Leibniz Gemeinschaft
Der Senat

SEN 0026/05
24.11.2005

Stellungnahme zum Institut für Weltwirtschaft (IfW)

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Vorbemerkung

Der Senat der Wissenschaftsgemeinschaft Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz – Leibniz-Gemeinschaft – evaluiert in Abständen von höchstens sieben Jahren die Forschungseinrichtungen und die Einrichtungen mit Servicefunktion für die Forschung, die auf der Grundlage der „Ausführungsvereinbarung Forschungseinrichtungen“[1] von Bund und Ländern gemeinsam gefördert werden. Diese Einrichtungen haben sich in der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft zusammengeschlossen. Die wissenschaftspolitischen Stellungnahmen des Senats werden vom Senatsausschuss Evaluierung vorbereitet, der für die Begutachtung der Einrichtungen Bewertungsgruppen mit unabhängigen Sachverständigen einsetzt. Die Stellungnahme des Senats sowie eine Stellungnahme der zuständigen Fachressorts des Sitzlandes und des Bundes bilden in der Regel die Grundlage, auf der der Ausschuss Forschungsförderung der Bund-Länder-Kommission für Bildungsplanung und Forschungsförderung (BLK) überprüft, ob die Einrichtung die Fördervoraussetzungen weiterhin erfüllt.

Auf der Grundlage der vom Institut für Weltwirtschaft (IfW) eingereichten Unterlagen wurde eine Darstellung der Einrichtung erstellt, die mit dem IfW sowie den zuständigen Ressorts des Sitzlandes und des Bundes abgestimmt wurde (Anlage A). Die vom Senatsausschuss Evaluierung (SAE) eingesetzte Bewertungsgruppe hat das IfW am 13./14. September 2004 besucht und daraufhin einen Bewertungsbericht erstellt (Anlage B). Der neue Präsident des IfW, der erst im Oktober 2004 sein Amt antrat, erläuterte der Bewertungsgruppe seine Pläne. Auf der Grundlage dieses Bewertungsberichts und der vom IfW eingereichten Stellungnahme (Anlage C) erarbeitete der Senatsausschuss einen Vorschlag für die Senatsstellungnahme. Der Senat der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft hat die Stellungnahme am 24. November 2005 erörtert und verabschiedet. Er dankt den Mitgliedern der Bewertungsgruppe für ihre Arbeit.

1. Beurteilung und Empfehlungen

Der Senat schließt sich der Beurteilung und den Empfehlungen der Bewertungsgruppe an. Das IfW erbringt in Teilen gute bis sehr gute Leistungen in der wirtschaftswissenschaftlichen Forschung und Politikberatung sowie in der Bereitstellung von wirtschaftswissenschaftlichen Informationen.

Das IfW gehört hinsichtlich seiner Publikationen in referierten Zeitschriften sowie bei der Einwerbung wissenschaftlich begutachteter Drittmittel zur Spitze der deutschen außeruniversitären Wirtschaftsforschung. In einigen Forschungseinheiten werden gute bis sehr gute Forschungsergebnisse erzielt. In der Politikberatung verfügt das IfW über anerkannte Kompetenz, ebenso wie in der Graduiertenausbildung („*Advanced Studies Program in International Economic Policy Research“)*. Das Institut lebt von einer guten Mischung junger motivierter sowie erfahrener Wissenschaftler.

Im Oktober 2004 trat der neue Präsident des IfW sein Amt an. Mit großem Engagement analysierte er die aktuelle Lage des Instituts und etablierte in beeindruckender Weise den „*Kiel Dialogue*“ – ein umfassendes Instrument zur inhaltlichen und strukturellen Reorganisation der Einrichtung. Die Umstrukturierungspläne des Präsidenten werden durch die Bewertungsgruppe vollständig unterstützt.

---
1 Ausführungsvereinbarung zur Rahmenvereinbarung Forschungsförderung über die gemeinsame Förderung von Einrichtungen der wissenschaftlichen Forschung (AV-FE)

Das IfW hat einen großen Teil der Empfehlungen des Wissenschaftsrats aus dem Jahre 1996 umgesetzt. Das Forschungsprofil wurde stärker fokussiert, indem ein Teil der Arbeitsgruppen zusammengelegt und weniger erfolgreiche Gruppen aufgelöst wurden. Die Kooperation mit der Universität Kiel wurde gestärkt, ist aber weiterhin ausbaufähig. Weiterhin wurde ein Kuratorium als Aufsichtsgremium installiert.

Trotz der erkennbaren Fokussierung des Forschungsprofils fehlen dem IfW bisher aber eine klare Forschungsstrategie und ein kohärentes Forschungsprogramm. Im internationalen Vergleich ist die Forschungsqualität einiger Abteilungen deutlich verbesserungsfähig. Insbesondere die Anzahl der Veröffentlichungen in referierten Zeitschriften sowie die Höhe der wissenschaftlich begutachteten Forschungsdrittmittel sollten weiter gesteigert werden. Darüber hinaus wurden Defizite im Bereich der Verwaltung, vor allem im Controlling (KLR) und in der Personalentwicklung festgestellt. Der Anteil der aus der Grundfinanzierung befristet beschäftigten Wissenschaftler sollte auf 50 % erhöht werden.

Das IfW galt bislang als das führende deutsche Wirtschaftsinstitut mit einer hohen Reputation in der weltwirtschaftlichen Analyse. Im letzten Jahrzehnt wurde die Konkurrenz zwischen den wirtschaftswissenschaftlichen Instituten national und vor allem international deutlich stärker. Zugleich haben sich in den Wirtschaftswissenschaften neue netzwerkartige Arbeitsstrukturen herausgebildet, in die sich das IfW noch nicht genügend integriert hat. Im Zuge dieser Entwicklungen hat das IfW an Forschungsrenommee eingebüßt. Die Bewertungsgruppe ist aber der Überzeugung, dass die Einrichtung ihr traditionell hohes Leistungspotential mit der Amtseinführung des neuen Präsidenten zurückgewinnen kann.

Mit Beschluss vom 3. März 2004 hat der Senat der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft die Bewertungsgruppe gebeten, im Rahmen der Evaluierung des IfW zu prüfen, inwieweit positiv evaluierte Forschungsbereiche des HWWA in das IfW integriert werden könnten. Diesem Auftrag ist die Bewertungsgruppe nachgekommen. Die Bewertungsgruppe ist der Ansicht, dass das IfW gegenwärtig vor einem enormen institutionellen Umbruch steht. Um die mit einem Umbruch zwangsläufig einhergehenden Spannungen und Herausforderungen optimal bewältigen zu können, ist eine Konzentration aller Institutskompetenzen und Potentiale notwendig. Die Integration von Forschungsbereichen eines weiteren Instituts würde eine zusätzliche Herausforderung bedeuten, die die zur Umstrukturierung notwendigen Kräfte des IfW über die Maßen beanspruchen würde.

Eine Eingliederung des IfW in eine Universität wird nicht empfohlen. Das IfW kann seinem Arbeitsauftrag, einer Kombination aus hochwertiger angewandter Forschung und Politikberatung, nur in entsprechend vernetzten und betriebsförmig organisierten Strukturen gerecht werden.

Mit seinem Arbeitsauftrag und den vorgelegten Arbeitsergebnissen, in Verbindung mit der vom Präsidenten geplanten inhaltlichen und strukturellen Neuorientierung, erfüllt das IfW die Anforderungen, die an Einrichtungen von überregionaler Bedeutung und gesamtstaatlichem wissenschaftspolitischen Interesse zu stellen sind.

Der Senat geht davon aus, dass der Wissenschaftliche Beirat der IfW in seinen Audits die erzielten Ergebnisse der inhaltlichen und strukturellen Reorganisation überprüft und dass das Institut in vier Jahren dem Senat der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft einen Bericht des Wissenschaftlichen Beirats über die Umsetzung der Empfehlungen vorlegt.

2. Zur Stellungnahme des IfW

Das IfW teilt die Einschätzung der Bewertungsgruppe, dass die Leistung des Instituts, gemessen an internationalen akademischen Kriterien, noch weiter verbessert werden muss. Dies decke sich mit dem erklärten Ziel des neuen Präsidenten und der Mitarbeiter. Das Institut dankt den Gutachtern für die zahlreichen Vorschläge zur Verbesserung der Qualität der Forschung im IfW. Es wird die Empfehlungen aufgreifen und sieht sich in seinen Reformanstrengungen bestätigt.

Ebenso begrüßt das IfW die Empfehlung der Gutachter, zum jetzigen Zeitpunkt von einer Integration positiv evaluierter HWWA-Forschungsbereiche abzusehen. Es wird nach Möglichkeiten suchen, die Kooperation mit den positiv beurteilten Forschungsbereichen beim HWWA zu verstärken (vgl. Stellungnahme des Senats zum Hamburgischen Welt-Wirtschafts-Archivs vom 15.06.2005, Anlage F).

Der Senat begrüßt die positive Aufnahme der Empfehlungen der Bewertungsgruppe durch das IfW und den konstruktiven Umgang mit den Empfehlungen.

3. Förderempfehlung

Der Senat der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft empfiehlt Bund und Ländern, das IfW als Forschungseinrichtung auf der Grundlage der „Ausführungsvereinbarung Forschungseinrichtungen“ weiter zu fördern.

Senate Evaluation Committee

SAE 0052/04
07-September-04

Annex A: Presentation

Kiel Institute for World Economics at the University of Kiel (IfW)[1]

Content

Appendices

[1] This presentation, compiled by the Evaluation Office, is approved by IfW and the relevant Federal and State departments.

1. Development and Funding

The Kiel Institute for World Economics (IfW) was founded by Bernhard Harms in 1914 as Königliches Institut für Seeverkehr und Weltwirtschaft. It has its roots in the University of Kiel, Staatswissenschaftliches Seminar, which was established in 1899. IfW is still affiliated with the University of Kiel as an independent institution. In 1934 the Institute was given its present name. Since 1977 the IfW has been receiving institutional funding from the German Federal Government and the community of German Länder (States) at a ratio of 50:50 %. The Schleswig-Holstein State Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Culture is responsible for the Institute. The Federal Ministry of Economics and Labour oversees the work of the Institute as funding representative of the Federal Government.

The previous evaluation of the IfW by the German Science Council took place in 1996. Afterwards based on an evaluation report and a statement of the German Science Council and a common comment of both Ministries the committee of the Bund-Länder-Kommission decided to continue funding the Institute.

2. Mission, Tasks, Main Work Areas and Scientific Environment

The main task of the Kiel Institute for World Economics is the analysis of global economic affairs and the dissemination of research findings to the scientific community, policy institutions and the general public. The focus of research is on empirical studies of international economic relations and their implications for economic policy at the national and the international level.

The three main work areas in research are:

- *International trade and* factor *flows.* This area comprises issues such as determinants and effects of foreign direct investment, the role of multinational corporations in globalization, patterns of geographical specialization and reforms of the international trading system for goods and services.
- *Growth, development and sustainability.* This area comprises issues such as patterns of growth and income distribution in the development process, technological change and structural adjustment, agglomeration and innovation, and the role of natural resources and the environment for economic growth.
- *Business cycles* and *financial markets.* This area comprises issues such as business cycle analysis, stabilization strategies for open economies, and the structure and dynamics of financial markets.

In each of these three working areas there are inputs from several departments of the Institute. At present, the Institute, without the Library, is divided into the President's Department (including among others the Advanced Studies Program in International Economic Policy Research and the Financial Markets Research Area), five Research Departments and the Information, Editorial, and External Relations Department.

The *President's* Department designs, coordinates and monitors the policy of the Institute vis-à-vis the public, including the donors, the media and the political institutions. The Advanced Studies Program in International Economic Policy Research, which is part of the President's Department, is a ten-month program, conducted fully in English, for postgraduates as well as for economists with several years of professional experience.

As a further separate unit within the President's Department, the *Financial Markets Research Area* works on projects that deal with the process of globalization of financial markets. Its implications are analysed in projects with a macroeconomic focus and projects with a microeconomic focus. The projects with a macroeconomic focus deal with the link between the structure and the integration of international financial markets, the propagation of macroeconomic shocks in open economies, and macroeconomic volatility. The projects with a microeconomic focus deal, for instance, with the structure of, and linkages between, international banking markets, and with the efficiency and dynamics of Europe's markets for fast-growing high-tech firms.

Moreover, the President's Department conducts individual research projects which deal mainly with Germany's position in global competition. It maintains close ties to the Faculty of Economics at Kiel University, as the president holds a chair at this Faculty and traditionally has supervised most of the dissertations written by young economists at the Kiel Institute.

The *Growth, Structural Change, and International Division of Labor Department* (RD I) concentrates its research on the integration of the world economy and related structural adjustments in advanced, internationally open economies. The globalization of the world economy, technological progress, and changes in institutions are analysed as the major determinants of economic development. In particular, international factor flows and their impact upon growth and employment, labour market regimes, and the design of social security systems are analysed. Special emphasis is given to the development of European integration.

The *Environmental and Resource Economics Department* (RD II) focuses on the allocation of environmental and natural resources. The factors influencing the increasing scarcity of natural resources are investigated and their impact on the allocation of factors of production and goods in the world economy is assessed. Its research focuses especially on the evaluation of international and national aspects of environmental policy measures leading to proposals for rational and efficient use of environmental policy instruments.

The *Regional Economics Department* (RD III) focuses on the spatial perspective of economic activity, on how centripetal and centrifugal as well as integrating and disintegrating forces are shaping the spatial division of labour. Currently, the Department's research activity concentrates on the importance of agglomeration for innovation and economic growth, on the spatial repercussions of European integration and on topics such as the New Economy and the spatial division of labour as well as institutional aspects of infrastructure investment and regulation.

The *Development Economics and Global Integration Department* (RD IV) targets its research activities basically toward two major issues: first, the interactions between growth, structural change, and income distribution in developing countries and emerging markets integrated in international goods and factor markets, and second, the prerequisites of monetary and exchange rate policies which are necessary to ensure macroeconomic stability in the process of economic growth in developing countries and emerging markets. Apart from these two major issues, the Department also conducts research on the role of developing countries and emerging markets in multilateral and regional trade policies and in the global allocation of foreign investment.

The Business *Cycles Department* (RD V) analyses and forecasts the cyclical development in the world economy, with a particular focus on Germany, the euro area, and other industrial countries. Furthermore, strategies for economic policy are analysed in order to evaluate whether they can contribute to price stability, economic growth, employment, and a more stable development of output. The development of the theoretical basis for understanding and forecasting business cycles is a central task of the Department. In addition, state-of-the-art econometric methods are used to improve the empirical basis for the forecasts and the assessment of economic policy. The Department uses several databases to analyse business cycles and public finances, and continuously updates these databases by adding national and international data from official and non-official sources.

Aspects of institutions and policies receive particular emphasis in connection with the Kiel Institute's role in policy advising.

Additional tasks of the Kiel Institute consist of providing an international forum for discussions on international economics and contributing to the postgraduate education of young economists from several countries in the context of the Institute's Advanced Studies Program in International Economic Policy Research as well as hosting visiting researchers from several countries and supporting their research activities.

Regarding **national and international significance** the Kiel Institute states that it is the only German research institute whose research focus is on a comprehensive view of determinants shaping the world economy. Scientific and public interest in this research area has further increased since the previous evaluation, as is shown by the intensifying debates on globalization and its implications for economic policy at the national and international level. The research results obtained at the Kiel Institute provide significant inputs for economic policy. Based on its comprehensive analysis of international economic relations, the Institute advises various institutions at the national and international level (including the EU, the World Bank, the IMF, the UNCTAD and the Inter-American Development Bank).

The Kiel Institute considers itself to be one of the three leading non-university economic research institutes in Germany (the other two being DIW in Berlin and ZEW in Mannheim), and one of the world's three leading non-university research institutes in the area of international economics (the other two being the Institute for International Economics in Washington and the Institute for International Economic Studies in Stockholm). According to the Institute, it enjoys a high worldwide reputation. Economists from the Institute have been invited to present their research findings at many national and international conferences. They have further increased the number of contributions in refereed journals since the previous evaluation. According to Keil and Huber[2], the Institute accounted for 30.2 per cent of the weighted TOP 30 journal publications of the ten leading German-speaking economic research institutes[3] in 1997–2000 compared to 14.9 per cent in 1993–96 (the period of the previous evaluation); the Kiel Institute occupied the top rank among the German research institutes in both periods. The Kiel Institute's journal *Review of World Economics/Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv* is one of the leading journals in the field of empirical research on international economics.

---

[2] Angelina Keil, Peter Huber, Wo die Luft dünn wird. Zur Publikationstätigkeit der deutschsprachigen Wirtschaftsforschungsinstitute. Österreichisches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung Wien, WIFO Working Papers, No. 185, September 2002, p. 14, revised version published as "Wo die Luft dünn wird. Zur Publikationstätigkeit der Wirtschaftsforschungsinstitute Österreichs und Deutschlands" in *Perspektiven der Wirtschaftspolitik*, 2004, 5(3): 363-375.

[3] The study covers the following institutes: (1) Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung Berlin (DIW); (2) IFO-Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung München; (3) Institut für Weltwirtschaft Kiel (IfW); (4) Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung Halle (IWH); (5) Hamburgisches Weltwirtschafts-Archiv (HWWA); (6) Rheinisch-Westfälisches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (RWI) Essen; (7) Zentrum für Europäisches Wirtschaftsforschung (ZEW) Mannheim; (8). Institut für höhere Studien (IHS) Wien; (9) Österreichisches Wirtschaftsforschungsinstitut (WIFO) Wien; (10) Wiener Institut für internationale Wirtschaftsvergleiche (WIIW) Wien.

The Institute's Advanced Studies Program has been attended by about 440 economists from more than 50 countries in the past 20 years. It is, inter alia, one of the top recruiting sources for international organizations such as the IMF, the World Bank and the ECB; currently there are about 50 alumni working for various international organizations.

The Institute says its high international reputation is also reflected inter alia by the fact that the Institute has attracted financial support for projects not only from domestic foundations and institutions but also from international institutions and by the fact that the Institute has been active in various domestic and international advisory functions.

While the Kiel Institute's focus on the world economy is distinct from that of the other two leading German economic research institutes (which focus on German and European issues), there are some areas in which there is a common research interest. Examples are environmental economics or business cycle analysis. But in each of these areas, the institutes either address different research topics or use different methodological approaches, so that there is competition in research and no "duplication" of research results. Ways of coordinating with other German research institutes exist in the area of networking. An example is the EUROFRAME group, a network of the Kiel Institute, the DIW and seven other European economic research institutes.

At present, the Kiel Institute finds itself in a period of transition to the term of a new presidency which will begin in October 2004. The Institute is considering focusing **future research activities** on the three major issues highlighted before. It intends to take a fresh look at central questions in global economic affairs, in particular concerning trade, growth and business cycles. The three work areas above are not to be viewed in isolation. On the contrary, the Institute plans to investigate interactions between growth and business cycles to a greater extent, and also between trade and growth. Moreover, it will seek to span the following traditional divides in economic research: Theoretical and empirical approaches, Micro- and macroeconomic approaches, Economic analysis and policy. The Kiel Institute plans to reorganize its research activities to intensify far-reaching international research collaboration, with the aim of generating new research initiatives. The Institute is one of the few institutions in the world devoted to the study of global economic issues and, as such, should be well placed to bring together prominent and promising researchers from all over the world to work on joint research projects. As a by-product of this endeavour, the aim is to establish a much stronger international presence in the public discussion of global economic affairs. The Institute is also prepared to intensify cooperation with research from neighbouring disciplines in order to add economic insight to global problems which currently are predominantly deemed to be the home turf of disciplines such as political science, sociology or geography. The Institute is well placed to move into these areas, since it already deals with multi-disciplinary research concerning the environment, natural resources, and geography. In these multi-disciplinary pursuits, the overriding strategy will always be to focus on issues central to the global economy, and thereby continue to develop a conceptual, methodological and empirical understanding of "Weltwirtschaft".

A major reason for **economic research at non-university establishments** is that university research neither has the continuity nor the capacity to devote resources to long-term research phenomena such as structural sectoral change, business cycle analysis and forecasting, or globalization issues. The handling and updating of large data samples necessary to submit complex phenomena to state-of-the-art tests is not possible at university institutes given the resource constraints. Moreover, research at non-university establishments has several positive feedback effects on university research.

3. Structural Features und Organization

The IfW is a nonindependent establishment of the state of Schleswig-Holstein.

The Institute has the following legal bodies: The **president,** who is responsible for directing the Institute's research and representing the Institute externally. The **Board of Trustees** (Kuratorium) consists of two representatives of the State Government (one from the Ministry of Education, Science, Research, and Culture and one from the Ministry of Economics, Technology, and Transportation), two representatives of the Federal Government (one from the Federal Ministry of Economics and Labour and one from the Federal Ministry of Finance), a member of the Scientific Advisory Council, and the rector of the University of Kiel, the latter two having an advisory function. The Board of Trustees deliberates on basic matters (e.g., the Annual Report, appointment of the president, by-laws amendments) and important financial matters (e.g., the budget) and makes proposals concerning these matters.

By end 2003, the **Scientific Advisory Council** (Wissenschaftlicher Beirat) consisted of nine members. The members, upon being proposed by the president, are appointed by the chairperson of the Board of Trustees. They are appointed for a period of four years and may be reappointed. The Scientific Advisory Council convenes at least once per year. It evaluates all of the Institute's research areas on a regular basis, makes recommendations concerning future research strategies and advises the Institute in all matters of research.

The **Academic Staff Assembly** (Kollegium der wissenschaftlichen Mitarbeiter) consists of all academic staff. It elects its members of the Institute's Council and serves as a forum for the exchange of information and advice beyond inner-departmental issues. It is convened at the request of the president or two-thirds of the members of the Academic Staff Assembly or a majority of the members of the Institute's Council. The **Institute's Council** (Institutsrat) consists of the president and – in equal shares – of the department heads and elected members of staff; the latter comprises 50 per cent academic and 50 per cent non-academic staff. Members of the Employee Council (Personalrat) may participate in Institute's Council meetings, but have no vote. The Institute's Council is convened as a rule twice a year. It deliberates and decides on all important matters of direction that concern more than one department and that are not purely matters of administration.

At present, the Institute, without the Library, is divided into the President's Department (including Administration, the Advanced Studies Program in International Economic Policy Research and the Financial Markets Research Area), five Research Departments, and the Information, Editorial, and External Relations Department (see Appendix 1).

With respect to **operations scheduling** the Institute states that the major topics of the work schedule are derived from the research profile and the stock of expertise of the individual departments and of the Institute in general. In addition, topics are selected with regard to the current academic and political discussion in the national and international context. The research plan is discussed regularly with the members of the Scientific Advisory Council. The Council`s recommendations are considered when revising the research plan. The basic feature of work planning and organization is a combination of top-down and bottom-up processes: The general line of research is decided top-down, i.e. by the Institute's president and the heads of departments in compliance with the general mission of the Institute. The allocation of staff members to different research topics and the choice of individual projects including interdepartmental work groups take account of the preferences and capabilities of staff members as far as possible. This manner of organizing the work schedule is especially important for younger staff members who are encouraged to exploit potential synergies between the research plan of the Institute and their individual research interests related to dissertation projects and to acquiring reputation in a specific research field.

The **quality management** of the Institute follows a two-step approach: (i) the heads of department are responsible for the scientific quality of their staff's work; (ii) the Information, Editorial, and External Relations Department is independent in its assessment of whether the work meets the standard of the Institute's publication series (when necessary, external advice is obtained). In cases of dispute, the president is responsible for the final decision. Because a rising share of the results of staff's research activity is published externally, it has to an increasing degree been exposed to the standard review procedures of journal editors and conference proceedings. Moreover, an increasing number of staff members are presenting their research results for scrutiny and discussion at national and international conferences subject to a pre-election process. Work in progress is presented in regular staff seminars at the Institute.

Regarding **Equality between men and women** the Institute complies with the legal requirements of the State of Schleswig-Holstein for the promotion of women in the public sector. The major institutions for moving towards the objective of equality between men and women are the equal opportunity for women officer, established in 1990, and the Women's Promotion Plan. At the end of 2003, the ratio of female to male academic staff was 16.4 per cent. By end 2003, the head of the Financial Markets Research Area was female.

4. Resources and Personnel

In 2003 the Institute's annual **budget** amounted to a total of 9.26 M€ (see Appendix 2). The institutional support in 2003 totaled 6.35 M€ (69 %). The proportion of third-party funding in relation to total financial resources reached 31 % in 2003. 50 % of the third-party income resulted from R&D agreements, 8.5 % from services and licenses. The most important third-party funds sources are Research Foundations and the Federal Government. In 2003 no third party funding from the German Research Foundation (DFG) was acquired. The Institute took several initiatives in the past to attract additional funds from the DFG which, however, were largely not successful.

During recent years, the Institute's **resource situation** has become increasingly tight. The annual budget was mostly rolled over on a nominal basis. Salary increases were frequently not taken into account. As a result, the budget has shrunk in real terms by an amount which is equivalent to about 5 academic research staff positions (BAT IIa) over the last seven years. Given this situation, the Institute has considered changing its traditional policy not to apply for consultancy projects commissioned by the private sector because of the lack of freedom to publish research results. Yet, the Institute has decided to stick to this policy and thus deems the opportunity costs for foregone revenues to be lower than the expected losses in academic reputation and publication output. To strengthen third-party funding, the Institute instead aims at improving its access to DFG funding by cooperating closely with universities and creating positions for research professors at the Institute, as well as by increasing efforts to obtain third-party funding via increased international networking activities.

The Institute considers the **premises** to be satisfactory overall. During the last years several measures for modernization and reconstruction were carried out. On the rule, the offices are occupied by one employee. Two rooms in the main building are sufficiently large for meetings or events. Both rooms are equipped with audio-visual systems. Moreover the staff also uses the meeting rooms of the Library for conferences etc.

All of the workplaces for the academic staff and most of the workplaces for the non-academic staff are equipped with personal computers that are connected to the Institute's network. Some of the workplaces are equipped with their own printer, the other printers for general use are located in various equipment rooms.

In 2003, almost 6.5 M€ were provided for **personnel** expenses. The Institute had 125 employees. Among these were 61 positions for academic and higher management staff (see Appendix 6) including 14 staff members working on dissertation projects (see Appendix 4). More than 50 % of the academic staff were paid according to BAT Ib or higher. 82 % of the total number of academic staff were financed by institutional resources (see Appendix 6). About 18 % of the personnel were employed on temporary contracts. Based on the total number of academic personnel employed in the research departments, the share was 38 %. Around 42 % of the academic staff belonged to the age group until 40 years and 34 % belong to the age group 50 and older. About 36 % have worked at the establishment less than 5 years, 31 % have worked for more than 20 years.

Academic and higher management staff is in general recruited by the Institute on its own authority. The president of the Institute, the heads of the Research Departments, the equal opportunity employment officer and the members of the Employee Council are involved in the process of recruiting. Job offers are announced in nationwide (or international) newspapers and weekly journals as well as on the Institute's homepage. New electronic media are used intensively to access the international labor market.

The employees working on a doctoral thesis normally are employed according to the rules of the German University Framework Act (Hochschulrahmengesetz). They are paid according to the rules prevailing in Germany's public sector in general (normally BAT IIa).

Three foreigners are employed in the Institute. Two work in the Research Department IV and one works in the Information, Editorial, and External Relations (IEER) Department.

The vast majority of the new employees of the Institute are university graduates in the field of economics with no previous professional experience; several graduates were recruited from the Institute's Advanced Studies Program. Due to the general expenditure cuts in institutional funding, it has become increasingly difficult to recruit qualified personnel. Moreover, the Institute has to compete with the private sector and financial institutions in acquiring and keeping highly qualified personnel.

5. Promotion of Up-and-coming Academics and Cooperation

All up-and-coming academics who join the Institute are expected to earn their Ph.D. At present, about one-quarter of all researchers are working on their dissertation thesis and three on their postdoctoral thesis (Habilitation). In the past three years, twelve dissertations and two postdoctoral theses have been completed at the Kiel Institute. On average, the postgraduates finish their dissertation around five years after they join the Kiel Institute. It should be acknowledged that the time actually needed to complete a dissertation is considerably shorter for basically two reasons. First, it is necessary to introduce the young scientists to empirical methods required for the Institute's empirical research focus. Second, they are involved in the research of their departments. This may include project-related research, contributions to the business cycle reports, or the acquisition of third-party financed projects. The topics of the dissertations are fully integrated into the research program of the Institute. As the larger part of the postgraduates are financed by third-party research projects, it is understood that the topics of their dissertations are linked to the project work as closely as possible.

An important innovation in the context of training programs for the up-and-coming academics is the Quantitative Economics Ph.D. Program at the Faculty of Economics, Business Administration and Social Sciences at Kiel University that commenced in 2002. All up-and-coming academics who complete their dissertation at the Faculty are required to participate in this program.

With the Advanced Studies Program in International Economic Policy Research (ASP), established in 1984, the Kiel Institute plays an active role in postgraduate education of young researchers from many countries. The courses in the ASP are frequently attended by researchers of the Institute.

Because quantitative methods are widely applied in the Institute, these techniques are updated regularly. Increasingly, in-house seminars review fundamental econometric techniques and courses held by invited experts help to implement new developments such as advances in microeconometrics into research projects. Moreover, researchers attend external courses to learn specific techniques for solving economic models with software packages such as GAMS or MatLab.

In staff seminars the researchers of the Kiel Institute present their work in progress. These seminars, which are held approximately bi-weekly, provide an opportunity to discuss methods and results and receive feedback and suggestions from colleagues. Brown Bag and Erich Schneider Research Seminars at the Faculty provide further opportunities for qualification.

Regarding **cooperation** the Institute states that based on a cooperation agreement with Kiel University , the Institute is currently cooperating with the Faculty of Economics, Business Administration and Social Sciences on a number of issues. Institutionally, it is intended that the new president and the Faculty discuss a joint project proposal for a special research area (SFB) to be submitted to the DFG. Moreover, the Institute will participate in a project to convert the international Quantitative Economics Ph.D. Programme into a Graduate School. Likewise, the Institute is prepared to take an active part in an International Relations M.A. Programme to be launched by the Institute of Political Science. Furthermore, in cooperation with the Department of Business Administration, it is intended that a newly established Chair of International Management will develop research topics jointly with research areas at the Institute in the fields of microeconomic foundations of foreign direct investment and organizational change. This cooperation is an essential requirement for this chair. Beyond such institutionalized relations, joint research interests exist with various chairs in the Economics Department and the Econometrics and Statistics Department, and the Institute's Departments.

Outside Kiel, the research departments have taken an active role in cooperating with other national and international institutions in the past, for instance:

In cooperation with the Center for Information and Network Economics (CINE) at the Seminar für Ökonometrie, Finanzökonometrie und Statistik of Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Munich, the *Research Department I* organizes an annual series of workshops on the Economics of Information and Network Industries. The Department has joined forces with the Institute for New Technology at the United Nations University in Maastricht, the Finance and Trade Policy Research Centre at the University of Oxford, the Centre for European Research at the

University of Rome, the Business School at Warwick University in Coventry and the University of Bangor in Wales in order to establish a research programme on "European Integration, Financial Systems and Corporate Performance". This collaboration has been funded by the European Commission as part of its 5th Framework Programme called Improving the Human Potential and the Socio-economic Knowledge Base.

In the context of climate policy research, the *Research Department II* participated in two European network projects (CATEP 2001–2003; TRANSUST 2003–2004) that both involved 10 to 15, mainly European, institutions. Since 2002, the Department has also been a member of the German Forum for Energy Models, which comprises German universities and research institutions that are active in energy modelling. Moreover, the Department was active in several interdisciplinary third-party funded projects with the Max-Planck-Institute for Meteorology in Hamburg and the Potsdam Institute for Climate Change. In the area of *biodiversity*, research work was carried out in collaboration with the Max-Planck-Institute for Foreign Public Law and International Law in Heidelberg. In other research projects the Department cooperated with institutions in Nepal, in Bolivia or the World Bank as well as the Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ).

In the context of research on agglomeration and innovation, the *Research Department III* hosted an international workshop in cooperation with the Local Economic and Employment Development Program of the OECD. The Department has also established a research cooperation network with Indiana University and Dortmund University. In a research project conducted within the 5th Framework Program of the European Commission the Department has been cooperating closely with a number of West and East European research institutes (e.g.,the Center of European Integration Studies in Bonn, the Luigi Bocconi University in Milan, the Economic and Social Research Institute in Dublin). Two members of the Department were invited to join consortia preparing proposals for Networks of Excellence and Integrated Projects as part of the 6th Framework Program of the European Commission. The Department also participated in an international research collaboration on *regional impacts of liberalizing international air service agreements* with the University of California at Berkeley.

The *Research Department IV* has cooperated with the International Center for the Study of East Asian Development, Kitakyushu, Japan, the World Bank and the Kennedy School for Government at Harvard University on the assessment of schooling performance and schooling institutions. Apart from this longstanding cooperation has been strengthened with the Erasmus University Rotterdam and the Centre for European Studies at the Chulalongkorn University Bangkok. Furthermore, the Department maintains traditionally strong links to German economic faculties such as those at the Universities of Bochum, Gießen, Göttingen, Marburg and WHU Koblenz.

For many years, the *Research Department V* has cooperated with the leading German research institutes in the joint forecast of the German economy and the world economy. The international network *EUROFRAME* was following an initiative by, i.a., the Department established in 1999. It consists of a group of nine European research institutes, cooperates in the area of macroeconomic research. The Department represents the Institute at meetings of *the Association d'Instituts Européens de Conjoncture Economique* (AIECE), a network of currently 38 European research institutes established in 1957. In May 2004, Professor Joachim Scheide was elected president of the AIECE.

The *Research Area Financial Markets* works together with a number of external cooperation partners on its microeconomic and macroeconomic projects. With regard to its microeconomic projects, the Research Area has analyzed the internationalization of financial markets for competition and investment and financing opportunities available for banks together with the Supervisory Department of Deutsch Bundesbank. Moreover, the Research Area has analyzed the implications of policy-induced and market-inherent barriers to international bank activities with the Research Department of the Deutsche Bundesbank. With regard to its macroeconomic projects, the Research Area has analyzed the implications of international financial integration for macroeconomic volatility with the University of Tübingen. The effects and the effectiveness of foreign exchange market interventions of central banks have been analyzed together with the WHU Koblenz.

In the period 2001–2003, 109 economists from academic and other institutions visited the Kiel Institute; about 70 per cent of the **visitors** came from abroad, half of them came from Western European countries. Almost all of them were staying less than one month. The list includes the lecturers of the Advanced Studies Program, and other researchers from academic and non-academic institutions, who cooperated with researchers of the Institute, e.g. by working on joint research projects, and/or attended selected courses of the Advanced Studies Program. On the other hand 35 academic staff members of the Institute visited other establishments, about 70 % of the guest visits lasted less than one month. More than a half of these visits were at German institutions. It has been a policy of the Institute to encourage and financially support staff members to visit other research institutions both in order to upgrade skills and to establish joint research networks. Mainly this applies to young staff members during their dissertation period: They are given the possibility to participate at the NBER Summer Institute.

During the last three years, two academic members of the Institute’s staff were appointed to faculty members (full professors), one at Tübingen University, and at Dunedin University, New Zealand, respectively. Another Institute’s staff member was offered a full professorship at Giessen University, which he declined .

6. Results – Research, Development and Services

The Kiel Institute generates own databases on merger activities in Europe, on subsidies in Germany, on the sectoral and regional composition of world trade, on the sectoral and regional structure of foreign direct investment stocks of Germany, Japan and the USA. These data are available for external users. Services that are provided by the Institute’s Library (ZBW) and the Economic Archives have been subject to separate evaluations.

The results of research at the Kiel Institute are presented in internal and external publications. **Internal publications** include

- the monograph series Kiel Studies, which comprises the results of larger research projects, dissertations and Habilitation theses;
- the quarterly journal *Die Weltwirtschaft*, which contains the regular business cycle forecasts of the Institute and other topics which are of interest to policy makers, the business community and the general public;
- the series Kiel Discussion Papers, which focuses on economic policy issues;
- the series Kiel Working Papers, which presents work in progress;

- the series Kieler Kurzberichte and Kiel Reports, which present summaries of research results and events at the Institute in German and English.

Publications in Kiel Studies, *Die Weltwirtschaft* and Kiel Discussion Papers go through a multi-step quality control process. Contributions have to be first approved by the head of department. In a second stage, they are assessed by the Information, Editorial and External Relations Department, which can require changes, reject papers or ask for external advice. The final decision on publication rests with the president. Doctoral dissertations and Habilitation theses that are published as Kiel Studies have in addition been subject to evaluation by at least one external university referee. Working Papers have to be approved by the respective head of department.

External publications include monographs, journal articles and contributions to collective works (see Appendix 6). With its international journal and its conference volume series, the Institute provides a publication platform for economists from all over the world. The *Review of World Economics/Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv* (founded in 1913) is a double-blind refereed journal focusing on empirical studies in international economics. To ensure a high-quality standard, the editor and managing editor are aided by an International Advisory Board. Approximately 150 papers are submitted per year, of which 15–20 % are accepted. The conference volume series comprises papers which have been presented and discussed at international conferences and workshops that were hosted by the Institute, in particular its regular Kiel Week Conferences.

As concerns the publications in refereed journals, the number of papers in peer-reviewed journals increased to an average of 33 per year in the period 2001–2003 compared to 19 per year in the period 1993–1995. In 2003, a total of 227 publications were published by the Institute, 36 % thereof in peer-reviewed journals and in other journals. About 37 % are published as Working/Discussion Papers.

The major change in the publication strategy since the previous evaluation has been a shift towards strengthening the international visibility. Researchers were encouraged to increase the number of publications in English and, in particular, the number of publications in refereed journals. About 63 % of all publications by staff members have been in English.

Economic policy consulting and finding new solutions to economic policy problems is one of the Institute's major tasks. Economists from the Institute have played an active role in advising domestic and foreign governmental institutions and international organizations, including the European Commission, the World Bank, the IMF, the UNCTAD and the Inter-American Development Bank. In terms of participation as a member in advisory board or advising committees or institutions the Kiel Institute mentions 100 advisory activities between 2001 to 2003. In terms of commissioned Expert Reports or Research Projects around 50 activities of Institute's members were cited. An important well known regularly report is the Gemeinschaftsdiagnose der führenden deutschen Wirtschaftsforschungsinstitute, common published twice a year.

Apart from teaching at universities – on average 28 hours per semester – economists from the Institute have given 53 **guest lectures** at non-university institutions. Another major contribution of the Institute in this area is the Advanced Studies Program in International Economic Policy Research, which was founded in 1984. Since then, about 440 economists from 50 countries have graduated from the program. The program is financed by tuition fees. Former participants of this program took over various job positions partly at important international organizations or at national economic policy institutions abroad or German ministries and financial institutions.

In order to intensify this exchange with economists from other countries, the Kiel Institute relies on an **international research network**, which was established in 2001 and consists of renowned economists acting as International Research Fellows. They promote worldwide awareness of the Institute's activities and research findings and stimulate further research by providing expert advice, participating in joint projects, or holding seminars and lectures, and conducting research at the Institute. Moreover, staff members of the Institute are integrated into various international research networks and cooperate with numerous national and international institutions.

The **marketing** of publications is mainly done by the publisher (Springer Verlag). The Institute supports marketing by presenting its publications at the annual meeting of the European Economic Association (EEA) and the Verein für Socialpolitik, in Kieler Kurzberichte / Kiel Reports and on the Institute's homepage. User statistics for visits to the publications site on the Kiel Institute's homepage are available.

Research results are communicated to the scientific community via publications in scholarly journals and other forms of knowledge transfer described above. Research results are communicated to **target groups** in politics, public administration and business through publications, particularly in *Die Weltwirtschaft* and Kiel Discussion Papers, which have a policy-oriented focus, through the regular business cycle outlook conference, and the Economic Policy Discussions during Kiel Week, through expert reports and advisory functions, and through summaries of research findings in Kieler Kurzberichte / Kiel Reports and on the Institute's homepage. Research results are communicated to the general public through press releases and reports in the media, press articles and statements by researchers from the Institute, public lectures, the Institute's homepage and Kieler Kurzberichte and Kiel Reports.

During the period under report the Institute has served as host for 25 **conferences and workshops** with international participation. It has also organized five external events in the context of its research projects and its cooperation with other European research institutions. Several members of the Institute have been invited to present papers at important conferences. On average about 100 times per year Institute's economists presented a paper at external conferences during the last three years. These conference participations concentrated on 30 to 35 academic members.

In recent years, several of the Institute's economists have received prizes, awards and honorary titles for their outstanding endeavours. Eight prizes or awards has been won by the Institute during the last three years.

7. Realization of German Science Council's recommendations

a) Collaboration with Kiel University should be intensified. In this context, an expansion of Environmental Economics should be agreed upon with the university and supported by the relevant course offers

The Institute has strengthened its cooperation with the Faculty of Economics, Business Administration and Social Sciences at Kiel University.A cooperation treaty was signed in 2000. A member of the Faculty has joined the Scientific Advisory Council of the Institute. There have been several joint research projects as well as joint organizations of conferences and workshops. A common initiative for a Special Research Area has been started. In addition, interdisciplinary cooperation has taken place with the Institute of Political Science, the Institute for International Law and the Institute for Economic Geography at Kiel University.

b) *The organisation of the Institute as an nonindependent research institution of the federal state is not practical. It should be examined whether the institute can be given greater scope in administrative matters and to what extent the Administrative Board carries out the supervisory function of a board of trustees which is usually the case at Leibniz establishments. The statutes should be changed accordingly.*

A Board of Trustees was established and embodied in the by-laws. A number of important institutional changes such as the transition towards a global budget, delegation of responsibilities for the personnel budget to the Institute and possibilities of extending temporary work contracts under the reformed German University Framework Act have significantly contributed to more flexibility and have led to a higher share of temporary contracts in all contracts. Thus, the manoeuvring space of the Institute has increased considerably.

c) *The Institute should sharpen its research profile, for instance, by integrating research groups on similar issues and by dropping issues, which have been successfully established by other research institutes.*

The Energy Research Group, Population Research Group and the two groups on Central and Eastern Europe and other very small groups (Primary Commodities and Agriculture, Model Analysis, and Employment and Income) were dissolved. By the end of 2002, there was no research group with fewer than two members. The reemergence of one-person research groups in 2003 is due to the fact that vacancies resulting from retirements and leaves were not filled in order to give the new president sufficient room for manoeuvre with respect to personnel decisions.

d) *The procedure for selecting projects does have negative effects on the consistency of research planning and the transparency of structures as well as on the Institute's external image. In some cases, the groups should be integrated better in the departments. It should be examined whether it would be possible to develop a matrix structure with overlapping groups right across the longer-term departments.*

A matrix structure has been established. There are numerous examples of cross-departmental cooperation. Future work budgets will further strengthen project-oriented cooperation within the Institute.

e) *The Institute should acquire more funds from external sources. This holds especially for funds which are conditional on a rigorous quality control such as funds from the German Science Foundation (DFG).*

The Institute has taken several initiatives to attract additional external funds from the DFG: A Special Research Area to be set up jointly with and under the leadership of the Economics Faculty at Kiel University is still pending. In the 1997–1999 period the Institute participated in two focal research programmes of the DFG. The Institute made several applications for individual research grants, of which, however, only one project was approved. To improve access to DFG funding, the Institute aims to cooperate more closely with universities and to create positions for research professors at the Institute.

f) *Department II, "Resource Economics", should be strengthened. Environmental projects from Department IV should be concentrated in Department II. The research groups, "Population"* *and "Energy", are under-staffed with only one member and not sufficiently integrated. They should not be continued in this form.*

Environmental research has been concentrated in Department II. Furthermore, Department II has been strengthened by hiring new personnel. Both research groups were dissolved.

g) *The economics archive at the IfW should concentrate on providing archiving services for the work at the IfW itself and those which the HWWA cannot provide. Mutual online-access must be made possible.*

Cooperation between the Archive of the Institute and the HWWA Information Center has been intensified, and has been evaluated as part of the HWWA Institute's evaluation procedure.

h) *The publications produced by Department III are both quantitatively and qualitatively less satisfactory.*

The publication record of Department III has been improved considerably. The number of publications was increased from 46 (1993–1995) to 80 (2001–2003). While in 1993–1995 there was no publication in a refereed journal, there were 8 in the 2001–2003 period ; contributions to collective works rose from 9 to 31. This improvement was achieved by a smaller staff (two persons fewer).

The research agenda has been markedly focused; the number of research groups was reduced from four to two in 2004.

i) *The staffing of the informatics groups should be examined and reduced.*

The IT Group still consists of five members. The increasing role of IT services in recent years does not permit a further reduction below this level. A well-functioning and regularly updated IT infrastructure is absolutely vital for the Institute.

The increasing role of IT services is reflected, inter alia, in a substantial increase in hardware, in particular servers (the number increased from 3 to 7) and in software packages (the number increased from 30 to 80), which have to be maintained and updated.

j) *Improvements can be made in promoting young academics. Suitable measures should be introduced to reduce the average duration of doctoral studies.*

The training of junior researchers has been intensified and the time period required for completing doctoral dissertations has been reduced. Nonetheless, on average, it still amounts to about 5 years; in a number of cases, however, this period has been cut to 2½ years. Further reductions of the period required for doctoral dissertations are limited because junior staff members are often involved in research projects which are not directly related to the dissertation. The Institute has, however, supported the training of doctoral candidates by providing a number of incentives such as the opportunity to participate in the NBER Summer Institute, the opportunity to participate in the Quantitative Economics Ph.D. Programme at Kiel University etc.

k) *A larger number of positions should be designated temporary contracts.*

The share of academic personnel with temporary contracts in the total number of academic personnel employed in the research departments has been increased from 20 per cent by end 1995 to 38 per cent by end 2003.

l) *The membership of the Scientific Advisory Council should be increased to approximately 7. One member should come from the Economics Faculty in Kiel. The Chairperson of the Council or his/her deputy should be a voting member of the Board of Trustees.*

The Council now includes a member of the Faculty. The membership of five members of the then Council members expired at the end of 2003. New members (except for one) have not been appointed in order to give the new president the opportunity to select new members in accordance with new research areas. The chairperson is a member of the Board of Trustees.

m) *It should be examined whether higher-grade positions predominate in the staffing schedule. The Heads of Department should all receive equal pay on principle.*

All department heads are remunerated equally: all are in civil service pay grade B3, except for the head of Department II, who has a special contract stipulating a pay grade similar to B3.

Appendix 1

Organization Chart

Scientific Advisory Council

Chairman: Prof. André Sapir, Ph.D.

Prof. Axel Börsch-Supan, Ph.D.
Prof. Sebastian Edwards, Ph.D
Prof. David Greenaway, Ph.D.
Prof. Dr. Thomas Lux

President: Prof. Dennis Snower, Ph.D. (as of Oct. 1, 2004)

Vice President: Prof. Dr. Rolf J. Langhammer

Advanced Studies in International Economic Policy Research
Head: Prof. Dr. Harmen Lehment

Administration
Head: ORR Ralf Kopischke

RESEARCH AREA
Financial Markets
Head (temporary): Dr. Christian Pierdzioch

RESEARCH DEPARTMENT I

Growth, Structural Change, and the International Division of Labor
Head: Prof. Dr. Henning Klodt

International Economics and Structural Change
Head: Dr. Jürgen Stehn

Technology and Growth
Head: Dr. Michael Stolpe

European Institutions
Head: Dr. Hugo Dicke

RESEARCH DEPARTMENT II

Environmental and Resource Economics
Head: Prof. Gernot Klepper, Ph.D.

Environmental Economics
Head: Prof. Gernot Klepper, Ph.D.

Natural Ressources
Head: Dr. Manfred Wiebelt

RESEARCH DEPARTMENT III

Regional Economics
Head: Prof. Dr. Rüdiger Soltwedel

Regional Growth and Spatial Structure
Head: Dr. Dirk Dohse

Infrastructure, Institutions and Integration
Head: Dr. Claus-Friedrich Laaser

RESEARCH DEPARTMENT IV

Development Economics and Global Integration
Head: Prof. Dr. Rolf J. Langhammer

International Capital Flows
Head: Dr. Peter Nunnenkamp

Industrialization and Foreign Trade
Head: Dr. Matthias Lücke
Trade Liberalization and Market Access:
Dr. Dean Spinanger

Human Capital and Economic Growth
Head: PD Dr. Erich Gundlach

Stability and Structural Adjustment
Head: Dr. Rainer Schweickert

RESEARCH DEPARTMENT V

Business Cycles
Head: Prof. Dr. Joachim Scheide

Basic Research
Head: Dr. Kai Carstensen

German Business Cycle
Head: Dr. Carsten-Patrick Meier

International Business Cycle
Head: Dr. Klaus-Jürgen Gern

Public Finance
Head: Dr. Alfred Boss

LIBRARY

German National Library of Economics

Head: Dipl.-Volksw. Horst Thomsen

Library Advisory Council

INFORMATION, EDITORIAL, AND EXTERNAL RELATIONS DEPARTMENT
Head: Prof. Dr. Harmen Lehment

Economic Archives and Information
Head: Dipl.-Volksw. Bernhard Klein

Editing and External Relations
Head: Dipl.-Volksw. Dietmar Gebert

Information Processing
Head: Dipl.-Math. Manfred Salden

Appendix 2

Financial resources and allocation of resources

(Figures in € 1,000)

	2003	2002	2001
I. Financial resources (income) [1]	**9259.8**	**8429.4**	**9642.8**
1.1 Institutional funding	6346.8	5517.8	6464.6
- Federal States[2]	3173.4	2758.9	3232.3
- Federal Government[2]	3173.4	2758.9	3232.3
- Other institutional funding[3]	0	0	0
Institutional funding as a proportion of total financial resources (in %)	*69 %*	*66 %*	*67 %*
1.2 Research support	1453.6	1136.3	1268.7
As a proportion of total financial resources	*16 %*	*13 %*	*13 %*
1.3 Services, contracts, licences, publications	246.7	280.9	248.9
As a proportion of total financial resources	*3 %*	*3 %*	*3 %*
1.4 Other third-party resources[4]	1212.7	1472.0	1660.6
As a proportion of total financial resources	*13 %*	*17 %*	*17 %*
1.5 Withdrawal from reserves and the like	0	22.4	0
II. Expenditures	**9259.8**	**8429.4**	**9642.8**
2.1 Personnel	6449.4	6344.3	6141.2
2.2 Materials, supplies, equipment	1594.3	1875.2	1856.5
2.3 Investments (not incl. building investments)	37.5	46.4	135.9
2.4 Building investments[5]	585.1	163.5	1017.1
2.5 Special positions (where applicable)	0	0	0
2.6 Allocations to reserves (where applicable)	593.5	0	492.1
2.7 For information only: DFG charges	149.3	135.3	128.9

[1] Actual expenditures in each year classified by financial resource; not incl. money in transit.
[2] Funding according to BLK decision
[3] Special financing, EU funds
[4] Fees received from ZBW for administration services.
[5] Building investments, multi-annual measures for building maintenance, land acquisition incl. demolition

Appendix 3

Third-party resources classified by organizational unit[1]

(Figures in € 1,000)

	2003	2002	2001
I. Total	**2913.0**	**2889.2**	**3178.2**
- DFG (German Research Council)	0	45.5	92.2
- Federal Government	475.2	567.8	451.4
- Federal States	0	8.1	8.1
- EU project funding	215.8	64.8	83.3
- Foundations, other research support	762.6	450.1	633.7
- R&D assignments, co-operation with industry, services, licenses	246.7	280.9	248.9
- Other third-party resources	1212.7	1472.0	1660.6
II. By organizational unit			
President's Department	**231.6**	**114.5**	**139.3**
- DFG (German Research Council)	0	0	0
- Federal Government	44.5	0	0
- Federal States	0	0	0
- EU project funding	0	0	0
- Foundations, other research support	187.1	114.5	139.3
- R&D assignments, co-operation with industry, services, licenses	0	0	0
- Other third-party resources	0	0	0
Department I	**89.5**	**133.0**	**330.4**
- DFG (German Research Council)	0	0	0
- Federal Government	0	0	0
- Federal States	0	0	0
- EU project funding	14.2	0	65.5
- Foundations, other research support	75.3	133.0	264.9
- R&D assignments, co-operation with industry, services, licenses	0	0	0
- Other third-party resources	0	0	0
Department II	**145.2**	**75.4**	**58.5**
- DFG (German Research Council)	0	0	0
- Federal Government	53.8	67.3	50.4
- Federal States	0	8.1	8.1
- EU project funding	18.0	0	0
- Foundations, other research support	73.4	0	0
- R&D assignments, co-operation with industry, services, licenses	0	0	0
- Other third-party resources	0	0	0

	2003	2002	2001
Department III	**198.4**	**255.1**	**128.9**
- DFG (German Research Council)	0	- 4.8	4.8
- Federal Government	76.8	201.6	70.6
- Federal States	0	0	0
- EU project funding	0	58.3	0
- Foundations, other research support	121.6	0	53.5
- R&D assignments, co-operation with industry, services, licenses	0	0	0
- Other third-party resources	0	0	0
Department IV	**277.3**	**182.3**	**298.6**
- DFG (German Research Council)	0	50.3	87.4
- Federal Government	38.1	34.6	47.5
- Federal States	0	0	0
- EU project funding	0	- 3.5	17.8
- Foundations, other research support	239.2	100.9	145.9
- R&D assignments, co-operation with industry, services, licenses	0	0	0
- Other third-party resources	0	0	0
Department V	**511.6**	**351.0**	**313.0**
- DFG (German Research Council)	0	0	0
- Federal Government	262.0	264.3	282.9
- Federal States	0	0	0
- EU project funding	183.6	10.0	0
- Foundations, other research support	66.0	76.7	30.1
- R&D assignments, co-operation with industry, services, licenses	0	0	0
- Other third-party resources	0	0	0
IEER Department	**133.6**	**187.9**	**173.8**
- DFG (German Research Council)	0	0	0
- Federal Government	0	0	0
- Federal States	0	0	0
- EU project funding	0	0	0
- Foundations, other research support	0	25.0	0
- R&D assignments, co-operation with industry, services, licenses	133.6	162.9	173.8
- Other third-party resources	0	0	0
Administration	**1325.8**	**1590.0**	**1735.7**
- DFG (German Research Council)	0	0	0
- Federal Government	0	0	0
- Federal States	0	0	0
- EU project funding	0	0	0
- Foundations, other research support	0	0	0

	2003	2002	2001
- R&D assignments, co-operation with industry, services, licenses[2]	113.1	118.0	75.1
- Other third-party resources[3]	1212.7	1472.0	1660.6

[1] Actual expenditure in each year classified by financial resource; not incl. money in transit.
[2] Rental income received from Club of Economics at the IfW (Haus Welt-Club), reimbursements received from ZBW for administration services
[3] Donations and member fees

Appendix 4

Staffing
acc. to sources of funding and pay scale
- Personnel (financed by institutional and third-party resources) in terms of full-time equivalents [reporting date 31.12.2003] -

	Total number	Number financed by	
		Institutional resources	Third-party resources
Total	**109.8**	**91.1**	**18.7**
1. Academic and higher management staff	**59.2**	**47.7**	**11.5**
- S (B4 and above)	0	0	0
- S (B2, B3)	6.0	6.0	0
- I, A16	0	0	0
- Ia, A 15	14.0	13.0	1.0
- Ib, A 14	12.0	11.0	1.0
- IIa, A 13	27.2	17.7	9.5
2. Doctoral candidates[2]	**0**	**0**	**0**
3. Other staff	**50.6**	**43.4**	**7.2**
- III, IV, A 12, A 11, A 10	4.7	3.7	1.0
- V, A 9, A 8	24.9	21.6	3.3
- VI, A7	8.2	6.3	1.9
- VII, VIII, A 6, A 5	5.0	4.0	1.0
- Wage brackets, other staff	7.8	7.8	0
- Trainees	0	0	0

[2] Academic staff/dissertations in progress: President´s Dept: 3; Research Dept. I: 1; Research Dept. II:3; Research Dept. III: 1; Research Dept. IV: 2; Research Dept. V: 4; total: 14

Appendix 5

Staffing acc. to organizational unit

- Personnel (financed by institutional and third-party resources) in terms of full-time equivalents [reporting date 31.12.2003] -

	Total	Academic and higher management staff[1]	Doctoral candidates[2]	Other staff, trainees
Entire establishment	**109.8**	**59.2**	**0**	**50.6**
Administration Dept.	23.4	1.0	0	22.4
President's Dept.	8.8	6.0	0	2.8
IEER Dept.	12.9	6.0	0	6.9
Research Dept. I	13.2	8.3	0	4.9
Research Dept. II	8.5	6.0	0	2.5
Research Dept. III	12.1	9.9	0	2.2
Research Dept. IV	14.5	10.0	0	4.5
Research Dept. V	16.4	12.0	0	4.4

[1] BAT IIa and above (not incl. doctoral candidates)
[2] If financed by institutional or third-party resources

Appendix 6

Personnel

- Individuals (financed by institutional and third-party resources) acc. to pay scale [reporting date 31.12.2003] -

	Total number	Financed by third-party resources		Temporary contracts		Women		Women on temporary contracts	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%[1]
I. Total	**125**	**23**	18.4	**23**	18.4	**62**	49.6	**6**	9.7
1. Academic and higher management staff	**61**	**12**	19.7	**21**	34.4	**10**	16.4	**4**	40.0
- S (B4 and above)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
- S (B2, B3)	6	0	0	2	33.3	0	0	0	0
- I, A16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
- Ia, A 15	14	1	7.1	1	7.1	1	7.1	0	0
- Ib, A 14	12	1	8.3	0	0	1	8.3	0	0
- IIa, A 13	29	10	34.5	18	62.1	8	27.6	4	50.0
2. Doctoral candidates	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
3. Other staff	**64**								
- III, IV, A 12, A 11, A 10	5								
- V, A 9, A 8	32								
- VI, A7	11								
- VII, VIII, A 6, A 5	7								
- Wage groups, other staff	9								
- Trainees	0								

0

[1] Women on temporary contracts / number of women

Cells marked in gray are not to be filled in.

Appendix 7

Publications

- Total number and classification by organizational unit[1] -

	2003	2002	2001
I. Total number of publications	**227**	**221**	**212**
- Monographs (authorship)	11 (6)[4]	13 (6)	11 (5)
- Monographs (editorship)[2]	5 (1)	3 (2)	1 (1)
- Contributions to collective works	43 (1)	47 (1)	44 (1)
- Papers in peer-reviewed journals	42 (3)	27	30
- Papers in other journals	40 (19)	55 (20)	39 (20)
- Working Papers / Discussion Papers	84	70	84
- Electronic publications[3]	2	6	3
II. By organizational unit			
President's Department	**50**	**50**	**41**
- Monographs (authorship)	6 (4)	3 (1)	5 (2)
- Monographs (editorship)[2]	1 (1)	3 (2)	1 (1)
- Contributions to collective works	10 (1)	6 (1)	8 (1)
- Papers in peer-reviewed journals	9 (1)	9	10
- Papers in other journals	7 (1)	11 (4)	4 (1)
- Working Papers / Discussion Papers	17	18	13
- Electronic publications[3]	0	0	0
Research Department I	**45**	**35**	**40**
- Monographs (authorship)	2 (1)	1	1 (1)
- Monographs (editorship)[2]	1	0	0
- Contributions to collective works	8	11	11
- Papers in peer-reviewed journals	11	5	3
- Papers in other journals	7 (3)	8 (1)	8 (5)
- Working Papers / Discussion Papers	16	10	17
- Electronic publications[3]	0	0	0
Research Department II	**16**	**15**	**17**
- Monographs (authorship)	1	4 (1)	2
- Monographs (editorship)[2]	0	0	0

[1] Each publication is counted only once and should be assigned to one organizational unit.
[2] Contributions to a monograph, which is edited by employees of the establishment, are to be listed in "Contributions to collective works".
[3] Only electronic publications which have not been published in printed form, e.g. CDs, electronic manuals.
[4] Number in brackets: publications edited by the IfW

	2003	2002	2001
- Contributions to collective works	1	3	4
- Papers in peer-reviewed journals	2	2	1
- Papers in other journals	1	2	4
- Working Papers / Discussion Papers	11	4	6
- Electronic publications[3]	0	0	0
Research Department III	**23**	**34**	**23**
- Monographs (authorship)	1 (1)	0	1
- Monographs (editorship)[2]	1	0	0
- Contributions to collective works	10	14	6
- Papers in peer-reviewed journals	3	3	2
- Papers in other journals	1	4 (1)	4 (2)
- Working Papers / Discussion Papers	5	7	8
- Electronic publications[3]	2	6	2
Research Department IV	**55**	**61**	**54**
- Monographs (authorship)	1	2	2
- Monographs (editorship)[2]	1	0	0
- Contributions to collective works	12	12	15
- Papers in peer-reviewed journals	13 (1)	8	8
- Papers in other journals	9 (2)	16 (2)	8 (2)
- Working Papers / Discussion Papers	19	23	21
- Electronic publications[3]	0	0	0
Research Department V	**38**	**26**	**37**
- Monographs (authorship)	0	3 (2)	0
- Monographs (editorship)[2]	1	0	0
- Contributions to collective works	2	1	0
- Papers in peer-reviewed journals	4 (1)	0	6
- Papers in other journals	15 (13)	14 (12)	11 (10)
- Working Papers / Discussion Papers	16	8	19
- Electronic publications[3]	0	0	1

Appendix 8

Documents submitted by IfW

- Evaluation report according to the Evaluation Questionnaire for the Leibniz Association Research and Service Facilities (including tables)
- Organization chart
- By-laws of the Institute (Satzung)
- Work schedule
- Annual Report 2003
- List of members of the Scientific Advisory Council
- Reports made by the Scientific Advisory Council on the internal audit
- Women's Promotion Plan (WPP) (Frauenförderplan)
- Electronic data processing (EDP) concepts
- Cost and activity accounting system (CAAS)
- Visits to the establishment, Visits by the establishment's staff to other establishments
- List of lectures/courses
- Dissertations and habilitations since 2001
- Agreement between Christian-Albrechts University Kiel and Kiel Institute
- Overview and detailed list of publications in the last 3 years, List of the ten most significant publications, List of publications in 2004
- Guest lectures at non-university institutions
- User statistics for visits to publications site
- Conferences and workshops hosted by the Kiel Institute, Organization of external conferences and workshops
- External conferences in which the Institute's economists participated in 2001–2003
- Prizes/awards
- Faculty appointments
- List of projects (EU, BMBF, DFG and others)

Senate Evaluation Committee

SAE 0073/05
08-April 2005

Annex B: Evaluation Report

Kiel Institute for World Economics (IfW)

Content

1. Summarized Evaluation and Relevance of the Facility

The Kiel Institute for World Economics (Kiel Institute or IfW) was evaluated as a research institution at the usual evaluation interval. The task of the expert panel was to assess the institute's performance over the past seven years as well as to determine whether the institute is well positioned within the international research landscape and viable for the future. Moreover, the institute's success in implementing the recommendations of the last evaluation carried out by the German Science Council was assessed.

The last evaluation in 1997 confirmed that the Kiel Institute is a renowned and efficient research institute. Although the institute still enjoys a good reputation in the national and international scientific community, it has been unable to sustain its outstanding position over the last few years. This may have been due to the retirement of the former President of the IfW in April 2003 and to the fact that a new president has taken office only in October 2004. The Acting President focused on administrative matters in order to provide scope for rearrangements by the new President.

The IfW has implemented the majority of the recommendations of the German Science Council. The productivity of the IfW, e. g. with regard to publications in peer-reviewed journals and to third party funding, has improved since the last evaluation in 1997.

The Kiel Institute has a number of **strengths** which will foster its future development. These include its traditional reputation for high-quality applied research in the field of global economics, its acknowledged competence in policy consulting and graduate training, valuable physical assets such as the co-location with the Kiel University and the German National Library of Economics (ZBW), a young and motivated staff who are open to the visions and changes envisaged by the new President, as well as experienced and qualified researchers. These assets will be a considerable advantage in the rebuilding of the profile and program offered by the institute.

Weaknesses are evident, too: the research strategy which should be based on competitive advantages was not clear in all departments; the integration into international networks, in particular into EU networks, is still not sufficiently developed; human resource development, management structures and techniques are not properly in place; and the publication performance measured by international standards is not sufficient which also holds for the external funding record with respect to competitive research funding.The output with regard to publications in peer-reviewed journals and external research funds won in competition must be substantially increased over the next few years.

The overall performance is comparably weak when judged against the standard international academic criteria. The work of half of the research groups is considered to be good or excellent. Hence, the institute needs reforms in order to mobilize its potential in order to regain the nationally and internationally acknowledged status as one of the leading European economic research institutes. The expert panel is convinced, however, that the IfW is capable of rising to this challenge. The incoming President presented ambitious visions and ideas for the fundamental reorganization of the institute, reforms which seem adequate for achieving the envisaged aim. The ambitious plans for reforms (known as the *Kiel Dialogue)* were well received by the current staff members – senior as well as junior researchers.

The necessary and important reform of the institute will call for both personal resources and major efforts on the part of all staff members. The integration of the **research areas of the Hamburg Institute of International Economics (HWWA)** into the IfW – after the evaluation of

HWWA it was suggested that this matter should be looked into –[1] could be an additional strain on the institute. Therefore, the expert panel does not recommend a merge between HWWA parts and the Kiel Institute in a top-down process. Instead, a two-step approach is proposed: in the short term, cooperation between the research groups from the two institutes where strong complementarities are found should develop in a bottom-up process. In the long run, the Kiel Institute is willing to check which research groups are in line with its own research agenda.

The comments and recommendations of the expert panel reported in the following sections are intended to assist the institute in regaining the excellent standing and reputation it has held in the past. The institute should provide a comprehensive report on changes in scientific performance, institutional structures and management in four years.

2. Mission, Tasks, Main Work Areas

The Kiel Institute holds a prominent position in Germany since it is the only German research institute which deals with global economic issues and practical problems in an encompassing, theoretically and methodologically profound way. Research studies are empirically based, and the quantitative methods used are mostly up-to-date.

Nonetheless, a convincing definition of the comparative advantages of the Kiel Institute over international and national competitors has not been put forward or was at least not sufficiently clear to the evaluators. The institute must develop a distinctive mission that provides clear interconnections and synergy effects between all departments. The project structure within the individual departments is rather heterogeneous in terms of content and methodology. This might be an implication that research topics mostly emerge in a bottom-up process. While this approach is certainly advantageous for the freedom of the individual researchers, it neglects the institutional added value which derives from a common knowledge base created by the highly qualified researchers and their interactions.

Research Department I (*Growth, Structural Change, and International Division of Labor Department*) addresses very heterogeneous research topics. They range from industrial organization to trade issues, labour market to corporate finance issues. Research topics are not sufficiently focused in terms of content or methodology, and hardly any inter-departmental communication takes place. The publication record of RD I has improved significantly over the past years from 0.3 to 1.3 refereed articles per researcher per year – although few articles have been published in English-language peer-reviewed journals. The research work appears to be driven by academic questions rather than by policy questions and identified concerns of policy makers.

Research Department I and Research Department III (*Regional Economics Department)* deal with overlapping issues and tenuous methodological differentiation. However, their approaches differ, with RD I working un-spatially on a national/international scale and RD III spatially on a sub-national level. The intra-departmental research areas on regulatory issues (electricity regulation and airport privatisation) of RD III are hardly related to the issues of spatial economics. The interaction between these departments is too weak. RD I and RD III cooperate only in one project, but potentials exist for broader exploitation of synergy effects. It is recommended to merge both departments at least with respect to these two groups of researchers, who have a

[1] In 2003 the HWWA was evaluated by the Senate of the Leibniz Association. In consequence of this evaluation, the Senate recommended that the evaluation committee of the Kiel Institute is to address the question whether research groups of the HWWA that have been positively evaluated should be merged with the Kiel Institute.

common interest in aspects of international trade, direct foreign investment, and regional economics.

The research topics of **Research Department II** (*Environmental and Resource Economics Department*) address mainly climate research and three relatively isolated projects dealing with resource economics. Most of the research projects of RD II meet the demands of modern economic science. Principally, the work fits well into the empiric and theory driven research agenda at the institute. The issues dealt with are all related to world economics' matters. They focus methodologically on Computable General Equilibrium models (CGE). Modelling climate protection policy with a general computable equilibrium model constitutes mainstream quantitative research and, theoretically, is well founded. This model delivers useful information on the costs of climate protection and their distribution among individual regions. The projects on biodiversity, genetic resources in developing countries and environment labels deal with interesting one-off topics; what they are missing, however, is a direct link to climate research. Therefore, the research should be more focused and better harmonized in a coherent framework. In addition, problems of climate change and sustainability are inseparable from questions of economic growth, structural change and globalisation. As other departments at the institute are specialized in these areas, a closer collaboration is desirable. In general, the number of publications in relation to the size of the department is appropriate. During the report period, on average 2.5 to 5.6 papers have been published per researcher per year. However, the number of papers published in leading journals should be increased in comparison to only 0.3 refereed articles at present. The group is well linked with the international scientific community. The size of the group is relatively small, therefore, it should be strengthened by the integration of additional researchers.

Research Department III (*Regional Economics Department)* addresses very heterogeneous research topics. They range from regional income questions, growth disparities to regulatory issues. The intra-departmental research areas on regulatory issues (electricity regulation and airport privatisation) are hardly related to the issues of spatial economics. Research topics are not sufficiently focused in terms of content or methodology, and hardly any inter-departmental communication takes place. The publication record for RD III remains very weak (0.3). The research work appears to be driven by academic questions rather than by policy questions and identified concerns of policy makers. As mentioned above, it is recommended to merge RD I and RD III at least with respect to the two groups of researchers, who have a common interest in aspects of international trade, direct foreign investment, and regional economics.

The research portfolio presented by **Research Department IV** (*Development Economics and Global Integration Department)* is good. Particular strengths lie in the areas of international Capital Flow and Human Capital and Growth. However, the department does not address the ongoing fundamental change in international development and cooperation policy: German policy makers and implementing agencies urgently need competent discussion partners to forecast and influence this change. There are numerous contacts with non-academic institutions on a simple project basis, but no institutionalized exchange on a broader basis. Although the institute is involved in numerous EU network activities, it needs to focus its research topic more in order to increase funds from European sources.

Regarding research output, this department has good figures: from 0.8 to 1.3 refereed publications per researcher per year. In addition, RD IV is successful in acquiring third party funds. The department also has an intensive teaching record at universities and non-academic institutions. Moreover, the department head is Vice President and held the interim presidency for 18 months.

Research Department V (*Business Cycles)* is extensively involved in providing regular services for politics, in particular in a very solid business cycle forecasting published twice a year and in commenting on economic development issues. For instance, the subsidy report produced biannually is regarded an important contribution to public services. These services are clear strengths of the department and of the institute. Three staff members are permanently engaged in the preparation of these services. Research topics addressed in RD V are only loosely connected with these central services, and a research strategy for combining research and service systematically is not evident. Research is diverse without an identifiable focus. The academic output, e.g. publications in renowned journals, has remained poor over the last few years. External funds are acquired mainly from the Federal Government of Germany and from the EU.

The **Financial Market Group** is integrated into the President's department and concentrates fully on research topics without the obligation of supplying service. The projects focus on well defined research topics and use advanced research methods. The group is well integrated into scientific networks. It boasts an excellent performance in terms of both presentation and publication record. It by far exceeds the institute's average output numbers with 1.8 refereed publications per researcher per year. This group consists of 3.5 full-time equivalent researchers, 1.5 of whom are writing their theses. The group leader – an outstanding researcher – has completed his habilitation thesis. The group is considered an asset and should be fostered in the ongoing organizational reform. Hence, the institute has to decide whether to stabilize and boost the group or to integrate it into RD I or RD V, provided that the departmental structure will continue to exist. The former group leader accepted a chair at a university but is still in close contact with the institute in her capacity as a research professor.

All departments are engaged in providing **policy advice** but the extents to which the individual departments contribute to this service differ. Whereas in RD I and RD III a lack of policy focus is evident, the other departments have a clear policy orientation in their research as a basis for scientifically sound policy advice. This kind of service is appreciated by various political institutions and policy makers. However, it often takes too much time for practical problems to be taken up in academia. The institute should continue to work on its goal to be a competent discussion partner for its stakeholders outside the academic world. In particular, the institute should develop learning mechanisms in order to be able to identify the changing needs of the stakeholders and the political decision-makers and to recognize which problems are practically relevant and should therefore warrant attention.

The new President put forward an impressing **vision** of a content-related restructuring of the institute. By establishing the "Kiel Dialogue", a coherent research program with respect to the three research fields "international trade and factor flows", "business cycles and financial markets" and "growth, development and sustainability" is envisaged. The institute's core activities will be research, public discussion, policy advice and graduate training. The President intends to streamline and sharpen the research profile, to focus on longer-term projects, to emphasize the interface between research and public policy discussion as well as to contribute to public service. His plans are convincing and supported by the expert panel.

In the course of the evaluation of the Kiel Institute an additional task had to be performed: based on the results of the evaluation of the HWWA in 2003, the Senate of the Leibniz Association and the BLK recommended verifying during the evaluation of the IfW whether **HWWA research** groups which were positively evaluated could be integrated in the IfW. According to this mandate, the experts collected and assessed statements by the members of both institutes. The experts came to the conclusion that a merger of HWWA research groups with Kiel research groups cannot be recommended at the present moment. Firstly, the incoming President of the Kiel Institute envisages substantial fundamental and organizational changes within the institutes. These changes are accompanied by serious tensions which have to be dealt with. The integration of new research groups, especially those located at a different place, could therefore easily lead to additional management problems. This could turn out as a handicap for the successful development of the institute. Secondly, although the research topics of both institutes show many complementarities, which could become interfaces between potential partners, in the short run, this decision should be taken by the researchers themselves in a bottom-up process. However, with regard to the experience of systematically shaping its role between economic research and policy making, HWWA could be an interesting discussion partner for the institute. In the long run, the Kiel Institute is ready to investigate in due course which of the research groups may fit into the institute's research agenda.

3. Structural Features and Organization

The incoming President assessed the strengths and weaknesses of the institute adequately and suggested measures for improvement. He set up the "Kiel Dialogue" and, thus, manages to motivate the institute's staff and to overcome resistance to radical changes. According to this plan, the content-related **departmental structure** will be abolished. The present department structures tend to constrain cross-departmental cooperation. In this respect, departmental structures appear to be out-dated since they impede a flexible leadership structure and thematic orientation. Potential synergy effects – benefits by means of the institute's organization – are not exploited sufficiently. In the future, the former department heads will be assigned functions of public good provisions, for instance *fund raising*, *publication service, internal systems* or *networking*. It should be carefully considered, however, whether department heads could consistently integrate their management function with their "public good functions" for the institute at large and whether those functions could be separated from research activities.

As stated above, **cooperation between departments** is rather weak. However, personal networks and formalized exchange of information exists. But most is left to the accidental emergence of personal initiatives. One of the comparative advantages of publicly funded institutes outside the universities is to manage complex and large projects. This capacity is not fully exploited by the departments. Many of the institute's projects are small and weakly interconnected with others, so that they probably could also be run at a university. The potential of larger, interdisciplinary conducted and long term projects should be exploited far more.

According to the incoming President, the research work shall be organized rather as a floating regime of research projects advised and overseen by a Steering Committee. The relationship between the responsibilities of this Steering Committee and the Scientific Advisory Board as well as the membership in the Steering Committee needs to be clarified.

The expert panel welcomes the plan presented by the new President, although it does not address in detail all the relevant issues raised by the panel. It is considered an interesting "*experiment",* which, however, needs to be reassessed in due course. For this reason, the expert panel gives very few recommendations regarding organizational structure: as to the scheduling of a research program, the incoming President seems to interpret his role as a moderator in a bottom-up process rather than taking leadership. In general, a bottom-up approach seems to be desirable, but the President is advised to give guidance and directions for a focused research program at the same time. He has to point out to the staff which research fields are to be dealt with. On that basis, projects should be developed in a bottom-up approach with project leaders having to apply for financial support from the institute and to provide project-relevant information such as the expected output, time schedules, and the budget required to conduct the project. The steering group will then decide on in-house funding. Thus, a combined bottom-up and top-down approach should be followed to establish a more coherent research program.

Further proposals made by the new President concerning reorganization are to set up a private company or to pursue a network strategy approach of appointing new research directors to oversee the research work at the institute. Both items are positively acknowledged by the experts. Nevertheless, the success of the network strategy approach should be looked into in due course.

The proximity to the **German National Library of Economics** (ZBW) is a valuable asset. However, according to the recommendation of the Leibniz Senate, ZBW is to become separated from the Kiel Institute and an independent institution within the Leibniz Association. After this reorganization, ZBW will offer services for the entire economic community and the private sector as well. Therefore, in the future there will be no special relations between ZBW and the Kiel Institute except for the joint administration, which has proven to be successful over the years.

The **Scientific Advisory Board** was changed recently and is doing a very good job now. The internal evaluation was carried out thoroughly and professionally. The Board consists of internationally renowned scientists who reflect the institute’s reputation. However, the members should participate in the meetings more regularly. As to the role of the Steering Committee envisaged by the President, the division of labour between the Scientific Advisory Board and the Steering Committee, should be defined in order to avoid conflicts of responsibilities.

In accordance with the recommendations of the last evaluation, the institute changed the **by-laws**. A Board of Trustees was established and the institute’s financial flexibility increased by the state of Schleswig-Holstein. But the legal status of the institute as a non-independent institution of the state still remains. Therefore, the institute and the Schleswig-Holstein State Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Culture are requested once again to examine possibilities of changing this status and creating a legally independent institute.

4. Ressources, Expenditures and Personnel

The Kiel Institute possesses magnificent physical facilities. Due to the proximity to and good relations with the library and Kiel University, the institute has good access to information and cooperation partners.

Research output according to standard scientific criteria differs a lot between the departments and individual researchers. An **efficient management structure** including an incentive scheme to induce higher productivity has not been established yet. Performance indicators should be developed and individual objectives agreed upon for every researcher will be needed. According to the plan of the new President, a quality monitoring system will be established and will include research steering groups.

As mentioned above, the institute is in a transition period. During the vacancy of the Presidency, the Acting President has not filled positions that became vacant due to the retirement of tenured personnel in order to provide scope for rearrangements by the new President. This decision of the Acting President is very positively acknowledged by the experts. The proportion of staff on **temporary contracts** paid out of the institutional budget has increased but is still too low. At the moment there is no longer any researcher on tenured contract paid by third party funds. The institute has a comparatively large proportion of non-academic staff. This has to be lowered and the number of researchers increased accordingly.

Revenues and costs of the Advanced Study Program (ASP) as well as costs of occasional seminars in econometrics for visitors from banks and universities are not documented in the official budget. The **cost accounting** is fully operative. But there is no reporting system which supports controlling by the department heads or the President. The overhead costs of different activities like publishing or conducting the ASP cannot be assigned individually either; they are calculated with a global share of 25 %. Individual and overhead costs have to be clarified and assigned to these different activities.

The institute is not very successful in acquiring **third party funds** in competitive procedures. The Financial Market Group and RD IV show the best figures still. No research funds were raised from the DFG (German Research Foundation). Including funds from the Federal and the State Governments RD V is most successful. The efforts taken to raise third party funds preferably in research competition from DFG and EU have to be strengthened.

According to initiatives proposed by the new President outside funding shall be increased: He plans a centralized grant administration, joint initiatives with cooperation partners as well as fund raising by the proposed new company, by addressing the private sector and establishing a alumni forum. These approaches are suitable ways of improving the institute's performance even with regard to standard international criteria.

5. Promotion of Up-and-coming Academics and Cooperation

The Kiel Institute undertakes several activities to promote and train young researchers. But there are some possibilities left to exploit.

At Kiel University a program known as the **Quantitative Economics PhD Program** is carried out. It also contributes to the advanced training of the institute's researchers. The relationship and potential cross-fertilization between this program and the **Advanced Studies Program** in International Economic Policy Research (ASP) should be considered and clarified. The long-standing ASP contributes greatly to the international reputation of the Kiel Institute and is one of its major assets. It fulfils two tasks: training postgraduates as well as networking and attracting renowned researchers to Kiel – to lecture and to visit the institute. Most of the students which participated in the ASP have found prestigious positions in Germany and abroad. But the scientists of the institute do not contribute with a large share of teaching and the international lecturers and visitors are not engaged in joint research programs of the IfW.

The institute still does not offer **doctoral positions** in a formal manner, nor has it created fellowships as recommended by the German Science Council. Currently, 25 % of all researchers are working on their theses. The average duration required to complete a thesis at the IfW (five years) is considered to be too long. In addition, the duration varies between the Research Departments: new staff in RD V spends much of the first two years involved in post-learning forecasting techniques and is largely unable to begin with independent research. In contrast, researchers in the Financial Markets Research Area start work on their theses immediately. The introduction of a graduate program with the University as proposed by the President should help to improve the situation here. If this comes to fruition, students would have the opportunity to focus more on their own studies than it is the case in the current set-up. The institute needs

fellowships or corresponding positions to allow doctoral candidates to concentrate full-time on thesis preparation and on course work, at least for the first year. Up to now, all of the institute's doctoral candidates have been supervised by the President. In the future, all academic staff members who are entitled to supervise post graduate students should be encouraged to do so.

There are some serious concerns about the scientific guidance of young academics. The junior staff is struggling to publish their research results in renowned journals. It appears that senior researchers do not support junior researchers sufficiently to enable the latter to finalize their papers in the necessary quality. Clearly, more mentoring is required in this respect.

The cooperation between the Kiel Institute and **Kiel University** is satisfactory but should be deepened in the future. Nevertheless, the participation of senior staff in graduate teaching and of junior staff in graduate courses needs clarification. Possibilities for joint applications for DFG or EU funds should be explored, too. Besides this, the institute has to check whether the cooperation with the Kiel University is according to the rules set up by the Bund-Laender Commission for Education Planning and Research Promotion concerning teaching obligations and joint appointments.

The way the department heads are appointed should be changed: all department heads should be appointed jointly with universities or at least, by university appointment-like procedures.

Since the production of knowledge takes place in international topic-related networks involving researchers from various institutions the IfW should intensify its cooperation in international research networks such as NBER, CEPR, ETSG, IMF or UN agencies or development banks. Kiel researchers are not well integrated into these new research structures nor do particularly strong links to German universities exist. Only a small number of IfW-researchers participate in research conferences to present papers, although there are considerable differences between researchers from the different departments. Each department of the institute should strengthen its EU network activities. The new President should also support the global networking with his international experiences. His vision to head for a combination of real and virtual initiatives and to set up virtual infrastructures like invisible research communities is still open to experience. To appoint external research directors and to attract visiting researchers may support this goal.

6. Results and Scientific Resonance

The Kiel Institute is an internationally acknowledged institution with an excellent, long standing **reputation** in international economic research and analysis dating back to the times of the institute's former heads such as Erich Schneider und Herbert Giersch. Nowadays, the institute is better known in Germany than abroad. In general, the academic staff is not sufficiently involved in the international scientific community as indicated by the presentation of papers at conferences and by publications in leading journals. The institute's international visibility is mainly due to its excellent Advanced Study Program, academic conferences, to the journal *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv* and even to its close relation to the ZBW. Its national reputation mainly derives from the solid policy advice it regularly provides.

The **aim** of the new President is to make the Institute "one of the world's top research centres in global economics". To better integrate the IfW into the international scientific community he intends to increase the impact of the institute's publications, to create a new E-journal to shorten the publication process and to intensify virtual networks.

The **publication record** is regarded as satisfactory in terms of the total of publications per researcher per year (2003: 4.4; 2002: 4.1; 2001: 4.3). However, with respect to publications in peer-reviewed journals, the publication record is regarded as weak (2003: 0.8; 2002: 0.5; 2001: 0.6). In the period under report all researchers published in total five articles in the top 40 journals worldwide. Moreover, the quality of the articles as assessed by the impact of the journals in which they are published seems to be below an appropriate level. Some senior researchers including several department heads have not published in refereed journals at all.

Publication performance varies considerably between the departments, with the Financial Group, RD I and RD IV being the best (about one and more articles in peer reviewed articles). RD II, RD III and RD V have small figures only, on average 0.3 refereed articles per year.

The most important objective for the next years is to raise these figures as they are regarded as the main standard criterion for research quality and productivity. One paper in an internationally renowned, peer-reviewed journal per researcher and year is considered an international benchmark in economics. This suggests that providing incentives for high performance is a key challenge for rebuilding the institute. To be successful the spirit of internationalization of research topics and the preparation of publications should be strengthened.

The quality and quantity of peer-reviewed publications would even be considered poor for an academic department in a university. Hence, the output of an independent research institute with staff which has few teaching responsibilities might be expected to produce a higher output. However, the institute has to fulfil other obligations such as providing forecasts and policy advice. This has to be taken into account when evaluating the publication records. Moreover, there are two other points that ought perhaps to be considered: Firstly, refereed journals concentrate predominantly on theoretical work whilst the institute concentrates on applied research. Secondly, young researchers, usually newly recruited from universities, need time to gain experience in high quality publishing. They also need guidance to meet the expected publication objectives.

The Kiel Institute plays a strong role in the **political arena** due to the reliable policy advice it provides and the reliable performance of contract research. It presents an intellectually sound non-partisan position when investigating and commenting on the German government and policies. Some of the academic staff members have good contacts and relations to policy makers and media. In addition, the institute stimulates and contributes to the public debate on policy-related issues. However, an indicator system which systematically describes the activities related to this type of output has not yet been developed. Hence, a proper assessment of the impact of policy advice is rather difficult. The impact might be improved by a bi-weekly economic policy report addressing policy research.

Another group of stakeholders interested in the IfW output are **university researchers.** Whether the Kiel Institute sees a comparative advantage vis-à-vis those institutions and whether universities are sufficiently served by the institute was questioned by the expert panel. The prevailing opinion was that the IfW would be able to contribute to the university research to a far greater extent. This comprises, for example, the generation of long-term data series or the joint acquisition of long-term projects, both of which offer considerable potential for complementing the research profile of universities.

7. Implementation of German Science Council's Recommendations

The institute has succeeded in raising the publication rate in peer-reviewed journals, in focusing research topics better – for instance the environmental research was strengthened and merged into one department, and four research groups were dissolved and their issues dropped – and in internationalizing research activities. The number of academic personnel employed in research with temporary contracts has been increased but is still too low. Therefore, these efforts need to be continued.

Some of the targets set by the last evaluation by the German Science Council have not been met or only in part. Areas that still warrant attention are the creation of a compact research profile and more concentration on a few core research topics; an increase in external funds; improvement in the quality of publications and the productivity of researchers; a reduction in the time spent on PhD thesis preparations and in the number of administrative positions.

Cooperation with Kiel University has been intensified by initiating joint research activities, but still has to be deepened. The German Science Council recommended a reorganization of the IfW in some areas. According to this, a Board of Trustees was established and embodied in the by-laws. Furthermore, the manoeuvring space and the administrative flexibility of the institute have been extended by important institutional changes.

8. Summary of the Evaluation Committee´s Recommendations

- In general, the plans for the institute's restructuring introduced by the new President are appropriate for a positive development of the institute. So far those are introduced they are given due support. In four years at least an intermediate report should be compiled on the implementation of the reforms put forward by the new President, as well as on how the recommendations given by this evaluation committee are dealt with.
- Basically, the institute should clarify and develop its comparative advantages vis-à-vis national and international competitor institutes. This involves the research agenda being made more coherent and focused on a smaller number of related issues than before. The institute should be integrated more intensively into international networks, in particular in EU networks, and take part in EU fund raising.
- To become a serious international competitor, the IfW has to better its publication record, in particular with regard to publications in internationally renowned journals. Furthermore, the efforts taken to raise third party funds preferably in research competition from DFG have to be strengthened.
- The legal independence of the institute should be granted by law and by an adjustment of the by-laws.
- The number of temporary contracts financed by the institutional budget has to be increased up to 50 % of the scientific personnel engaged in research.
- At the present moment, the integration of the research projects mentioned positively in the HWWA evaluation report into the institute is not recommended, although the cooperation of complementing research groups whose productivity could improve through greater collaboration is encouraged.
- Cooperation with Kiel University has to be intensified. In particular a joint graduate program has to be established. In general, the promotion of young researchers should be-

come better through the establishment of fellowships and by offering PhD courses. The time needed to complete a PhD thesis also has to be shortened.

- A fellowship program for doctoral candidates to finance the first one or two years of study – followed by a temporary contract as an employee – should be introduced. Doctoral candidates should be supervised by all professors of the institute and also by professors from other universities. The introduction of an obligatory PhD program for all doctoral candidates of the institute is strongly supported.
- A program to increase the number of temporary stays abroad of members of the Institute in internationally renowned research institutes should be installed. The number of visiting researchers from abroad who stay for more than one month and who work on joint research projects should be increased.
- The founding of a GmbH within the legal framework of Germany to give more flexibility for the work of the Institute is supported. This private company should perform commercial assignments for services, thus providing a clear division between independent research and externally supported services and policy advice.
- A clear division of competencies between the Scientific Advisory Board and the Steering Committee envisaged by the incoming president should be established from the beginning to avoid conflicts. The Steering Committee should report to the Scientific Advisory Council.
- The Economic Archives are a department of IfW, their budget, however, is part of the budget of the German National Library of Economics (ZBW). As the Economic Archives work in close cooperation with the library of HWWA, they had been already evaluated together with HWWA. In this evaluation it was recommended to merge the libraries of HWWA and ZBW as well as to verify whether to continue the Economic Archives in Hamburg and Kiel. In case it is concluded to be continued they should be integrated into the ZBW on an organizational level including their budgets. If it is decided to close the Economic Archives, the financial means attributed to the Economic Archives should nevertheless be transferred to the budget of the (new) ZBW.

Appendix

Participants:

1. Evaluation Team

Chairman (Member of the Senate Evaluation Committee)

Prof. Dr. Richard **Hauser** (Frankfurt/Main University, Institute for Economics)

Vice Chairpersons (Members of the Senate Evaluation Committee)

Prof. Dr. Martina **Brockmeier** (Federal Agricultural Research Centre, Institute of Market Analysis and Agricultural Trade Policy)

Prof. Dr. Dietrich **Fürst** (Hannover University, Institute of Regional Planning and Regional Science)

Prof. Dr. Dietrich **Wegener** (Dortmund University, Experimental Physics V)

External Experts

Prof. Kym **Anderson**, PhD (University of Adelaide, School of Economics)

Prof. Dr. Dieter **Cansier** (Tuebingen University, Faculty of Economics)

Dr. Rainer **Durth** (KfW, German Bank for Development, Financial Cooperation Policy Department)

Prof. Dr. Bernhard **Felderer** (Cologne University, Faculty of Economics, Business Administration and Social Sciences)

Prof. Dr. Bernd **Hansjürgens** (Centre for Environmental Research Leipzig-Halle, Department of Economics, Sociology and Law)

Dr. Heinz **Herrmann** (German Central Bank, Department of Economics)

Prof. Will **Martin**, PhD (World Bank, Trade and Development Research Group)

Prof. Dr. Manfred **Neumann** (Bonn University, Department of Economics)

Prof. Dr. P. Michael **Schmitz** (Giessen University, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration)

Prof. Dr. Konrad **Stahl** (Mannheim University, Chair for Economics and Applied Microeconomics)

Prof. Ian **Wooton**, PhD (University of Strathclyde, Department of Economics)

Federal Representative

RD Dr. Thomas **Roth** (Federal Ministry for Education and Research)

Representative of the States

MinDirig Dr. Heribert **Knorr** (Ministry of Science, Research and the Arts)

2. Guests

Representative of the relevant Federal Department

Reinhard **Heck** (Federal Ministry of Economics and Labour)

Representative of the relevant State Department

Ingrid **Malecki** (Ministry for Education, Science, Research and Culture)

Representative of the Bund-Laender Commission for Educational Planning and Research Promotion

Dr. Karin **Andrae**

Representative of the Leibniz Association

Prof. Dr. Christoph M. **Schmidt** (Rhine-Westphalian Institute for Economic Research, Essen)

Representative of the Advisory Board

Prof. André **Sapir**, PhD (Université Libre de Bruxelles)

3. Representative of the University

Prof. Dr. Johannes **Bröcker** (Kiel University, Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences)

.

12.05.05

Anlage C: Stellungnahme der Einrichtung zum Bewertungsbericht

Institut für Weltwirtschaft an der Universität Kiel (IfW)

Das Institut nimmt die Feststellung der Bewertungsgruppe mit Freude zur Kenntnis, dass das Institut seine Produktivität seit der Evaluierung 1997 verbessert hat, vor allem gemessen an Veröffentlichungen in referierten Journals. Das Institut teilt die Einschätzung der Bewertungsgruppe, dass die Performance des Instituts gemessen an internationalen akademischen Kriterien noch weiter verbessert werden muss. Dies deckt sich mit dem erklärten Ziel des neuen Präsidenten und aller Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeiter. Das Institut dankt den Gutachtern für die zahlreichen Vorschläge zur Qualitätsverbesserung der Forschung im IfW. Es sieht sich dadurch in seinen Reformanstrengungen bestätigt.

Das IfW wird alle Empfehlungen aufgreifen. Die folgenden Punkte dokumentieren die Reaktion des IfW auf besonders wichtige Empfehlungen der Bewertungsgruppe:

1. Das Institut soll in vier Jahren einen umfassenden Bericht über die Veränderungen in der wissenschaftlichen Leistung, der institutionellen Struktur und des Managements vorlegen.

   Das Institut sieht in dieser Empfehlung eine gute Möglichkeit, den Erfolg des begonnenen Reformprozesses in angemessener Frist zu dokumentieren.

2. Die Abteilungen I und III sollen zumindest in bezug auf die beiden Forschungsgruppen verschmolzen werden, die gemeinsame Forschungsinteressen im Bereich des internationalen Handels, der Direktinvestitionen und der Raumwirtschaft haben.

   Die Empfehlung entspricht der übergreifenden Strategie des Instituts, anstelle der bisherigen Forschungsabteilungen drei Programme einzurichten, unter deren Dach eigenverantwortlich tätige Forschungsbereiche Projekte durchführen, die dem Standard erfüllen, den der Bewertungsbericht setzt. Dabei soll in einem kombinierten bottom-up und top-down Prozess eine Profilschärfung des Forschungsprogramms erreicht werden.

3. Die positive Beurteilung des Forschungsbereichs „Finanzmärkte“ veranlasst die Gutachter zu empfehlen, dass Finanzmarktforschung in der bevorstehenden organisatorischen Reform als Forschungsbereich gestärkt wird.

   Es ist beabsichtigt, dem Forschungsbereich „Finanzmärkte“ eine wichtige Rolle im Programm „Macroeconomic Activities and Financial Markets“, einem der drei Schwerpunktprogramme, einzuräumen.

4. Es wird empfohlen, die Politikberatung besser als bisher den wechselnden Bedürfnissen der zu Beratenden anzupassen und Lernmechanismen zu entwickeln, um einen größeren Erfolg dieser Beratung sicherzustellen.

   Das Institut wird ein „Public Policy Center“ einrichten, um in der europäischen Politikberatung stärker präsent zu sein und um den Dialog mit politischen Entscheidungsträgern zu institutionalisieren. Dabei wird das Institut auf eine enge Anbindung der wirtschaftspolitischen Beratung an den aktuellen Stand der Forschung achten.

   Das Institut prüft außerdem die von den Gutachtern unterstützte Gründung einer GmbH für die Durchführung kommerzieller Aktivitäten.

5. Es wird die Empfehlung ausgesprochen, den Anteil der nichtwissenschaftlichen Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeiter zu verringern und den der Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler entsprechend zu erhöhen, sowie den Anteil der befristet Beschäftigten beim wissenschaftlichen Personal bis auf ein Niveau von 50 % der Gesamtbeschäftigten im wissenschaftlichen Bereich zu erhöhen.

Das Institut wird sich bemühen, unter Berücksichtigung der arbeitsrechtlichen Vorschriften dieses Ziel zu erreichen.

6. Der Bewertungsbericht fordert die rechtliche Selbständigkeit des Instituts. Das IfW und die ZBW sollen als rechtlich selbständige Einrichtungen geführt werden.

   Das Institut wird dies gemeinsam mit den Zuwendungsgebern im Zusammenhang mit den strukturellen Reformen des IfW und den anstehenden Entscheidungen über die Zusammenführung der HWWA-Bibliothek mit der ZBW prüfen und entscheiden.

7. Das Controlling System soll dahingehend verbessert werden, dass die Overhead Costs verschiedener Aktivitäten wie Redaktion oder die Führung des Advanced Studies Programs erfasst und zugeordnet werden.

   Das Institut wird das Controlling System im Rahmen des Übergangs von der Kameralistik zu den Programmbudgets verbessern.

8. Die Querbeziehungen zwischen dem Ph.D.-Programm der Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Fakultät (Quantitative Economics) und dem Advanced Studies Program sollen intensiviert werden.

   Das Institut wird in Zusammenarbeit mit der Fakultät prüfen, wie die Beziehungen zwischen beiden Programmen ausbaut werden können. Darüber hinaus wird eine stärkere Vernetzung mit in- und ausländischen Universitäten angestrebt.

9. Alle Mitglieder des wissenschaftlichen Kollegiums, die berechtigt sind, Dissertationen zu betreuen, sollen diese Möglichkeit in Zukunft wahrnehmen.

   Das Institut wird in Zusammenarbeit mit der Fakultät die Betreuung von Dissertationen auf eine breitere personelle Ebene stellen.

10. Es wird empfohlen zu prüfen, ob die Kooperation mit der Universität (Lehrverpflichtungen) in Übereinstimmung mit den Regeln ist, die die Bund-Länder-Kommission für Bildungsplanung und Forschungsförderung bezüglich Lehrverpflichtungen und gemeinsamen Berufungen aufgestellt hat.

    Das Institut wird diesem Prüfauftrag nachkommen.

11. Es wird vorgeschlagen, dass das Institut bei der Berufung von Abteilungsleitern in gemeinsame Berufungsverfahren mit der Universität eintritt oder zumindest mit berufungsähnlichen Verfahren operiert.

    Laut Satzung werden die Leiter der bisherigen Abteilungen in einem berufungsähnlichen Verfahren berufen. Das Institut wird in Zusammenarbeit mit der Universität und den Zuwendungsgebern prüfen, wie diese Berufungspraxis bezüglich der Anforderungen, die die Universität an Berufungen von wissenschaftlichem Leitungspersonal stellt, verbessert werden kann. Dabei soll die Umstellung der Organisationsstruktur im IfW von Abteilungen zu Programmen und Forschungsbereichen berücksichtigt werden.

    Es wird im Rahmen der rechtlichen Verselbständigung des IfW angestrebt, Regelungen zu schaffen, um zukünftig leitende Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler durch gemeinsame Berufungen mit der Universität zu gewinnen.

12. Der Bewertungsbericht bemängelt, dass es noch kein Indikatorsystem gäbe, das systematisch die Aktivitäten beschreibt, die das Institut in der politischen Beratung und in der Medienpräsenz anbietet. Der Bericht stellt die Möglichkeit eines im zwei-wöchentlichen

Abstand erscheinenden wirtschaftspolitischen Reports vor, der politiknahe Beratung zum Inhalt hat.

Das Institut wird darauf hinarbeiten, die Präsenz des Instituts in der wirtschaftspolitischen Beratung und in den Medien besser als bisher zu dokumentieren und zu publizieren.

13. Zum Zwecke einer besseren Arbeitsteilung zwischen dem Wissenschaftlichen Beirat und dem Steering Committee wird empfohlen, dass das Steering Committee dem Wissenschaftlichen Beirat berichtet. Eine Abgrenzung der Aufgaben beider Gremien ist nötig.

    Das Institut wird diese Empfehlung aufgreifen.

14. Der Bewertungsbericht empfiehlt für den Fall, dass das Wirtschaftsarchiv seine Tätigkeit fortsetzt, es in die ZBW als organisatorische Einheit einschließlich seines Budgets zu integrieren. Für den Fall, dass entschieden wird, das Wirtschaftsarchiv zu schließen, sollten die budgetären Mittel, die dem Archiv zur Verfügung standen, nichtsdestoweniger in das Budget der erweiterten ZBW übertragen werden.

    Das Institut wird in Zusammenarbeit mit den Zuwendungsgebern und dem Direktor der ZBW die Zukunft des Wirtschaftsarchivs auch im Lichte der Eingliederung des HWWA Service-Teils in die ZBW prüfen. Das IfW begrüßt die Empfehlung, die budgetären Mittel im Falle der Einstellung der Wirtschaftsarchivdienste im Budget der ZBW zu belassen, und sieht darin eine Chance, das Angebot der ZBW an innovativen Dienstleistungen auszubauen.

Das Institut für Weltwirtschaft sieht sich veranlasst, einige Faktendarstellungen richtig zu stellen. Entgegen der Aussage, das IfW habe während des Zeitraums 2001-2003 keine Forschungsmittel von der DFG eingeworben, ist darauf hinzuweisen, dass in der Abteilung IV in den Jahren 2001 und 2002 ein von der DFG mit rund 138.000 Euro gefördertes Forschungsprojekt (s. Tabelle 3.1) durchgeführt wurde. Konjunkturprognosen werden nicht 2x pro Jahr veröffentlicht, sondern mindestens 7x (s. Jahresbericht des Präsidenten). Der Bericht führt zudem aus, dass in der Konjunkturabteilung ständig drei Wissenschaftler Dienstleistungen für die Politikberatung erbringen. Dies ist nicht richtig, soweit sich die Aussage auf den zuvor erwähnten Subventionsbericht bezieht. Dieser Bericht wird von weniger als einer jährlichen Vollzeitkapazität eines Wissenschaftlers erbracht. Der Bericht führt zudem aus, dass die Forschungsfragen der Abteilung III überwiegend von akademischer Natur geprägt zu sein scheinen und weniger von wirtschaftspolitischen Fragestellungen. Dies übersieht, dass sich zahlreiche Forschungsthemen in der Abteilung III am Beratungsbedarf deutscher und europäischer Institutionen orientieren.