations to both academic and public debate, cannot be overstated.

For the time being, it is unrealistic for CEIC to reach an international standard as a centre of academic excellence. But its main function is to contribute to a more knowledge-based and critical public debate in Angola. With a new election campaign going on, and after that a new generation of national leaders expected to take over, all in the midst of the deepest economic and social crisis in the country since peace was achieved, CEIC has a critical role to play, in large part thanks to this programme. The great demand for CEIC's products and its

¹³ We have the name of the original source of these anecdotes in both cases.

¹⁴ The Dean of the Economic Faculty of the Universidad Agostinho Neto claims that they would be able to produce research without political conditioning. Few other respondents believe this would be possible.

accumulated knowledge is the best evidence for the relevance of the Norwegian-funded programme.

6 CEIC's academic achievements

The two programme objectives addressed in this section are whether there has been an increase in competent research personnel at CEIC; and whether CEIC is recognized as the leading social science-based knowledge centre in Angola.

6.1 Capacity Building at CEIC

The question about increasing competence can be understood both in quantitative and qualitative terms.

Quantitatively, there has been no increase of the academic staff so far during the present phase. CEIC had a total of 11 permanent researchers and a number of collaborators when the most recent phase of the two Norwegian programmes started. At the time of finalizing the Review, CEIC had 9 permanent researchers, with the following academic degrees¹⁵:

- Alves da Rocha (Director, Head of the Economic Research Area) (Master)
- Nelson Pestana (Head of the Social Research Area) (PhD)
- Regina Santos (Head of the Energy Research Area) (Licenciada)
- Osvaldo Silva (Master, doing PhD in Brazil)
- Francisco Paulo (Master)
- Precioso Domingos (about to defend Master)
- Vissolela Gomes (will defend Master in September)
- Carlos Vaz (expected to defend Master in 2018)
- Cláudio Fortuna (Licenciado)

The CEIC permanent staff therefore counts only one PhD researcher plus one additional doing PhD studies in Brazil, with five Master's level researchers by the end of 2017 and one additional expected to finish in 2018. Additionally, there are three collaborators, who are not part of the permanent staff: Gilson Lázaro (PhD), Eduardo Sassa (MA; initiated PhD), Margareth Nanga (MA, intending to start a PhD programme in 2018).

Qualitative competence growth: The academic capacity development programme established for this phase (Table 4.1. in the Project Document of the Core Programme) contained eight of the permanent staff plus the three mentioned collaborators. Table D.3. summarizes how this programme has progressed compared to the intention.

PhD: Two researchers (Tomas and Lázaro) will have finished their PhDs by the end of the year (although Tomas without substantive support from the CMI programme and now moved to the public university, thus still being part of Angola's academic human capital), and a third (Silva) is working on his PhD in Brazil. Sassa has also initiated his PhD. This is pretty much according to schedule, but at the time of the Review it falls short of the expected capacity strengthening of CEIC. Neither Margareth Nanga (planned to finish in 2020) nor Francisco Paulo (planned to finish in 2021) have started on their PhD programmes yet.

Planned Master degrees: Two researchers (Domingos, Gomes) are supposed to obtain their Master degrees before the end of 2017; one more (Vaz) is attending a Master course in Lisbon and may finish in 2018.

¹⁵ Two of the 2015 staff left during the programme period. One new researcher, Esperança Vili (Master in Economics), joined but left again end of May this year when she was offered a job on better conditions at the Ministry of Finance.

General progress: There are some delays with the academic advancement progress. The programme has contributed to CEIC's, and the country's, academic capacity development, but less than planned. None of the PhD candidates are among permanent CEIC researchers.

Ex-CEIC researchers moving to other positions: One of the important functions of CEIC has been to prepare high-level human resources for key functions in the Angolan society. The following are some examples of ex-CEIC researchers who have ended up in important positions:

- Miguel Francisco Manuel – Economist in the President's Office (Casa Civil)
- Milton Reis – National Director for Studies and Planning, Ministry of Planning and Territorial Development
- Pedro Luteso – Angola's Development Bank
- Emílio Londa – Director, Office of Studies and International Relations, Ministry of Finance
- Rui Seamba – Ministry of Higher Education, Direcção Nacional de Acreditação
- Esperança Vili, Ministry of Finance
- Pedro Vaz Pinto – PhD Candidate, University of Porto (Portugal), member of Fundação Kissama (Foundation to promote biodiversity)
- Sendi Baptista – Member of Fundação Kissama
- Baltazar – present staff of Chevron oil company

Particularly the two first persons on this list are expressions of the status CEIC is enjoying as producers of first-level economic advisors to the government apparatus.

What could CEIC do better?

One opinion was that CEIC could and should do more to promote young researcher candidates, offer internships, opportunities to be research assistants, "cultivate the research appetite among university students". Another view was that CEIC should have a promotion programme in order to attract future researchers. The inclusion of the three "collaborators" in the competence development programme had this intention in mind. However, since CEIC does not have financial resources to offer employment, such efforts do not permanently impact on CEIC's academic standard.

How dependent is CEIC on the Director?

Another aspect emphasized by respondents identify the CEIC and the Annual Economic Report almost directly with – and in many cases exclusively with – the CEIC Director. Although he is undoubtedly responsible for a great part of the success CEIC has had, this probably represents an overstatement of the reality. Efforts *have been done* lately of actively promoting younger researchers in the public domain. One of them was recently invited by the IMF to an academic gathering, on the virtue of his academic performance. But this heavy association with the Director does make CEIC quite vulnerable.

There is almost similar identification between the Annual Social Report and Nelson Pestana. One important aspect of the latter report is that parts of the field work is being done in partnership with some of the most prominent CSOs in the country, such as ADRA, OPSA and others. In Angola, such institutions may also be considered to be as much think-tanks as NGOs. This points in the direction of some kind of "action research", where an academic institution (CEIC) invited hybrid action and research institutions to collaborate. Another aspect worth noting is that the social studies area in fact has been quite successful raising additional funds (UNICEF/EU, Statoil, etc.)

6.2 CMI Contribution to CEIC Capacity Building

Table D.4. shows the capacity building outputs per project as reported by CMI annual reports, and our assessment of the contributions to CEIC compared to intended outcome. For most of the projects, there was a relatively broad approach: supervision of individual researchers, methodological training, report draft training, seminars and workshops etc. In one case (project 1 “inequality”) an experimental survey was implemented. In another case (project 4 “urban and rural poverty”) there was a shared survey design that was later implemented in urban and rural settings. The overall assessment is that while important training may have been conveyed, there are limited direct links between the CMI contributions and the formal capacity advancement of CEIC researchers, with new PhD and Master’s degrees, mostly achieved in other Lusophone countries – Portugal, Brazil – in one case in Kenya. But CMI has been offering academic monitoring of clear relevance for the formal academic promotion of CEIC researchers. Perhaps the most direct impact has been through the shared survey design and implementation in projects 4 (urban and rural poverty dynamics) and project 5 (gender relations and human rights).

Again, we need to distinguish between *attribution* and *contribution*, where the latter obviously has taken place while the former is hard to determine.

While there is not a very visible academic promotion outcome of two three-year programmes with a total budget of NOK 28.6 mill, the CMI contribution is still considerable compared to the academic standards of other Angolan institutions.

6.3 CEIC Status as Social Science-Based Knowledge Centre

As to the *overall situation* 11 years after Norwegian funding started and 9 years after the CMI was brought in as a mentoring institution, at a total cost of NOK 87.25 million, CEIC is still a vulnerable and by international standards rather weak academic research institution.

UCAN is second to the Baptist University regarding number of teaching staff with PhD status among the private universities of the country (24 and 36, respectively), while the Agostinho Neto University (UAN), the leading public university, has a completely dominant position in this regard with 295 reported PhDs.¹⁶ While the quoted EU study regards UAN as “the leading flagship university” in Angola, it goes on to say that “(S)ome private universities also have the potential to contribute to boost the knowledge production system through research and training. These universities would be better positioned to expand the capacity of the public universities. Universidade Metodista de Angola (Unimetod), Universidade Católica de Angola (UCAN) featuring a well-respected socioeconomic research centre; are two examples of universities that could be used to leverage the post-graduate local training, particularly to respond to the need to train more academic staff for the system.” (p. 30)

Compared to other Angolan universities with much higher numbers of PhD-level staff, it is therefore fair to underline our conclusion about the prominence of CEIC regarding the production of *research-based knowledge*.

The results framework for the core agreement defined the *intended impact* to be whether it had contributed to make UCAN as a whole, “a leading knowledge producing institution in Angola and

¹⁶ A total of 632 PhD-level academics are reported among the staff of Angolan universities. These degrees evidently result in very little research (*EU Diagnostic Study*, Table 21).

internationally". This MTR could not really deal with the academic standard of UCAN as such, apart from the African ranking referred to above showing that UCAN is the leading higher education institution in Angola. We have no real basis to validate the contribution of the CEIC-CMI programme on this situation.¹⁷ But the Vice-Rector of UCAN, responsible for research at the University, said that "without CEIC, the UCAN would have to start from scratch as an academic institution", in the sense that "a University without research capacity is no real university", as another interviewed University Rector put it.

Considering the status of CEIC, the *intended outcome of the programme* is very much the same, as formulated in the results framework, of having a lead position in Angola. Judging by the indicators listed in the results framework, we may make the following considerations:

- *Number and share of CEIC research staff with (i) MA degree or equivalent, (ii) PhD degree.* The number of PhDs is for instance considerably higher at the economic faculty of the Agostinho Neto University (claimed to have 30 PhDs out of 210 teachers) according to the Dean. There are also other universities with a larger number of PhDs, yet doing no research.
- *Number of scientific products* – books, professional journal articles, contributions to scientific gatherings – produced by CEIC staff. This information is partly provided above. The review found no comparative figures from other universities, but it can safely be concluded that CEIC occupies a lead position in Angola. The public university publishes a journal, *Socioeconomicus*, which basically prints articles based on the students' Master's theses (16 of them in the October 2016, Special Edition).
- *Trend in CEIC's budget levels, with increasing share from own-generated activities.* This is shown in the next chapter, concluding that the share is indeed increasing, but starting from a very modest level.
- *Number of international (outside Angola) research events* at which CEIC staff are invited to present their work and findings. This has not been recorded systematically.
- *Number and share of "hits" on CEIC's web-site that originate outside Angola.* This information has been provided (ref. Table 5.1.), and the result is quite impressive.
- *Number of CEIC articles and papers downloaded from CEIC's web-site:* This is also a quite impressive number (also presented in Chapter 5).
- *Number of references to CEIC research in international science publications:* This information was requested, but no real record of this is available.

When asking the question about CEIC's position in Angola, the same answer was practically the same from all respondents: *CEIC is clearly seen as the leading social science-based knowledge centre in Angola*. Many respondents added: "and the only one". There is almost full consensus among non-academic respondents, and even most of the academic respondents, about this. Although the number of responses is limited, and hardly representative particularly for government institutions, it can be concluded that civil society, media, the diplomatic community and the foreign oil companies seem to share this conclusion. Other academics tend

¹⁷ It may be noted that a Master Programme was initiated at UCAN with funding from the U.S. oil company Connoco Phillips, but discontinued when the company closed down its operations in Angola earlier this year. UCAN has so far not been able to get new funding for this programme.

to agree, understandably with more hesitation, since some feel that there is limited academic vetting of CEIC products, and that it is therefore impossible to judge the academic standard of their publications.

One researcher who recently left CEIC claims that the limited academic vetting of CEIC's products makes it impossible to judge the academic standard of their publications, including the Annual Reports. "CEIC is not doing research; it is doing analysis (...) on the basis of data supplied by others", he claims, adding: "CEIC cannot be doing the same work as economic journalists (and still call it research)". This affirmation is hardly representative, but still it might provoke a discussion of CEIC's academic approach, bearing in mind what we have pointed out before: CEIC is dedicated to applied research, not basic research.

Making a general assessment of whether the CEIC-CMI partnership "has produced high quality and relevant research-based knowledge", as the ToR asks, it is important to note that this MTR is not in a position to make an independent academic review of the research products. When discussing this issue with Angolan and non-Angolan academics, there are differing views on the academic standard of CEIC, as noted above, from those who apply strict basic research criteria to others that claim such criteria to be irrelevant, and instead arguing that some of the CEIC products are *too* academic for their purpose. When summarising, however, it is the team's clear conclusion that high quality research-based knowledge is being produced, especially when talking about applied research relevant to the Angolan situation, and in particular when judged by Angolan standards.

CEIC's achieved status as the leading institution of its kind in Angola can hardly be ascribed to the latest cooperation programmes reviewed here since this was probably the situation even before the 2015-17 programmes started. A more relevant question to ask would be: *is this status sustainable*; would it continue if the Norway-financed programmes are discontinued? Given the degree of financial – less so academic – dependence, that would probably not be case. That is the real challenge to meet regarding the future of CEIC.

7 Effectiveness of the Agreements

Although two different programmes are being assessed, it is difficult to distinguish which of them is contributing to exactly what outcome and impact.

7.1 CEIC Core agreement

Core Agreement: NOK 8.6 mill for 4 years, with the following objectives:

- “contribute to make UCAN recognized”
- CEIC recognized as leading knowledge centre
- Institutional: academic and financial solidity
- For each of three academic areas: more informed public debate
- For each of three academic areas: produce leading-edge studies

As already pointed out, most of these objectives have been reached. This is summarized for each of the three academic components in Table D.5.

Component 2, Economic studies area: Most of the outputs have been delivered as intended, in some cases clearly over-achieved.

Component 3, Social sector studies area: Here also, most of the intended outputs were delivered or even over-achieved. There is a concern about delays with the production of the Annual Social Report for 2016, to be presented in June 2017.

Component 4, Energy sector area: The outcome here, “more informed public debate on Angola’s energy sector and the development alternatives”, seems to be more uncertain, although most of the intended outputs have been delivered. This component, which was not supported by CMI, is probably the weakest and least developed of the three academic areas.

The missing link compared to the above-mentioned objectives is the financial solidity, which remains unsustainable.

7.2 CMI-CEIC Cooperation Programme

CMI-CEIC agreement: NOK 20 mill for 4 years, NOK 10.8 mill to CMI, NOK 9.2 mill CEIC, with the following objectives:

- Research: CEIC-CMI have produced high-quality and relevant research-based knowledge
- Dissemination: Results are well integrated in Angola’s political/public debate
- Capacity building: Highly competent research personnel in social sciences increased at CEIC (number vs. individual growth)

Also in this case, the objectives have in general been achieved, as noted above (ref. tables D.1-D.4).

7.3 Effectiveness of CEIC Achievements

The most important effect of the programme is obviously its relevance for public and political debate in Angola. This effect is of very high value, appreciated by most observers, but the question is if the rather high cost of CMI’s contribution is justified when judged against its academic contribution? Could this investment have led to more tangible results if done differently?

On the *cost* side, a Portuguese university guest professor on a two-week combined teaching and supervision visit to the Agostinho Neto University costs on average EUR 11,000,¹⁸ while a similar visit by a CMI researcher to CEIC would have a total cost of about EUR 15,000.¹⁹

The *benefits* side is more difficult to compare. It is clear that CEIC is considered a more successful social science programme than the one at Agostinho Neto, but how much of this can be attributed to the external researchers is impossible to gauge.

A counter-factual could be to see if CEIC could get similar research skills from a different source than CMI, and particularly from other Lusophone countries thus avoiding the language problems, at a lower cost. On the other hand, the fact that CEIC researchers are assisted to publish in English – the main academic language – is in itself of value.

Knowledge-building and dissemination in Norway was removed as an objective in the latest programme. This makes it less important to have a Norwegian partner, which may reduce the total cost-effectiveness of the programme. Whether or not being an explicit objective of this programme, the following question is relevant: how important is it to have a Norwegian knowledge centre with in-depth understanding of the socio-economic, political and cultural complexities of what is Norway's most important economic partner in Africa, and that also has direct and trusted access to the leading competency milieu in Angola on these issues?

While capacity building programmes are always difficult to measure, a key aspect of a successful approach is predictability and continuity. The fact that CEIC researchers are known by and themselves know their CMI counterparts and have worked with them for a number of years is a value-added component. It allows for building relationships built on trust and thus having more genuine partnerships evolve over time, something that CEIC researchers referred to several times. The fact that this is a partnership where researchers on either side can simply contact the other – e-mail, skype – is of great value when one is engaged in research-like processes that necessarily take time and need to be adjusted as new issues or problems arise. Reducing these kinds of transaction costs is thus important. What seems to be most appreciated by the CEIC staff is precisely the feeling of being treated as equals by a European research institution, free of paternalism, in a relationship which is characterized by a permanent exchange of ideas.

If one ignores the benefits to Norway from this research collaboration and only looks at the issue from CEIC's perspective, the real test would be what CEIC would do if it were given the same budget and the same distribution of funding between itself and a partner research organisation. The response from CEIC to this is that CMI, with its long collaboration history, represents a clear asset for CEIC. In an open competition, CEIC says it would always pick the most attractive proposal, which in 2015 was CMI's.

¹⁸ Information provided by the Dean of the Economic Faculty. The Portuguese institutions offer no economic support for such collaboration.

¹⁹ Including travel, local costs and salary, with no overhead for a senior researcher, information provided by CMI

8 Programme Management

A key concern of the Embassy is the continued high dependency of CEIC on Norwegian funding. As shown in Table D.6, the two agreements implying Norwegian funding represented 66% of total CEIC revenues in 2015; 70% in 2016. The challenge of this dependence for the continued existence and growth of CEIC was underlined by the entire CEIC staff.

8.1 Financial Management

On the CMI side of the collaboration programme, there is a team of seven persons working with project management, budgets, reports etc., in addition to 3 IT advisors. CMI, in this regard, probably has a more solid management capacity than many other research institutions. It has considerable experience with similar agreements, but right now there is only one additional agreement of a similar character (with Sudan). Consolidated and separate financial reports are prepared for all programmes, and CMI accounts are audited by EY. Management letters are issued whenever there are issues to report about, or upon request from the donor. The Embassy receives biannual reports, and there are annual meetings between the Embassy, CMI and CEIC.

The finance management and admin department at CEIC consists of three staff. Two have worked at the centre since the start, whereas a third member, a young accountant, was recruited earlier this year. This is positive in the sense that the department provides continuity and institutional memory within CEIC. On the other hand, the department has faced challenges in getting up to speed on new and more demanding reporting and finance/admin requirements and management procedures. The recruitment of this third member should therefore be welcomed as a positive investment.

The accounting has since the start of CEIC been outsourced to an external company called ESCF, which appears to be working relatively well. Annual financial audits are performed by a local (regional) company, *Multi-Act*. It is not entirely clear whether this company applies international standards and norms, as they are not yet registered with the newly established Order of Accountants and Auditors in Angola²⁰. This means that there is a lack of “checks and balances” that would otherwise come with an internationally recognized company. Management Letters have not been produced by the auditors during the current project period. This is a clear weakness, and CEIC should request Management Letters in the future in order to get advice and guidance on how to improve on routines and practices.

Although the overall financial management and administration appear to have been running relatively smoothly throughout the programme period, the CEIC finance/admin team seems to be stretched to their limit. This means that they will need reinforcements in order to handle a more diversified and potentially more demanding donor portfolio in the future.

Another major challenge to the efficiency and management of the programme is the fact that CEIC does not produce consolidated, audited financial reports. In addition, CEIC had huge difficulties producing a consolidated overview of income for the three-year period 2015 – 2017, when asked about this by the MTR team. CEIC produces a mix between project reports to specific donors with whom they have established annual agreements (i.e. CMI, Core

²⁰ [OCPCA - Ordem dos Contabilistas e Peritos Contabilistas de Angola](#)

support, OSISA, Statoil and BP) and reports from punctual events like the launch of the annual economic and social reports where other donors have contributed with earmarked funds. The lack of consolidated financial reporting is likely to present a serious obstacle to attracting new donors.

Documenting results and the absence of clear routines for systematically gathering monitoring data is another area for improvement. The simple fact that CEIC does not use the same template for their annual reports from one year to the other makes it very difficult to access information and to compare and measure progress.

According to CMI, CEIC has – despite the limitations mentioned above – improved on routines and procedures during the project period, and CMI has received required financial information of adequate quality within deadlines. CMI has also been satisfied with the annual audited financial statements submitted by CEIC.

The main challenge appears to be linked to communication and the lack of authority that the finance/admin department experience in their relationship with the two research departments. This is a source of frustration. The practice of logging hours and submitting time-sheets has slowly, but surely become more embedded as a habit among the research staff. Nevertheless, there are still challenges linked to the timeliness of submitting the timesheets, which has led to interruptions and delays in payment of subsidies. This has been a source of tension between the finance/admin department and the research staff.

We also observed a lack of consistency in the use of templates for CEIC's annual reports. This makes access to information more difficult, but could be easily avoided if they use the same format every year.

The problem with under-expenditure that was mentioned in the previous review report (NIBR 2013) no longer appears to be an issue.

Both CEIC and CMI strongly regret that capacity building and support on finance and admin management issues was left out of their current collaboration agreement (and left to be covered only by the Core Agreement between the Embassy and CEIC). CMI has noted that CEIC has very limited capacity to develop management capacities, and believes that this is seriously complicating the ambition of reaching management sustainability. The MTR team agrees that CMI with its quite professional research management team could have made an important contribution in this regard.

8.2 Risk Management

The lack of a proper funding diversification strategy is by far the greatest risk to the continuation and sustainability of CEIC. In their start-up report, CEIC stated that it aims at a 10% increase in other income and funding during the current project period. From 2015 to 2016, there was an increase of around 17% in non-Norwegian funding. However, the real value of this increase was a mere USD 45 000 (Ref. Table D.6). The future revenue strategy is based on the same principles as for the current period, namely to develop more follow-on tasks and value-added services to the annual report, as well as building longer-term funding relations with independent sponsors such as some of the larger companies in Angola. The risk with this is of course ending up in a new pattern of dependence: on commercial actors, turning the institute into more of a consulting unit than an academic institution. Some of the stakeholders interviewed hinted that this may already represent a challenge. But overall there

has been no real movement towards a more diversified and sustainable funding situation during the most recent phase of the programme.

The Scientific Council of UCAN is in the process of elaborating a general strategy document for the financing of the University, that later on will be submitted for the consideration of foreign donors. The position of CEIC will also be discussed in this context.

CEIC does not present consolidated financial reporting, an element that decreases the overall transparency of the financial management. This represents a serious risk that needs to be managed and corrected.

Finally, there appears to be a gap in strategic leadership that needs to be filled, in order to implement a more forward-looking sustainability strategy for CEIC. The MTR failed to see visionary management thinking at the institution. The overall management of UCAN should be expected to take a co-responsibility for this, but only the CEIC management itself can define a way forward towards a sustainable research institution with a credible research strategy. This shortcoming has also been noted by CMI. There is furthermore an imbalance and at times tensions between the two research departments, related to CEIC's identity as an economic vs. a multi-disciplinary research institution. Similar tensions may also be identified on the CMI side.

These challenges should be better addressed in preparations for any future research programmes.

Risks to the CMI are of less importance. CMI is a well-established Norwegian research institution, with a staff of 80 highly qualified persons and an annual turnover (2015) of NOK 77 million. The CEIC-CMI programme thus represents less than 5% of its revenue. Still, this Angola research programme relies on the Embassy-funded collaboration with CEIC. A loss of this relationship and funding would clearly be a blow to one of CMI's most well-established programmes, but would of course not constitute a real threat to CMI as an institution.

9 Future Support to Socio-Economic Research in Angola

The two first phases of Norway's funding of CEIC and CMI were based on direct applications, without competition.

For the third phase, initiated in 2015, there was an open bidding process for international support, while CEIC was still pre-selected as the Angolan partner. CEIC even took part in the elaboration of the international tender invitation, defining the research areas in consultation with the Norwegian Embassy. According to the Embassy more than one serious proposal was considered, and the outcome was quite close. It may have been CEIC's preference to continue working with CMI that in the end became decisive for the decision.

Norway has the intention to continue funding socio-economic research in Angola for another period. But this time around, the Embassy wants an open, competitive process, where the *potential* for delivering high-quality research will be decisive. The intention is that also researchers from other institutions get access to research funding. The Review Team has been asked to come up with a proposal for how that may be organized, where the main concern is to make sure that Angolan research becomes more self-sustained. Partnering with Norwegian institutions could still be an option, but the development of Angola competence in Norway is no more seen by the Embassy to be its responsibility (this criterion was also removed from the third phase).

The Embassy, and even CMI, has for a long time been insisting with CEIC that they need to find other donors, but as discussed above this has so far proven very difficult,

9.1 Situation of Socio-Economic Research

The first question is whether there are any prospects for GoA funding of such research. In Angola, there is a distinction between the Ministry of Higher Education and the Ministry for Science and Technology, with the latter being responsible for research through the National Directorate for Science and Scientific Research. Nobody in the research institutions spoken with had any knowledge of GoA financial support to scientific research in the areas of relevance here. There was a call for research proposals in 2014, to be financed through the State Budget (OGE) starting in 2015 and intended to form part of what was termed the National Strategy for Science, Technology and Innovation (ENCTI); and National Policy for the same (PNCTI).²¹ The objective was: "to support projects for scientific research and technological development that might produce new knowledge, new processes or products". Among the areas PNCTI defined for support were Education, culture and professional training; Health; Industry, petroleum, gas and mineral resources; Energy and Environment.

The emphasis of this strategy is clearly on technology and natural sciences plus education, with no specific reference to social science or economics. The National Director for Science and Scientific Research claims, however, that these areas might be considered as cross-cutting and therefore in principle may be eligible under this programme.

²¹ República de Angola, Ministério da Ciência e Tecnologia, Edital No. 1 / PlanCTI/MINCT /2014: Apresentação de candidaturas a projectos de investigação científica e desenvolvimento tecnológico no âmbito do plano anual de ciência, tecnologia e inovação 2014 (PLANCTI 2014)

A total of 41 projects (39% of received proposals) were approved in 2014, before the economic crisis (i.e. drastically falling oil prices) hit the country with the result that no project received any funding. The National Director claims that another effort to find funding for the selected projects will be made with the 2018 OGE. Another call for proposals seem very unlikely at this point – particularly when speaking about the areas of economics and social sciences.

The conclusion is that no public Angolan funding of competitive socio-economic research may be expected to be available for the foreseeable future. Yet, most observers agree that there is a great need for other academic institutions to develop such research capacity in Angola. It would be of particular importance that the principal public university, *Universidade Nacional Agostinho Neto* (UNAN), could do that. Its Economic Faculty did establish an embryonic research institute, *Centro de Investigação Social e Económica* (CISE), in 2012.²² According to the Dean of the Faculty, the only missing element to initiate serious research at this institute is solid financing. But this was also cut short by the economic crisis. The Dean gives a telling overview of how unreliable actual disbursements from the state budget may be for a public university: in spite of a clearly fixed budget amount, monthly amounts received over the last year and a half have varied between 5 million Kwanzas and zero, in a completely unpredictable manner.

The CEIC researchers have no confidence in the seriousness of CISE's capacity and academic independence to do serious research. The EU Delegation shares this scepticism. It did consider supporting some research at CISE, but concluded that it was not viable because of its academic and management standards and because the Government is not expected to allow it the necessary academic autonomy to carry out independent and critical research. This judgement is the opposite of what the Dean of the Faculty claims. It should also be mentioned that Statoil is supporting human rights education at the public university.

Of the other universities visited or considered in Angola (*Universidade Lusíada*, *Univesidade Independente*, *Universidade Metodista*), none have any research capacity in economics or social sciences. Whether they would be in the position to compete for research resources in these fields in the immediate future is highly unlikely, short of focused academic support from international institutions.

9.2 Research Support from other countries

Some countries offer support to research in Angola. Most *Portuguese universities* allegedly have some collaboration with Angolan universities²³. The problem, however, is that no economic support seems to come with these agreements; they rather represent unsustainable costs for the Angolan counterparts. One example is the collaboration on Master's degree courses between the Economic Faculty of the *Universidade de Lisboa* and UNAN, where the Angolan partner (as mentioned above) has to cover all expenses (fee, travel, boarding, per diem etc.).

²² Diário da República, Estatuto Orgânico da Faculdade de Economia da Universidade Agostinho Neto, Artigo 32, Despacho no. 2256/12, 18.10.2012. Internal rules for the Centre have also been approved (Regulamento Interno, CISE).

²³ Interview with Gomes Mateus, Camoes

France has supported technological research and employment generation through public-private partnership.

Perhaps the most interesting cooperation comes from *Brazil*, providing thousands of scholarships including on Master and PhD level (so-called PEC-PG) to most African countries, with preference for the Lusophone partners. Angola has not been among the most active users of this support, but after 2010, an average of 8-10 Angolan students (including from CEIC) have annually been following Master or PhD programmes in Brazil²⁴.

Another interesting example of South-South cooperation is the joint research funding initiative between MINCT and *South Africa*, having resulted in two calls for proposals for which higher education institutions of the two countries jointly propose projects.²⁵

9.3 Models for Funding Socio-Economic Research

While Angola is not competitive when it comes to international research, it should still be an ambition to support research that is relevant and useful for Angola's needs, and strive for gradual progress towards a minimum international standard. The question remains: are the conditions ripe for a competitive-based tender process among Angolan socio-economic research milieus?

A concern raised by many stakeholders (including CMI), is that the transition to a competitive regime may take time to implement, and that CEIC meanwhile may be seriously weakened or simply fail to survive, with the serious consequences that might have for public debate at a critical moment in Angola.

In the following, two possible models for competitive support to social and economic research in Angola are presented.

I: Independent Research Board and UNDP:

The MTR team has been considering how to establish a new structure of vetting and funding research projects in Angola.

In Norway, the logical starting point for the organization of public support to research is the Research Council of Norway (RCN), which has the following action points in its 2010-2020 international strategy:

- All of the Research Council's activities (programmes, open competitive arenas, special initiatives, institution-oriented measures and other forms of support) must include clearly-defined objectives and plans for international cooperation.
- The Research Council will promote Norwegian participation in joint programmes across national boundaries when this is crucial to cope with common challenges or to strengthen Norwegian research and knowledge-based industry.
- The Research Council will develop financial instruments to support the establishment of long-term institutional cooperation between Norwegian institutions and similar institutions in other countries.

²⁴ EU Diagnostic Report, p. 23

²⁵ *ibid.*, p. 55. The total value of these calls mentioned mentioned in the EU Report, 1 billion USD, sounds unrealistically high.

RCN's core competency of relevance for a future Angola programme building on the CMI-CEIC experiences revolves around the setting of international scientific and relevance standards, the organization of competitive calls, the assessment and selection of proposals.

RCN's most important engagement in Africa is its South Africa programme, now in its third period, being co-financed (75% Norwegian funding from the Norwegian Embassy in the country), with the country's National Research Foundation, at a value of 30-40 mill NOK over four years. RCN has a direct presence in South Africa through the special envoy for research and technology at the Norwegian Embassy. But the academic standard of South African universities is – as we have seen – completely different from what we find in Angola.

There are also RCN activities, with a variety of modalities, in other countries including Eastern Europe (EEA funding), India, China etc. There has been a close liaison with EU research programmes, i.a. Horizon 2020. In some cases, e.g. Hungary, programmes have been discontinued due to problems with corruption and attempts of political conditioning.

RCN is quite clear that there is no capacity to have permanent presence on the ground in the case of Angola, or to take responsibility for the management of funds there. But RCN is open to discuss other forms of participation in a future Angola programme, if funding is provided by the Embassy.

Regarding management of funds, the UNDP Country Director in Angola expressed positive interest in the possibility of managing a research collaboration programme, in terms of disseminating calls and receiving proposals, organizing the infrastructure of vetting and selection, making the payments and following up financial reporting. He claims that UNDP would have no problem to play this role even if the resulting research is critical of the government.

But the UNDP cannot take the responsibility for the actual academic screening and selection process. For that purpose, an ad hoc Research Board would have to be established, consisting of a group of prominent academics without proper interest in the competition. This Board should not be limited to Angolan academics (including from the diaspora), but could also have an international participation, preferably from other Lusophone countries since the competition would probably have to be organized in the Portuguese language. There could be one representative from the Angolan Ministry of Science and Technology with relevant academic credentials, and one from the Norwegian Research Council.

It is assumed that joint Norwegian-Angolan research proposals might still be an option, incentivizing Norwegian research institutions to identify research partners in Angola.

When this tentative model was discussed with stakeholders (including both CMI and CEIC), doubts about the role of UNDP were expressed, due to its cumbersome bureaucratic and time-consuming procedures and probably also doubts about UNDP's real independence from GoA.

One special window of the programme could be to invite the CEIC to extend its accumulated competence by establishing partnerships with other academic or para-academic institutions (e.g. some of the NGOs doing action research of considerable quality). Given the almost total lack of previous experience with serious research in other academic institutions in Angola,

CEIC could have an important contribution to make here²⁶. Asked about this, the CEIC staff expressed its willingness to play such a role, provided the collaborating institution has the necessary academic autonomy, and of course provided the assistance is remunerated.

II: Alignment with EU Plans for research support in Angola

The EU is now in an identification process regarding options for support to research (including social and economic research) in Angola. The proposal set forth by the EU consultants is to establish a EUR 11 million support programme to public higher education institutions in Angola, starting in 2018, with a share of it dedicated to research (not yet defined – even less how much would go to social and economic research). The Diagnostic Study (op.cit.) recommends (recommendation no. 5) that the Ministry of Higher Education (MES) and the Ministry of Science and Technology (MINCT) «can work together in developing the national research fund», and hints (p. 56) that this fund in its «early stage of development offers an opportunity for EU support ...». The “new research fund” referred to here is a proposal assumingly elaborated by MINCT²⁷. The EU *Action Document* goes on to propose «funding through a competitive research and postgraduate learning fund and other financial mechanisms», and «provide workshops to the institutions on how to develop project proposals for the competitive fund as a stepping stone to prepare them for future engagement with funding mechanisms such as Erasmus+ and Horizon 2020.»²⁸. The consultants foresee having a long-term technical assistance team in place for the duration of the project, supported by a pool of short-term assistance experts. Regarding implementation, the preferred option is «indirect management with member state agencies», in practice a combination of Portugal (Camoës and Cipes) and French cooperation, possibly also involving Unesco. The EU Delegation in Luanda emphasizes that the design of the programme is still under consideration, with national stakeholders as well as internally in the EU. The Delegation expresses interest in discussing the plans with Norway with the possible aim of coordinating the EU and Norwegian support plans.

The RCN already has a close coordination with EU’s “Horizon 2020” Research programme. One possibility is to negotiate with the EU the sharing of a common structure and procedure for their planned research support – through any of the two options described above.

Even economic support from oil companies (and other private sector support) could in principle be channelled the same way. Statoil, e.g., does not rule this out.

Assessment: The Norwegian Embassy has made it clear that it is not an option to channel funds through a government-managed system. So, if the EU concludes with a model as proposed in the Diagnostic Study, it is probably not very relevant for the future Norwegian support. There is also a concern that the establishment of the new EU facility may be quite time-consuming, while Norway needs a system to be operative before mid-2018 (when the present programme is supposed to be terminated). From CEIC’s perspective, there is a worry that a government-run fund will have too many strings attached to allow independent research.

²⁶ In line with considerations quoted from then EU diagnostic study under Section 6.3.

²⁷ The MTR received no information about this when we interviewed MINCT.

²⁸ Annex 2 of the Commission Decision on Supporting Higher Education – *Action Document* for “Governacao Inovadora e Desenvolvimento Estrategica de Ensino Superior Angolano (GIDEESA), financed under the European Development Fund, p. 15

Anyway, it seems quite logical for the EU and Norway to coordinate their planned support to social science research from 2018. But it is premature at this point to conclude whether the EU could join a Norway-initiated model, or the other way round. Consultations about this will have to continue into second half 2017.

9.4 Quality Research of Relevance for SDG Development

The Terms of Reference also invited the Review to consider how Norwegian-supported research may be of relevance for the enhancement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in Angola.

Going through the list of SDGs (with indicators), and comparing to the CMI-CEIC programme, there are a number of following areas of relevance:

- Goal 1: End poverty in all forms (projects 1 and 4)
- Goal 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls (project 5)
- Goal 7: Ensure access to affordable, sustainable, modern energy for all (CEIC's energy sector programme – no more part of the agreement with CMI)
- Goal 8: Promote sustained, inclusive, sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all (projects 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
- Goal 9: Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation (project 2)
- Goal 10: Reduce inequality within and among countries (project 1, 4, 5, 6)
- Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development; access to justice; accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels (among indicators: reduce corruption; participatory decision-making at all levels) (projects 1, 4, 6)

The SDGs had not been launched at the time of initiating the programmes under review here, and they could therefore not be taken systematically into account. For any future programme, it is fully possible to make the more explicit connection to these seven goals, or any other of the 17 goals and 232 indicators.

9.5 Recommendations

Looking towards the remaining year of the present programme and beyond, the Review Mission has the following recommendations:

- 1) During the remaining period of the programme, CEIC should put more emphasis on developing a funding strategy with alternative funding options (not really done as signalled in the 2015 Core Programme Document), bearing in mind the dilemma of how to avoid the two pitfalls of ending up as a "commercial consulting company" or being "politically hijacked" if generous public funding should become available.
- 2) There is a need for strengthening CEIC's management, with an aim to strengthen the strategic planning function. The top management of UCAN should take a lead responsibility in this task, perhaps by recruiting a manager to work with the academic leadership of UCAN. A plan in this regard should be in place before any new institutional agreement is initiated. A possible new programme (based on competitive criteria) should contain support to both strategic and financial management of UCAN/CEIC.
- 3) Considering CEIC's crucial role in public and political debate about socio-economic alternatives in Angola, it is critical to avoid the sudden loss of CEIC. Until a new funding

model is found, there may be a need for bridge funding (a no-cost extension would not be sufficient for this purpose). It will be crucial to find the financial means to assure that Master and PhD candidates are enabled to finish their degrees and thus contribute to a generational renewal of the institution.

- 4) CEIC needs to develop a more pro-active media strategy, perhaps by drawing upon or strengthening UCAN's communication unit.
- 5) It is difficult to find a viable and acceptable model for competitive funding of socio-economic research in Angola. The first tentative proposal put forward in this Report – a combination of an international research board with management support from UNDP – is seriously questioned by both CEIC and CMI. A future EU support to research may offer an alternative management model also for Norwegian support, if it keeps a sufficient distance from GoA control. It is anyway important to keep a close liaison with the EU Luanda Delegation over the next months, aiming at a possible coordination of research management mechanisms.
- 6) The Review Team has the following recommendations regarding management issues:
 - Include capacity building in financial and administrative management in future agreements.
 - Make sure to use an audit company that is compliant with international norms and standards. CEIC should verify that their current auditor registers with the newly established Order of Accountants and Auditors.
 - CEIC should request annual Management Letters (*Carta de Recomendações*) from their auditor.
 - Lack of consolidated financial reporting is an obstacle to attract new donors. CEIC should produce consolidated annual financial reports that clearly reflect income from all donors, as well as total expenditures. This will enhance the overall transparency of the financial management.
 - Increase overall project management / coordination capacity within the CEIC team.

Appendix A: Terms of reference

GENERAL INFORMATION

The Royal Norwegian Embassy in Luanda, hereinafter referred to as the Contracting Authority, is inviting participation in a tender procedure to establish a contract for a midterm review of CEIC-CMI Research collaboration programme 2015-2018, and the CEIC core programme support 2015-2018 as well as an assessment the feasibility of future Norwegian support to research in Angola beyond April 2018.

The Contracting Authority may invite the tenderers to negotiations provided the Contracting Authority, following an initial evaluation of the tenders, considers this appropriate.

The tentative schedule for the procurement process is:

Activity	Time/Date
Invitation to tender made public on Doffin	31 January 2017
Deadline for receipt of tenders	20 February at 12.00 hrs Luanda time
Notification of award	10 March 2017
Contract signature	17 March 2017
Expiry of tender validity period	23 March 2017

All questions and enquiries regarding this invitation to tender are to be submitted by email to emb.luanda@mfa.no.

Complete tenders must be in English and must be delivered electronically to: emb.luanda@mfa.no. Write "Tender, case no. AGO-14/0006 and AGO-14/0004" in the subject field. The tender document(s) must be protected by a password. The password shall be submitted by email immediately after the expiry of the deadline for receipt of tenders.

All tenderers will be notified by e-mail when a decision has been made on the award of contract.

The tenderer must confirm whether he may have or not have potential conflicts related to the requested services.

ABOUT THE CONTRACT

Description of the services required

OBJECTIVE

The objective of the consultancy contract is three-fold;

- 1) firstly, to conduct a midterm review of the CEIC-CMI Research Programme 2015-2018,
- 2) secondly, to conduct a midterm review of the CEIC Core Programme Support 2015-2018, and
- 3) thirdly, to assess the feasibility of future Norwegian support to research in Angola, primarily in the areas of economics, social sciences and natural resource management.

The review should present an impartial assessment of the implementation of the two ongoing programmes and their results compared to plans. The review should furthermore provide a basis for the planning of future Norwegian support to research in Angola, including how the support can be managed.

Background

The Royal Norwegian Embassy has provided core financial support to the research institute Centro de Estudos e Investigação Científica (CEIC) at Universidade Católica de Angola (UCAN) since 2006. In addition, the Embassy has financed a research collaboration program between CEIC and the Norwegian partner CMI (Chr. Michelsens Institute) since 2008. Both the Norwegian core support to CEIC and the research collaboration programme were renewed, with substantial changes, in 2015 for an additional 3-year period, ending in April 2018. Both programmes were reviewed in 2013.

The Embassy would like to continue the support to research in Angola after the current support programmes ends in April 2018. The Embassy would however like to contribute to the building of research capability in more than one institution in Angola, on a competitive basis. The research areas of future programmes will be limited to economics, social sciences and natural resource management.

Scope

The review must address, but not necessarily be limited to, the following review criteria, questions and issues for both programmes;

The review shall:

Assess the extent to which the two programmes are on track in terms of fulfilling the four main objectives:

That CEIC-CMI has produced high quality and relevant research-based knowledge
That programme results are well integrated in Angola's political and public debates
That highly competent research personnel in various social sciences has increased at CEIC
That CEIC is recognised as the leading social science-based knowledge centre in Angola

The review shall also, to the extent possible at this stage of the programme development cycle, address the following review criteria:

Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency as described in the two enclosed agreements, as well as financial management and risk management.

Any other issues the reviewers identify of relevance for a successful accomplishment of the programmes.

Regarding the assessment of the feasibility of future Norwegian support to research in Angola, the following issues should be addressed and discussed:

What key universities and research institutes in Angola may have the minimum capacity and capability to be able to produce quality research in the areas of economics, social sciences and natural resource management.

What are the Government of Angola's plans for future support to research in the above-mentioned areas?

How may future Norwegian support to research in Angola be managed in a way that secures the integrity, quality and relevance of the research. Different designs and institutional set-ups,

including the possibility of having the support managed by a national or international institution, including UNDP, should be discussed.

How may Norwegian institutions provide support to the building of quality research relevant for the development of Angola in line with the Sustainable Development Goals?

Deliverables

The review will be based on information received through interviews with key informants as well as the review of relevant documents. The consultants will be responsible for the programming of meetings and visits.

The review shall take place in Angola during a period of 14 days. The consultant ought to pay a visit to CMI in Bergen.

A draft report in English shall be submitted to the Embassy before 1 June 2017. The Embassy will circulate the report to CMI and CEIC for comments. The final report in Pdf-format shall be submitted one week after the reception of comments from the Embassy.

The main text of the final report shall not exceed 25 pages and ought to include an executive summary. Complementary information deemed useful should be put in the annex.

Timeframe

A draft report in English shall be submitted to the Embassy before 1 June 2017. The final report must be submitted to the Embassy at the latest week 25 (starting 19 June 2017). The Embassy shall in writing accept the delivery/ file a complaint within three working days.

Contract type

The Consultancy Assignment Agreement will apply, cf Appendix 2.

CONDITIONS FOR PARTICIPATION

Mandatory documentation

Signed “Declaration of good conduct”, Appendix 1.

Professional ability

Conditions for participation: Tenderers must be able to document experience of relevant consultancy services in the past three years.

Documentation that must be provided: Details of similar services provided by the tenderer during the past three years, including their value, their content, the names of the clients and the tenderer’s role in the services.

AWARD CRITERIA

Proposed solution for the service required (weight 20 %)

Tenderers must submit a short description of the proposed solution in accordance with chapter 2.1. This should include an assessment of risk factors.

Expertise specific to the service required (weight 50 %)

The assignment should be carried out by a team of consultants. The consultants should together have the following competences:

Knowledge about the political, social and economic situation in Angola
Good knowledge about Norwegian development policy and interests in Angola
Relevant knowledge of research, capacity building and institutional development
Good understanding of project/program management issues
Demonstrated experience in conducting reviews of development cooperation programmes
Excellent command of Portuguese and English

Tenderers must submit details of relevant competence and experience for each of the consultants they propose to use. A CV should be submitted for each consultant as additional documentation of competence and experience.

Price (weight 30 %)

A total price in Norwegian kroner (NOK) excluding VAT must be submitted. The price shall include all costs related to the performance of the assignment according to this invitation to tender and the contract (Appendix 2), as well as the offered solution.

We emphasize that the travel costs shall be included in the offered price.

The offered price can not exceed NOK 450 000 excluding VAT.

Appendix B: Questionnaire

(a Portuguese version was also sent)

To whom it may concern:

A simple questionnaire to external stakeholders of the CEIC-CMI programme:

The Norwegian Embassy in Luanda has requested the consulting company Scanteam to carry out a Mid-Term Review of its support to the Research Programme of CEIC (Centro de Estudos e Investigação Científica) da Universidade Católica de Angola.

In that connection, the Review Team would like to ask a few questions to a group of stakeholders, that might take interest in the academic and popularized production of CEIC. We are principally interested in the quality and relevance of CEIC's research-based knowledge production.

We have the following questions, which in some cases may be followed up through personal or telephone-based interviews. We would be very appreciated if you could be so kind to send your response by return mail to the sender of this mail (Ms. Vibeke Skauerud), by 20 April this year.

Best regards,

Vegard Bye
(Team Leader)

Questions:

- 1) How much familiar are you with CEIC's publications (academic as well as non-academic) and other outreach activities? Is it possible to quantify approximately how many cases of CEIC production / appearance you have noted over the last year?
- 2) How visible is CEIC in the political and public debates in Angola?
- 3) Have you noted any evolution (improvement or deterioration) in CEIC's publications during the latest years? Can you briefly elaborate on what you have noted?
- 4) How do you see the quality of CEIC's publications relative to those of other Angolan institutions?
- 5) Do you agree with the following statement: "CEIC is recognized as the leading social science-based knowledge center in Angola"?
- 6) Have you noticed the presence of the Norwegian social science research institution CMI as an accompanying partner of CEIC?

- 7) Do you have any specific recommendations about how the relevance of CEIC and similar institutions in political and public debates in Angola may increase?
- 8) Which other potential institutions do you find to be potentially capable of filling a similar role?
- 9) Are you familiar with any Government of Angola plan to support academic research in the areas of economics, social sciences, natural resource management? (Please specify)

Appendix C: List of interviews

DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATIONS			
EU	Head of Cooperation	Ramon Reigada-Granda	interview
EU	Coop officer	Catarina Caetano	interview
UNDP	Country Director	Henrik Larsen	interview
ANGOLAN INSTITUTIONS			
Banco Nacional de Angola	Director of the Bank Academy	Nsingue André	interview
Ministério de Ciências e Tecnologias	National Director for Science and Research	Domingos da Silva Neto	interview
Ministério de Planeamento	National Director	Flávio Couto	completed questionnaire
	National Director	Milton Reis	completed questionnaire
UNIVERSITIES AND ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS			
Universidade Agostinho Neto	Faculdade de Economia, Dean	Redento Maia	interview
Universidade Católica + Lusíada Lubango? (Benguela?)	Lusiadas - Lobito	Ana Duarte	interview
University of Oxford	Professor	Ricardos Soares de Oliveira	mail exchange
Independent Policy Analysis (UK)	Independent Adviser	Soren Kirk Jensen	Skype interview
Universidade Lusíada	Dean	Vicente Pinto de Andrade	Interview
PRIVATE SECTOR			
Associação Industrial AIA	Presidente	José Severino	
BP Angola	Vice President	Paulo Pizarro	completed questionnaire
Statoil	Compliance / CSR	Audun Sande	interview
Statoil	Team leader - Sustainability	Juelma Giovetti	interview
MEDIA			

Expansão	Jornalista	Carlos Rosado de Carvalho	Interview
Independente	Jornalista	Reginaldo Silva	interview
Jornal de Angola	Jornalista	Afonso José "Fonseca Bengui"	interview
CIVIL SOCIETY			
ADRA	Director	Belarmino Jelembi	interview
AJPD	Presidente	Lúcia de Silveira	completed questionnaire
Development Workshop (Alan Cain)	Director	Allan Cain	interview
Mosaico	Director Administrativo	Frei Mário Rui Marçal	completed questionnaire
OPSA	Coordinator	Sergio Calundungo	interview
OSISA	Presidente	Elias Isaac	interview
POLITICIANS and MPs			
One rep for each of the three main political parties (leaders of Parliamentary factions?)	MPLA	Virgílio de Fontes Pereira	did not respond
	UNITA	Adalberto Costa Júnior	did not respond
	CASA-CE	Miau Mendes de Carvalho	did not respond
Ex-politician	Independent	Alexandra Simeão	interview
Ex-reitora	Economist	Laurinda Hoygaard	completed questionnaire
CEIC STAFF			
CEIC	Director	Alves da Rocha	meeting discussion
CEIC	Researcher/Economic Sector	Francisco Paulo	meeting discussion
CEIC	Researcher/ Sector	Nelson Pestana	meeting discussion
CEIC	Researcher/Energy	Regina Santos	meeting discussion
CEIC	Researcher/Economic & Energy Sector	Preciso Domingos	meeting discussion
CEIC	Researcher/Economic & Energy Sector	Vissolela Gomes	meeting discussion
CEIC	Researcher/Social Sector	Esperança Chili	meeting discussion
CEIC	Researcher/Economic & Social Sector	Claudio Fortuna	meeting discussion

CEIC	Researcher/Social Sector	Margareth Naugacore	meeting discussion
CEIC	Administrative Assistante	Margariada Teixeira	meeting discussion
CEIC	Accounting	Afonso Romao	meeting discussion
CEIC	Administrative Assistante	Lucia Martirns	meeting discussion
CEIC	Assistente	Evadia Kuyola	meeting discussion
CEIC	Researcher	Gilson Lazaro	meeting discussion

CMI STAFF

CMI	Programme coordinator	Eyolf Jul-Larsen	interview; meeting
CMI	Admin Officer	Sara Ögmundsdottir	interview; meeting
CMI	Researcher	Aslak Orre	interview; meeting
CMI	Researcher	Inge Tvedten	interview; meeting
CMI	Researcher	Iselin Strønen	interview; meeting
CMI	Researcher	Arne Wiig	skype interview

NORWEGIAN EMBASSY

Embassy	Ambassador	Ingrid Ofstad	skype interview
Embassy	Chargé d'affaires	Håvard Hoksnes	interview
Embassy	Advisor	Sérgio Fernandes	interview
Embassy	Second Secretary	Birgitte Wilhelmsen Wessel	interview

THE RESEARCH COUNCIL OF NORWAY	Director	Bjørn T. Kjellemo	interview
---------------------------------------	----------	-------------------	-----------

Appendix D Tables

Table D.1: Scientific outputs of CMI-CEIC collaboration

Project	Scientific outputs Phase 3	Contribution to outcome
1. Inequality in Angola	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> chapter in Economic Report 2016 (da Rocha) Journal article due 2017 (intended for peer reviewed) 	<i>Intended:</i> Improved knowledge and understanding of inequality dynamics <i>Assessment:</i> No academic production available at time of review; two products by end 2017 may contribute to intended impact
2. Economic diversification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Journal article completed 2016 – published in Lucere (not peer reviewed) 1 additional article announced – intended for peer review 	<i>Intended:</i> Better knowledge about impact of policies on economic diversification <i>Assessment:</i> Lucere article supposed to be read locally in Angola; with intended additional article, outcome seen to be reached
3. Extending the CEIC-CMI macro model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Model used in 2016 Annual Report (forthcoming) for consistency and forecast purposes Data from database applied to macro sections of Annual Report 	<i>Intended:</i> A model that can serve to evaluate the correctness and consistency of the Angolan Government's macro-economic policies <i>Assessment:</i> This may have some impact, given the status of the Annual Report and the methodological weaknesses of government publications
4. Urban and Rural Poverty Dynamics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 Sub-sections to Social Report 1 Report on rural poverty (in draft version) 1 Journal article (to appear in 2017) 	<i>Intended:</i> Improved understanding of social differences vs. rural/urban mobility <i>Assessment:</i> This is a crucial matter, so far not well documented in Angola; potentially important contribution
5. Gender relations and human rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sub-sections to social report (2016?) Working paper on rural gender and HR (in process) Working paper on urban gender and HR (in process) 	<i>Intended:</i> Increased knowledge about gender differentiation in life opportunities and basic human rights <i>Assessment:</i> Criticism in previous phases for little weight on gender; these products may have impact and be followed up by local researchers
6. The role of the município	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Article in Lucere with conclusions from study (forthcoming) Subsection to Social Report 	<i>Intended:</i> Improved understanding of local governance contribution to poverty reduction <i>Assessment:</i> These publications may have impact

Table D.2 Dissemination outputs of CMI-CEIC collaboration

Project	Dissemination outputs	Contribution to outcome
1. Inequality in Angola	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 newspaper op-ed • several newspaper op-eds 	<p><i>Intended outcome:</i> Better knowledge about inequalities among policy makers and other stakeholders</p> <p><i>Assessment:</i> If planned academic products are followed up through good dissemination, it may have intended impact</p>
2. Diversification of the Angolan economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numerous newspaper articles • 1 brief on tax policy in process • 1 brief on economics of diversification (in process) 	<p><i>Intended outcome:</i> Better knowledge about diversification impact of economic policies</p> <p><i>Assessment:</i> Good prospects for intended impact</p>
3. Extending the CEIC-CMI macro model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 brief issued 	<p><i>Intended outcome:</i> Inform the political environment in Angola about the existence of the model and how it can be used</p> <p><i>Assessment:</i> Impact very dependent on how actively and effectively the CEIC Director is able to engage public economic institutions</p>
4. Urban and Rural Poverty Dynamics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Brief on rural poverty • 1 Brief on urban poverty 	<p><i>Intended:</i> Increased awareness among policy makers and public about urban/rural poverty differences</p> <p><i>Assessment:</i> Such briefs alone may have limited impact – more systematic dissemination may be required</p>
5. Gender relations and human rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 brief on urban gender and HR • 1 brief on rural gender and HR 	<p><i>Intended:</i> Better understanding among politicians, civil servants, public</p> <p><i>Assessment:</i> Briefs alone will have limited impact – more systematic dissemination may be required</p>
6. The role of the município	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40th Anniversary researcher conference (2015) • N. Pestana presented findings from study at a high profile and well attended conference on decentralisation and the autarquias in December 2016. • 2 media op-eds 	<p><i>Intended:</i> Central and local level policy-makers engaged in research-based debates</p> <p><i>Assessment:</i> Impact here may be considerable – also given the expected new Vice President's interest in the matter</p>

Table D.3: Capacity Development at CEIC

Name	Licenciatura	MA / MSc	PhD	Actual performance / prospects
Cláudio Tomas	2006	2010	Planned for 2015	Yes, finished PhD, but moved to Un. A. Neto (2016)
Gilson Lázaro*	2006	2010	Planned for 2015	Finished the PhD in 2017
Osvaldo Silva	2006	2012	Planned for 2018	Now doing his PhD in Brazil
Eduardo Sassa*	2009	2014	Planned for 2019	Initiated PhD
Margareth Nanga*	2009	2013	Planned for 2020	Starting PhD studies in 2018
Francisco Paulo	2009	2013	Planned for 2021	Not yet initiated PhD
Precioso Domingos	2010	Planned for 2015	Planned for 2022	Will defend MA this summer
Vissolela Gomes	2013	Planned for 2016	Planned for 2022	Will defend MA in September
Carlos Vaz	2013	Planned for 2017	Planned for 2022	Attending MA course in Lisbon; expected defense 2018
Cláudio Fortuna	2011	Planned for 2017	Planned for 2022	Failed to obtain Master scholarship for Brazil
Wilson Silva	2012	Planned for 2017		Gave up Master plan for personal reason; now working in a ministry

*Collaborator, not part of permanent staff

Table D.4: Capacity Building at CEIC delivered by CMI

Project	Reported capacity-building outputs	Contribution to outcome
1. Inequality in Angola	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master supervision Carlos Vaz (enrolled in Lisbon) • Seminar on inequality and use of DHS data (Luanda, 2016) • Analysing survey data (Luanda, 2016) • Experimental methodology (experiment 1st quarter 2017) • Seminar presentations (Ucan, 2016) 	<p><i>Intended outcome:</i> Increased competence and no. of researchers in economics of wealth distribution</p> <p><i>Assessment:</i> Relatively broad approach to capacity building (but limited post-graduate supervision)</p>
2. Diversification of the Angolan economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master supervision of Vissolela Gomes (to defend MA in September 2017) • Completed measurement of diversification (2015) • Completed seminar presentations (UCAN 2016) • Completed analysis of cross-country data 	<p><i>Intended outcome:</i> More and more competent researchers to monitor economic developments in Angola</p> <p><i>Assessment:</i> Relatively broad approach to capacity building (but limited post-graduate supervision)</p>
3. Extending the CEIC-CMI macro model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant literature used during training sessions • Two workshops (Luanda and Cape Town) covering whole team 	<p><i>Intended outcome:</i> Well-trained personnel to operate the model and perform macro-economic analysis</p> <p><i>Assessment:</i> Conditions may have been created for outcome to occur (but no post-graduate supervision)</p>
4. Urban and Rural Poverty Dynamics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey design and implementation (10 enumerators) (2015) • Training digitalization and analysis of survey data (ongoing) • Qualitative methodologies (2015) • Seminar presentations (2015) • Supervision of Gilson Lázaro 	<p><i>Intended:</i> More and better researchers re urban/rural poverty analysis</p> <p><i>Assessment:</i> Relatively broad approach to capacity building (but limited post-graduate supervision)</p>
5. Gender relations and human rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervision Fortuna, Silva, Nangacovie (2015) • Survey design and implementation (2015) • Qualitative methodologies (2015) • Training digitalization and analysis of survey data (ongoing) 	<p><i>Intended:</i> More and better researchers for the study of gender relations</p> <p><i>Assessment:</i> Considerable impact may be expected (with three post-graduates being supervised)</p>
6. The role of the município	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PhD Supervision E. Sassa well underway (planned to finish 2019) • Qualitative research software course (2015) • Network-building with political science/UAN 	<p><i>Intended:</i> Consolidate CEIC as leader in research, debate, analysis of governance in Angola</p> <p><i>Assessment:</i> Intended impact (governance) is very broad and not realistic to achieve. On role of local government and its impact on local governance it may be reached</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Departure of Cláudio Tomás from the team reduced the possibility of expanding CEIC's capacity in political science for now • Annual Conference • CMI/Angola website development 	
7. Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate & efficient admin procedures established 	

Table D.5: Results compared to Results Framework, CEIC Core Programme 2015-2017

Expected Results	Pre-defined Indicators / Target Values	Reported status end 2016
Impact		
UCAN is recognised as a leading knowledge producing institution in Angola and internationally	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share of faculty with PhD degrees • Share of faculty that is full-time employed by UCAN • Number of scientific products – books, professional journal articles, contributions to scientific gatherings – produced by UCAN staff • Absolute and share of UCAN total budget that is dedicated to research and knowledge production 	We find these issues to be irrelevant to the review of CMI-CEIC collaboration (no responsibility for UCAN's general development)
Project Outcome (only indicators – no target values)		
CEIC is recognised as the leading social science-based knowledge centre in Angola	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number and share of CEIC research staff with (i) MA degree or equivalent, (ii) PhD degree • Number of scientific products – books, professional journal articles, contributions to scientific gatherings – produced by CEIC staff • Trend in CEIC's budget levels, with increasing share from own-generated activities • Number of international (outside Angola) research events at which CEIC staff are invited to present their work and findings • Number and share of "hits" on CEIC's web-site that originate outside Angola • Number of CEIC articles and papers downloaded from CEIC's web-site • Number of references to CEIC research in international science publications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7/9 MA (expected); 1/9 PhD (+1 preparing) • 4 journal articles and 3 other academic reports • budget trends: slight increase in own-generated incomes • web-hits (I have total hits but not specified how many non-Angolan - do you remember who showed us this when we went through it – perhaps Francisco?) • The overall conclusion (based on our interviews with external stakeholders) is that CEIC beyond doubt is recognized as the leading social-science knowledge centre in Angola. But that was the case even before the 3rd phase of the programme started.
Component 1 Outcome and Outputs: <i>CEIC Institutional Development</i>		
1: CEIC Component Outcome: CEIC is academically and financially a solid research centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [The indicators and target values are in practice the Outputs being delivered as presented below] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEIC is by Angolan standards an academically solid research centre • However, CEIC is not financially solid (still very much dependent on Norwegian support: 70% in 2016)

1.1 CEIC has clearly established objectives and priorities for its work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEIC has defined operational statements regarding its vision and mission that all staff are familiar with • CEIC has a medium-term (2015-17) work plan that identifies the major results to be achieved by the end of the period • CEIC prepares annual work plans in each of the three major work areas with annual work targets defined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision and mission clearly define in the documents and website, but not well disseminated to the staff • The existed plan was produced by external consultant (Arne Disch) • Annual plans were prepared for each year •
1.2 CEIC has in place management systems and practices that are in line with “good international practice” for research bodies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEIC has an organisational structure in place that reflects its research priorities, with management roles and responsibilities clearly defined • CEIC has staff/human resources management procedures in place that define roles and responsibilities of management and staff • CEIC has a procedures manual in place that defines the financial/accounting/audit standards and procedures that are to be followed regarding financial management, and similar for key internal administrative matters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEIC has an organigram and well defined functions • CEIC has developed a manual however it’s still waiting to be revised according to the new labour law. In addition, CEIC request completed timesheets prior to payment. There are however questions regarding efficient implementation (see comments in the text) • CEIC has manual that covers more the human resources and administrative management procedures however has limited focus on financial management procedures
1.3 CEIC has a medium-term (5-10 years) capacity development program in place that foresees that all core research staff have at least an MA-degree and at least 75% have PhD degrees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A staff development program that identifies the individual career paths of all research staff from today’s situation till expected completed MA/MSc and PhD degrees • A funding programme that makes it probable that the planned staff academic progress can be achieved • By end of project period: Four more researchers at CEIC have obtained an MA • By end of project period: At least one more researcher has obtained a PhD and at least two others have initiated or about to initiate their PhD studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • Not fully • 3 yes, 2 more uncertain • On track – 1 has finished but moved to public university; one more supposed to finish 2017; another supposed to finish 2018; one more initiated
1.4 CEIC has a medium-term (3-5 years) financial development program in place that foresees an annual budget increase of 10% with identified sources of revenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEIC has costed each core research programme in each pillar (own research and research collaborations) • CEIC has a medium-term financial plan with expected main revenue sources by year: (i) UCAN funding, (ii) research collaboration funding, (iii) own sources: events, publications, contract tasks, (iv) external funding for own core research tasks including donor grants funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This has not been done • • • Yes – but how realistic and sustainable?

Component 2 Outcomes and Outputs: <i>Economic Studies Area</i>		
2-a: Societal Component Outcome: A more informed public debate on Angola's economic development and alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of public events regarding Angola's economy where CEIC researchers speak/are main participants • Number of public events regarding Angola's economy where CEIC products are presented/cited • Number of public statements (newspaper articles, journal articles, media events by Angolan media) by or with CEIC researchers regarding Angola's economy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main finding: YES • 11 public events attended by the CEIC researchers • More than 12 articles in different Newspapers. CEIC has appeared on TV 4 times, in radio 12 times. Also in 2016 CEIC was called several times by the Russian radio, VOA, German Radio • 24 from Alves da Rocha (twice a month in News Paper Expansão, and in 2016 6 articles published by other Economic Researchers also in Expansão)
2-b: CEIC Component Outcome: CEIC has the capacity to produce leading-edge studies on Angola's economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [The indicators and target values are in practice the Outputs being delivered as presented below] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YES
2.1 CEIC has defined a core work programme that includes own tasks, research collaborations and possible commissioned tasks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEIC produces a costed work-programme that covers its main activities per year, showing the time-use of all involved CEIC researchers on each task 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YES
2.2 CEIC produces an annual Economic Study that provides in-depth data and analysis on the Angolan economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CEIC Annual Economic Study is delivered with (i) updated data, (ii) updated analyses, (iii) introduction of new materials derived from the research collaboration with CMI, (iv) other data that enriches the understanding of the Angolan economy and policy alternatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YES
2.3 CEIC produces a series of specific studies on the Angolan economy (articles, presentations) to particular audiences	<p>Annually CEIC produces at least:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 academic journal article on Angola's economy • 1 presentation at an international academic event • 3 follow-on deliverables to the main report 	<p>Over-Achieved: In addition to Annual Economic Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 journal article on economic diversification • Annotated bibliography on macro-economic models • Presentations at internat. Academic events not recorded • Follow-on deliverables to main report not recorded
Component 3 Outcomes and Outputs: <i>Social Sector Studies Area</i>		
3-a: Societal Component Outcome: A more informed public debate on Angola's social sectors and their development alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of public events on Angola's social sectors where CEIC researchers speak/are main participants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main finding: YES • 29 events attended

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of public events regarding Angola's social sectors where CEIC products are presented/cited • Number of public statements (newspaper articles, journal articles, media events by Angolan media) by or with CEIC researchers regarding Angola's social sectors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 17 events where CEIC researchers presented communications • 12 articles were published in newspapers and magazines
3-b: CEIC Component Outcome: CEIC has the capacity to produce leading-edge studies on Angola's social sectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [The indicators and target values are in practice the Outputs being delivered as presented below] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YES
3.1 CEIC has defined a core work programme that includes own tasks, research collaborations and possible commissioned tasks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEIC produces a costed work-programme that covers its main activities per year, showing the time-use of all involved CEIC researchers on each task 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timesheets were completed prior payment
3.2 CEIC produces an annual Social Sector Study that provides in-depth data and analysis on the Angolan social sectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CEIC Annual Social Sector Study is delivered with (i) updated data, (ii) updated analyses, (iii) introduction of new materials derived from the research collaboration with CMI, (iv) other data that enriches the understanding of the Angolan social sectors and policy alternatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Social Reports were produced and disseminated (2016 edition to be presented 2017 may be delayed)
3.3 CEIC produces a series of specific studies on the Angolan social sectors (articles, presentations) to particular audiences	<p>Annually CEIC produces at least:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 academic journal article on Angola's social sectors • 1 presentation at an international academic event • 3 follow-on deliverables to the main report 	<p>YES, over-achieved, in addition to annual Social Reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 journal article on rural/urban poverty (forthcoming) • 2 working papers on gender and human rights • 1 article (Lucere) on (lack of) local governance (autarquías)
Component 4 Outcomes and Outputs: <i>Energy Sector Area</i>		
4-a: Societal Component Outcome: A more informed public debate on Angola's energy sector and the development alternatives available	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1. Number of public events regarding Angola's energy sector where CEIC researchers speak/are main participants • 2. Number of public events regarding Angola's energy sector where CEIC products are presented/cited • 3. Number of public statements (newspaper articles, journal articles, media events by Angolan media) by or with CEIC researchers regarding Angola's energy sector 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main finding: UNCERTAIN • 1: 4 events: 1. Annual Conference 2015; 2. Annual Conference 2016; 3. Presentation to EU Ambassadors; 4. Presentation to BP • 2: 2 events • 3: 20 newspaper articles, journal articles; • 10 media events
4-b: CEIC Component Outcome: CEIC has the capacity to produce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [The indicators and target values are in practice the Outputs being delivered as presented below] 	

leading-edge studies on Angola's energy sector		
4.1 CEIC has defined a core work programme that includes own tasks, research collaborations and possible commissioned tasks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEIC produces a costed work-programme that covers its main activities per year, showing the time-use of all involved CEIC researchers on each task 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, completed
4.2 CEIC produces an annual Energy Sector Study that provides in-depth data and analysis on the Angolan energy sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CEIC Annual Energy Sector Study is delivered with (i) updated data, (ii) updated analyses, (iii) other data that enriches the understanding of the Angolan energy sector and policy alternatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, completed
4.3 CEIC produces a series of specific studies on the Angolan energy sector (articles, presentations) to particular audiences	<p>Annually CEIC produces at least:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 academic journal article on Angola's energy sector • 1 presentation at an international academic event • 3 follow-on deliverables to the main report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 articles (category of journals not specified) • Not yet • In 2017 <p>(These are totals for the two years, but programme only started in mid-2015)</p>

Table D.6: Distribution of CEIC's Revenues, 2015-2016

Revenues: (USD)	Planned 2015	Actual USD	Planned 2016	Actual USD	Comments
UCAN Grant	50 000	30 303	75 000	30 303	The grant in 2016 was provided in the form of payment for the 13th month / holiday and Christmas subsidies. The subsidies were paid directly to CEIC staff, and did not enter CEICs accounting.
UCAN Indirect funding	60 000	60 000	60 000	60 000	Not quantified, but estimated at USD 60 000 per year. Includes use of office space, payment of Social Security for CEIC staff, etc.
Norwegian Core Grant	368 500	368 345	375 000	308 351	Reduction due to exchange rate.
CMI Research collaboration	530 000	144 396	507 000	416 170	Late disbursement in 2015 reduced the overall total. Amount in 2016 reduced due to exchange rate.
Publications	30 000	15 416	30 000	20 109	Numbers taken from CEIC annual reports and confirmed by CEIC.
Commissioned tasks	95 000	158 219	100 000	198 632	This is a total of some annual project support like Statoil and OSISA, as well as punctual support to launch of reports and smaller studies. Includes donations from UNICEF, UNDP, BNA, BFA, BP and BCH. Numbers from OSISA do not match numbers from CEIC.
Total	1 133 500	776 679	1 147 000	1 033 565	

"Norwegian" share of
revenues

66%

70%

(Exchange rate: 1 USD = 165 AkZ)