WHOSE' KNOWLEDGE FOR DEVELOPMENT? KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT IN DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION: LESSONS FROM THE DEVELOPMENT GATEWAY

Entwicklung – durch wessen Wissen?
Wissensmanagement in der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit am Fallbeispiel des Development Gateway

Nina Witjes*

Austrian Research Foundation for International Development, Sensengasse 3, 1090 Vienna

Abstract

Since 1990 the international development community, particularly the development agencies led by the World Bank, has postulated a new development paradigm: knowledge was now seen as the means for poverty reduction. Poverty, in this understanding, is rooted in a lack of knowledge. Knowledge, in turn, could and should be transferred from -rich» to -poor» societies. The World Bank´s approach to knowledge as a transferable commodity is expressed in its biggest knowledge management initiative, the Development Gateway. It will be shown, that the aim of organizing and disseminating development- relevant knowledge as focused by the Gateway is not achieved. Reasons for this are the Banks approach to knowledge itself, which ignores means of power and sees knowledge as neutral. Instead of fostering an equal and democratic exchange of knowledge between the North and the South the web-based initiative helps to strengthen the Bank's neoliberal paradigm. To use ICT-based Knowledge Management for social change, the recognition of different forms and expressions of knowledge as well as participation and inclusion of marginalized groups are necessary preconditions.

keywords: *Knowledge Management | Development Cooperation | World Bank | Development Gateway | Knowledge for Development | ICTs | Participation*

Zusammenfassung

Zahlreiche Organisationen der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit haben ab den 1990er Jahren Wissen zur zentralen Ressource für Entwicklung erhoben. Die Weltbank hat hier früh eine Führungsrolle eingenommen und sich selbst zur „Wissensbank" ernannt. Die Ursache von Armut liegt im Verständnis der Bank auch in einem Mangel an Wissen und Information. Mittels Techniken des Wissensmanagements könne entwicklungsrelevantes Wissen ausgetauscht und transferiert werden und so zur Armutsreduzierung beitragen. Wissen erhält eine eindeutig ökonomische Funktion und wird zu einem global handelbaren Gut. Dieser Ansatz zeigt sich auch in der größten Initiative der Weltbank, dem Development Gateway. Anhand dieses Fallbeispiels soll gezeigt werden, dass ein demokratischer und gleichberechtigter Wissensaustausch zwischen Nord und Süd bisher nicht erreicht wurde. Der Grund dafür ist u.a. die Konzeption von Wissen durch die Bank selbst: Wissen wird als neutrales Gut dargestellt, während gleichzeitig durch den Ausschluss kritischer Stimmen aus den entwicklungspolitischen Diskursen die neoliberalen Paradigmenhoheit der Bank gefestigt wird. Damit ICT-basiertes Wissensmanagement sozialen Wandel unterstützen kann, müssen folgende Grundvoraussetzungen für Initiativen des Wissensaustausches erfüllt sein: Verschiedene Artikulationsformen des Wissens müssen anerkannt werden; die Initiativen müssen sich am spezifischen Bedarf und dem sozio-kulturellen Kontext vor Ort orientieren und von Beginn an auf allen Ebenen partizipatorisch gestaltet werden. Um nachhaltige Erfolge zu zeigen, sollte die Inklusion marginalisierte Gruppen gewährleistet werden.

Schlüsselwörter: *Wissensmanagement | Entwicklungszusammenarbeit | Weltbank | Partizipation | Informations- und Kommunikationstechnologien*

Knowledge was an integral part of international development cooperation since its official beginning in the 1950ties. It was knowledge about Others", knowledge about what (and who) has to be developed and how as well as knowledge about the desired effect of development cooperation. Often it was western knowledge and epistemology that was spread across the globe and claimed to be the valid, or true, knowledge (King and McGrath provide an interesting overview about knowledge-based aid. See King & McGrath 2004). Development Agencies saw themselves as holders of development-relevant knowledge for a long time, often not distinguishing between knowledge and information. During the 1990ties and strongly influenced by aid effectiveness debates, knowledge for development was kind of rediscovered as central for achieving poverty reduction. Because of the technical progress, mostly the development of ICT, it was now feasible to digitalize all the project- and programme material

*n.witjes@oefse.at

formerly stored in development agencies. Without doubt, the intern knowledge management as well as knowledge sharing between agencies had positive effects in the sense of organizational effectiveness, transparency and harmonization among donors. But, as King and McGrath point out regarding the discovery of knowledge-based aid: «*[. . .] it is somewhat ironic that knowledge is being emphasized when there is little evidence for answers to many perennial questions*» (King & McGrath 2004, p. 49). Analyzing knowledge-based aid, there are actually more answers given than questions posed by the agencies, above all the World Bank. At the beginning I will briefly introduce the Bank´s rediscovery of knowledge for development and it´s approach to knowledge which stands in a sharp contrast to a poststructuralist understanding of knowledge as socially constructed, diverse and tied to a specific cultural, political and economic context. To illustrate the Bank´s conception of knowledge its main knowledge exchange initiative, the Development Gateway, will be introduced and analyzed. Criticisms on the editorial policy of the Gateway, irrelevance of northern-generated knowledge information and unequal possibilities to participation in the open-part of the Gateway for people in developing countries will be presented. I will concentrate on the choice of topic as well as the system of Topic Guides who determine which material is presented on the platform.

Finally, I will make some proposals how ICT-based knowledge-sharing initiatives can be made more inclusive, opening up possibilities for real participation of those who should be at the center of all efforts of knowledge-based development.

THE KNOWLEDGE BANK – LENDING LITTLE PIECES OF KNOWLEDGE?

Since 1990 the international development community, particularly the development agencies led by the World Bank, has considered knowledge as the central resource for development. Access to development-relevant knowledge and information was stated to be even more important than land, labor or capital. With the World Development Report 1998/99 on „Knowledge for Development«[1] the World Bank drove the agenda and established itself as the „Knowledge Bank.«

The first sentence in the World Development Report expresses in a poetic manner the expectations of knowledge: „*Knowledge is like light. It can easily travel the world, enlightening the lives of people everywhere. Yet billions of people still live in the darkness of poverty – unnecessarily* (World-Bank 1999, p. 1). Knowledge, the WDR states, can save lives and creates development. It is available (mainly in the global North) und can be transferred (mainly to the global South). The difference between North and South is clearly defined in the second section: „*Poor countries – and poor people – differ from rich ones not only because they have less capital but because they have less knowledge.*» (World-Bank 1999, p. 1).

In the World Bank´s conception, knowledge seems to be little more than information, transferrable and objective while

obscuring that knowledge is power and that processes of knowledge dissemination are never neutral. During the Bank´s strategic reorientation knowledge management became the major instrument in achieving knowledge-based development cooperation (For more information about the strategic reorientation see for example Fuhr & Gabriel 2002).

Bank staff gained experience with intern knowledge management projects and then turned outward to manage the disordered » development knowledge. One of the central assumptions of the Knowledge Management fascination as well as the knowledge for development paradigm is that global knowledge is manageable. In order to organize, share and disseminate knowledge via ICT, what knowledge is has to be clearly defined.

No universal definition of knowledge exists since it has been the object of philosophical disputes for hundred of years. However, this process, instead of defining knowledge opens up space for negotiation which is important to gain acceptance that there are different forms of knowledge instead of the kind» of knowledge, mostly possessed by those who hold the power.

There are several critical points in the construction of the World Bank as the knowledge bank and its approach to knowledge. First, it ignores multiple forms of knowledge as well as the controversial debates and understandings which surround it. It also disregards opportunities to articulate and present knowledge in different ways. A second question arises: If knowledge, whatever it is like, is useful for development – and this is not a World Bank discovery – why is it not primarily the knowledge generated in developing countries which is debated, disseminated and supported by development agencies? Why it is mainly the knowledge generated in northern universities and think-tanks which is defined as relevant to development? And there is another important point: why is it the World Bank, a financial institution, which wants to be the central knowledge broker? Beginning with the last question, the political-economic background of the Banks strategic reorientation is crucial: At the end of the 1980ies and during the 1990ies the Bank experienced a significant loss of importance.

As King and McGrath state: «*[The] conjunction of the need to become a learner organization, criticism of the effectiveness of the Bank´s operations, and a growing need to think beyond structural adjustment opened up a space for the notion of the knowledge bank to emerge.*» (King & McGrath 2004). By repositioning itself as a knowledge broker the Bank extended its original objectives and assumes a pioneering role in the global market place for development knowledge and is actually central actor in the knowledge economy in which «*[. . .] knowledge is the only source of long-run sustainable competitive advantage*» (Thurow 1996).

GLOBALIZATION and technological progress allowed a steady flow of capital and information. As a result, information and communication technologies helped to put knowledge back on the development agenda and created significant promise and many expectations. Proponents of ICT are sure that it is only a question of time before the digital divide can be closed.

Technologies which are able to send information around the world in seconds seem to be making the idea of a totally networked world come true. As Samoff and Stomquist argue,

---

[1] World Bank (1999): World Development Report 1998 / 99: Knowledge for Development. Oxford University Press New York

the expectation is that the material poor no longer need be deprived of information (Samoff & Stromquist 2001).

By using technologies and access to crucial information they acquire the means of improving their livelihood as well the economic situation of their country. Inequalities resulting from gender, religion, nationality or status can be reduced.

Poor countries will be enabled to catch up and to accelerate the introduction of the knowledge-based society and thus the participation in the global market for knowledge (Samoff & Stromquist 2000). Knowledge in the World Bank´s understanding is seen as a commodity which can be traded and easily transferred on behalf of ICT. But there is, as in other development agencies' knowledge initiatives, often no clear distinction between knowledge and information. This ignores that information has to be converted in knowledge through human action and, according to Mittelstraß is a central promise of the knowledge economy: to get access to and command of knowledge without the bothersome processes of learning (Mittelstraß 2001). This understanding of knowledge, available in little pieces, is reflected in the Bank´s greatest web-based initiative for knowledge exchange, the Development Gateway.

THE DEVELOPMENT GATEWAY: ONE-WAY-STREET FOR DEVELOPMENT KNOWLEDGE

The *Development Gateway* (DG) is an online portal which comprises five different web-based platforms with the aim of disseminating knowledge relevant for development. It was developed in the context of the aid effectiveness debates and focuses on three areas of ICT-related development cooperation: effective government, knowledge sharing and fostering a global network between organizations in developing countries. [2]

Initiated by the World Bank, it has been independent of the Bank since 2001 when it was transferred to the DG-Foundation. [3] The services available inform about programmes, projects and calls of the international development community.

In special Country Gateways content is provided by multi-stakeholder organizations in developing countries, but selected and given technical and financial support by the DG-Foundation. For the purpose of this paper, the Knowledge Exchange Service » is of special interest. Thematic priorities are Governance, Economy, Sectors, Environment, Education, Health, Society, Culture as well as Science and Technology which all include specific subtopics and are moderated by Topic Guides.

There are several criticisms of the Gateway, mostly articulated by NGOS in the field of knowledge and as well from researchers both in the North and the South. [4] Criticisms mostly concentrate on the editorial policy of the Gateway, its connection to the World Bank as well as the irrelevance of northern-generated information for and unequal possibilities to participation in the open-part of the Gateway (e.g. discussions, ranking the material). I will go now through this one by one.

WHO DECIDES WHAT´S BEING DISCUSSED?

The choice of topics is thus orientated to the official donor categories while you will not find topics such as political economy, inequality or discrimination, instead concepts like governance and human development. Wilks criticizes this taxonomy because it «*[. . .] appears to reflect an aim to organize development-related information in a way that is convenient for people who see the world through official development lenses, or perhaps a failure to understand that issues are constructed and perceived differently by different groups.*» (Wilks 2001). The Choice of Topic setting is a highly political field, determining the mainstream development discourse. In spite of the commitment the World Bank has made to the new Aid Architecture as signatory of the Paris Declaration as well as the Accra Agenda, it can not be said that the principles, [5] especially the concept of Ownership, are reflected in the Development Gateway. On the contrary, it seems that the communication and information structure of the DG still represents a top-down approach to participation as transaction instead of fostering fair representation. Ownership of the choice of topic as well as content generation and the structuring of communication is not realized in the actual design of the DG.

As Thompson (2004) puts it, the Gateway organizes information in a way that "*[. . .] objectifies, measures and exposes 'the developing' in categories not of their own choosing; it 'mediates' by screening and presenting a view of development which accords with dominant developmental power relations[. . .]*» instead of putting the » and diverse in the center of attention.

The choice of language is only one example for this. Given, that you can » only something you understand, there is no reason why DG-content is published mainly in English or another of the six UN languages. Swahili for example is one of the most important and widespread languages in East and Central Africa. It counts more than 60 million speakers and plays a crucial role in every day life of millions of people.

---

[2] Development Gateway / About: 2011-07-26. http://www.developmentgateway.org/about. Accessed: 2011-07-26. (Archived by WebCite® at http://www.webcitation.org/60Sam6XxD)

[3] The Development Gateway is financed by several governments, International Corporations, mainly from the Technology Sector as well as from the World Bank itself. This is a critical point because the World Bank declares the DG as independent, only governed by the Development Gateway Foundation. In an analysis with the Tool Issue Crawler, Noortje Marres from the University of Amsterdam founds out that there are indeed strong ties with the Bank. For detailed information about tracing trajectories of issues see: Marres (2004).

[4] Most critique came from the CSOs Bretton Woods Project, OneWorld, Bellanet and Voice of the Turtle. For further reading see for example: Voice of the Turtle (2001), The Development Gateway: A Declaration of concerned knowledge workers. Available at : http://www.voiceoftheturtle.org/gateway/. Accessed: 2011-07-26. (Archived by WebCite® at http://www.webcitation.org/60Sb2xzJR)

[5] The Paris Declaration (2005) and the Accra Agenda for Action (2008) are founded on the five core principles Ownership, Alignment, Harmonization, Results and Mutual Accountability. For more information see: http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/11/41/34428351.pdf. Accessed: 2011-07-26 (Archived by WebCite at http://www.webcitation.org/60SbCvwyK)

The process of knowledge production is directly restricted to language skills, and to exclude for example Swahili from the Development Gateway would mean excluding millions of people from participation. On this basis to use only English in the context of East Africa allows access to only a limited (exclusive) group - quasi a linguistic elite and excludes the marginalised in from what is claimed to be knowledge relevant to development.

This is true for the Country Gateways, too, which were a response to voices in civil society critical of the centralized Gateway structure and of the lack of ownership for developing countries. This seems democratic and participatory, but it ignores that it will be only a certain elite who has the opportunity to disseminate its knowledge through the Gateway, also because «*[…] issues of inclusion and representation are more directly connected with conflict and survival*» (Van Der Velden 2002a, p. 8).

Another critical point is that mechanisms of selection transform the southern-generated knowledge till it is integrated in northern knowledge databases. As Samoff and Stromquist state with respect to the aspects of power in knowledge sharing processes: «*[…] the official knowledge collectors will have important authority over what is regarded as knowledge and over the constructs used to organize it, for example 'indigenous', 'traditional', and 'authentic'.*» (Samoff & Stromquist 2001, p. 639).

TOPIC GUIDES: A CRITICAL ONE-MAN SHOW

It is the task of the Topic Guides to select the material which will be available on the Gateway. According to King, they fulfill the central function of knowledge management. But it seems doubtful that their collection represents the interest of all in the development communities, especially because «*[…] the Topic Guide would need to be a very unusual combination of knowledge manager, networker, reviewer, disseminator, synthesizer, policy analyst, and last but not least – scholar.*» (King & McGrath 2004). There are a lot of criticisms articulated by civil society organizations from the North and the South about this selection procedure, especially with respect to the missing transparency about the Gateways quality standards which determine if material is published. This is crucial because Topic Guides have to find a balance between material send by established organizations as the WHO, UN or even the World Bank and their mandate to encourage capacity-building in the South. Methods of knowledge validation do not exist in a power-free space and are not only oriented to quality.

The selection of which knowledge is worthy to be published made by the Topic Guides, thus as well as the presentation of information determines who has access – and who has not.

THERE IS NO CONSENSUS

The super-site for development knowledge creates the impression that a consensus exists about relevant knowledge in the international development community. But knowledge is power and therefore it is contested. This is not reflected in the Gateways structure nor is there room for discussion about knowledge in general or what is meant by, for example, the term development which cannot be supposed to have the same meaning for everybody using the Gateway.

With reference to the work of Maja Van der Velden, development as understood by the DG means the diffusion of knowledge from more to less developed societies in a linear process and has nothing to do with emancipation through the deconstruction of power.

Instead, I endorse the comprehension of knowledge as imperfect, socially constructed and diverse, which is situated and cannot be detached from its cultural, political and economic context (This comprehension is adopted from Lyla Mehta in her critical examination of the World Development Report on Knowledge for Development. See Mehta 1999). Otherwise, communication between knowledge networks and within the DG becomes merely an information transport medium. The role of the knowledge network will be to «*[…] provide cheap, fast, long-distance communication that will strengthen the relations between centers and margins while weakening everything between; it supports centralized decision-making and authority while decentralizing ‹location›, i.e. work; it will go further and faster while saying less about more.*» (Menzies 1996).

There cannot exist a real consensus when a lot of people are excluded from the development discourse as arranged by the Development Gateway. According to Foucault, mechanisms of exclusion regulate the access to discourses as well as which discourse is possible and which is not (Foucault´s general theories concerning power and the relation between power and knowledge were significant for the development of the poststructuralist theory of knowledge. Among his the most important works are Foucault 1972, 1973).This means that certain regions of the discourse are reserved for qualified persons; others, who do not meet the given requirements, will be marginalized or even totally excluded (Pscheida 2010, p.36, my translation).

It can be stated that because of the mechanisms of exclusion – through top-down topic setting and content selecting by DG Staff, opaque quality criteria, and the lack of recognition of other forms of knowledge which perhaps cannot be expressed in the context of the present structure of the DG as well as by arbitrary language choice – that the DB empowers a certain kind of discourse.

Initiatives such as this one enable select groups of expert to determine what is regarded as valid and relevant knowledge. But this group is not likely to fulfill the needs of people in developing countries, especially when local and indigenous knowledge is excluded.

As Ishengoma points out: «*[It] implies that the Bank has already set a standard for development knowledge. That means the huge amount of local / indigenous knowledge outside its scientific and technocratic community will be excluded from the Bank´s standard knowledge website. This exclusion will consequently make the World Bank irrelevant to Africa and many other Least Developed Countries.*» (Ishengoma 2001, n.P.).

This raises concerns about the World Bank´s role as knowledge broker, or, as we have seen, concerns about its domination of the development discourse by discouraging dissonant discourses in many different ways. As Robert Bissio points out: has argued in favor of the World Bank […] starting to publish a newspaper, even in countries which badly lack them. There

would be a public outrage if someone proposed it, as the press is supposed to be free.» (Roberto Bissio, Executive Director of The Third World Institute, Montevideo commented on the Development Gateway. See therefore Wilks 2001).

But even if nobody from developing countries has asked for the Development Gateway, the expected advantages seem to be clear: with an ostensibly open platform it became possible to appease some of the voices critical of the Banks disconnection to -world» problems in developing countries while at the same time privileging those contributions, which will not affect the neoliberal paradigm. (Regarding the bank intern research unit DEC Robin Broad, a formerly World Bank economist states that there exist a lot of mechanisms to discourage dissonant voices from within the Bank which reduce the trust in the Banks claim to provide the -available» knowledge in the Gateway. For a detailed and critical analysis of World Bank research see Broad 2006).

Through the setting of quality standards many people (and therefore many different views) get excluded from discourse while at the same the DG-Team maintains that the platform has many possibilities to interact and participate.

The option to comment on and rank the material on the website seems democratic only at the first sight. But it implies that everyone has access to a computer or the time to spend in front it as well as a functioning internet-connection or even the necessary electricity. Perhaps this is one of the reasons why in 2001 only 30 per cent of the Bank´s site users were from outside the U.S. (Wilks 2001).

CONCLUSION

The stated aim of World Banks´ Knowledge Management initiatives was the sharing of Knowledge between the North and the South. The implicit assumption that by means of knowledge management knowledge can be detached from its specific context is critical. This illustrates the Bank's approach to knowledge as something which can be transferred in a linear way and can be possessed in the North while being applied in the South. The analysis of the Development Gateway confirms that in the case of the World Bank there seems to be no equal and participative kind of knowledge exchange between North» and South» as a constructive sharing of expertise.

Instead, it is argued, the Bank's leading position as a global knowledge broker has been strengthened by its focus on knowledge management, mainly through ICT, while the equal participation of other actors has not been achieved. The nature of technical-based knowledge management as used by the World Bank makes it an instrument to preserve dominance in global knowledge governance. Hence, knowledge management itself is not the problem but the way the Bank originally implemented it. But, Knowledge Management and ICTs for Development have a great potential as instruments for the global knowledge exchange, recognizing diverse kinds of knowledge as well as multiple ways of knowledge creation and validation. To reach a democratic and empowering knowledge exchange, three aspects for knowledge sharing initiatives are of importance:

First, it was shown that methods do not exist in a power-free space. Acquaintance with the scientific METHODS means also to gain power. The selection of information through the

Topic Guides, processes of knowledge validation as well as the presentation of information determines who has access – and who has not.

Second, to be relevant in the context of self-determined development, platforms have to be designed in a participatory manner. This means, that a variety of stakeholders on all levels of society has to be involved in planning processes from the beginning, not only intellectual, political and economic elites. Methodical, it would be most promising to use participatory action research to assess the knowledge needs of people in developing countries. Therefore, it is important that the social context in which knowledge sharing initiative are developed has to form the basis of their design. This includes e.g. linguistic and socio-cultural translations to make the knowledge accessible for all, independently of their educational background (Van Der Velden 2002b, p. 12). This is the only way information and knowledge can be relevant for those concerned and to improve their living conditions through knowledge exchange. Therefore, participation has to be conceptualized as a citizen right with the aim of a radicalised democratization of knowledge exchange which includes as many people as possible.

Third, the design of ICTs for development has to be inclusive if their aim is to reach the most marginalized groups. These are largely excluded till now as well as from content generation as from access to the highly technology-based knowledge databases. E.g. papers and analysis could be offered as audio files for visually impaired or illiterate persons. As already mentioned the choice of language is of high importance for access. There is no reason for the dominance of former colonial languages. Knowledge Management should be used as an instrument which allows as many as possible different voices to be articulated and heard. This also means creating opportunities for people in developing countries to participate in the international development discourse as equal participants and not only as receiver of knowledge generated and tested elsewhere

REFERENCES

Broad R (2006): *Research, knowledge, and the art of 'paradigm maintenance': The World Bank's development economics vice-presidency (DEC)*. Review of International Political Economy **13**(3): 387–419.

Foucault M (1972): The archaeology of knowledge & the discourse on language. Pantheon Books, New York.

Foucault M (1973): The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences. Taylor & Francis Ltd.,, London.

Fuhr H & Gabriel J (2002): Wissensmanagement., Chap. Wissensmanagement in der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit – das Beispiel der Weltbank., 189–216. Leske und Budrich, Wiesbaden.

Ishengoma J. M (2001): *Whose knowledge counts? Re-examining the role of the World Bank as a Broker of Development Knowledge from a Southern Perspective.*

King K & McGrath S (2004): Knowledge for Development?: Comparing British, Japanese, Swedish and World Bank Aid. Zed Books, London.

Marres N (**2004**): *Tracing the trajectories of issues, and their democratic deficits, on the Web: The case of the Development Gateway and its doubles.* Information Technology & People **17**(2): 124–149.

Mehta L (**1999**): *From darkness to light? Critical reflections on the world development report 1998/99.* Journal of Development Studies **36**(1): 151–161.

Menzies H (**1996**): Whose brave new World? The Information Highway and the New Economy. Between the lines, Toronto.

Mittelstraß J (**2001**): Wissen und Grenzen. Philosophische Studien. Suhrkamp„ Frankfurt a.M.

Pscheida D (**2010**): Das Wikipedia-Universum. Wie das Internet unsere Wissenskultur verändert. transcript Verlag, Bielefeld.

Samoff J & Stromquist N (**2000**): *Knowledge Management Systems: on the promise and actual forms of information technologies.* Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education **30**(3): 323–332.

Samoff J & Stromquist N (**2001**): *Managing knowledge and storing wisdom? New forms of foreign aid?* Development and Change **32**(4): 631–656.

Thompson M (**2004**): *Discourse,'development'& the'digital divide': ICT & the world bank.* Review of African Political Economy **31**(99): 103–123.

Thurow L (**1996**): The future of capitalism: How today's economic forces shape tomorrow's world. Penguin Books, London.

Van Der Velden M (**2002**a): *The end of diversity? Knowledge, ICTs and the development gateway.* Paper presented at the 3rd International Conference on Cultural Attitudes Towards Technology and Communication 2002., –, Citeseer.

Van Der Velden M (**2002**b): *Knowledge facts, knowledge fiction: the role of ICTs in knowledge management for development.* Journal of International Development **40**(1): 25–39.

Wilks A (**2001**): *A Tower of Babel on the Internet? The World Bank's Development Gateway.*

World-Bank (**1999**): *World Development Report 1998/99: Knowledge for Development.*Oxford University Press.