Terms of Reference for the evaluation of the MOST National Liaison Committees

MARCH 2005

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1   MOST programme background: The Management of Social Transformations (MOST) Programme, part of the Social and Human Sciences Sector (SHS) of UNESCO, was launched in March 1994. Its establishment was prompted by concern amongst social scientists, Member States, and development and UN agencies that governments across the globe resorted to social science analysis on a fragmented and disorganised basis. They appeared to use policy research for specific ad hoc tasks and neglected the need to base development and policy decisions on longer term, analytical social research.

This observation was reinforced at the time and in subsequent years by the recommendations contained in the reports on the five preceding United Nations World Summits: the Summit on Environment and Development (Rio de Janeiro, June 1992), the Conference on Population and Development (Cairo, September 1994), the World Summit for Social Development (Copenhagen March 1995), the World Conference on Women (Beijing September 1995) and the Conference on Human Settlements (Istanbul, June 1996).

One element common to these five Summits was the sweeping consensus for a new approach to development that puts people and social equity at the heart of the development agenda. Social science, as the study of social and human relationships, is the obvious centre stage for new and innovative thinking on policy alternatives and social development models. Hence, the need for a programme that could amongst others: encourage the social science community to co-operate in a more interdisciplinary and international manner; assist the social science community in translating the results of major social research undertakings into policy or planning alternatives; and reach out to national and local governments to convey the importance of considering results from sustained, endogenous social research in decisions regarding social policy alternatives.

1.2   MOST Programme mandate and role: The MOST programme falls within one of UNESCO's key objectives stipulated by the founding member states in 1946, namely the promotion of the social sciences and their practical utilisation. MOST was created with the twin goals of improving our scientific knowledge of social transformations as well as generating practical policy-relevant recommendations. During its first life cycle (1994-2002), it strongly emphasized research that was comparative, international, interdisciplinary and policy relevant. In this vein, MOST was designed to organize and promote international research networks, to focus attention on capacity building and to establish a clearing-house for social scientific knowledge. MOST-Phase I was characterized by three major thematic orientations: Multi-Culturalism, Urban Development, and Governance-Globalisation issues.

MOST is the only programme in UNESCO fostering and promoting social science research and occupies a pivotal position in promoting UNESCO'S overall goals. Its role in supporting interdisciplinary and intersectoral programme development and conceptual work within the different Sectors of UNESCO should also be stressed.

The MOST Evaluation Report 1994-2002 identified the programme's principal strengths as follows: its capacity to mobilize networks, to co-ordinate projects from UNESCO's headquarters and field offices, to provide high level expertise for the upstream preparation of projects as well as their evaluation at both national and regional levels. MOST's concerted efforts to ensure involvement from almost all geo-political regions were paid tribute to.

In general terms, MOST should attempt to achieve the following:

(a) To further understanding of social transformations;
(b) To establish sustainable links between social science researchers and decision-makers;
(c) To strengthen scientific, professional and institutional capacities, particularly in developing countries; and
(d) To encourage the design of research-anchored policy.

1.3   Reorientation of the MOST Programme: In 2000-2003, a thorough external evaluation assessed the programme's achievements since its creation in 1994. The ensuing broad consultations redirected the programme both thematically and logistically. Following the recommendations of the 6th session of the Intergovernmental Council of the MOST Programme (February 2003) and the debates held at the 166th Executive Board Session (April 2003) to which the MOST evaluation was submitted by UNESCO's Internal Oversight Service, MOST has been reoriented in line with the overall concentration effort specified in UNESCO's Medium Term Strategy for 2002-2007 (31 C/4). The core business of the retooled MOST programme is to broker policy-relevant knowledge to a range of established and emerging policy-actors and to support multi-actor approaches conducive to the generation of evidence-based policy.

The overall expected results for Phase II of the MOST Programme include:
▪ Improved image of the usefulness of research results for policy design and implementation with policy-makers, media and communities;
▪ Improved information and learning processes with a view to integrating research results in strategic/policy-frames;
▪ Improved quality of decision-making and policy implementation; and
▪ Enhanced public acceptance of social policies.

1.4   Governance of the MOST Programme: An Intergovernmental Council (IGC) and an independent Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) govern the MOST Programme. Co-ordination is provided by a small Secretariat in UNESCO Headquarters (see item 1.5). The elected Bureau of the Intergovernmental Council, consisting of the MOST Chairperson, the Rapporteur and the six Vice-Presidents representing the six electoral groups (regions), has been considerably strengthened during Phase II, through regular meetings and close following-up on programme development. These debates have been enriched by the new modality of holding Joint IGC Bureau and SAC meetings, the first one of which was organized from 2-5 July 2004, at UNESCO Headquarters.

1.5 Structure of the Secretariat: The refocusing of MOST on the science-policy interface was paralleled by the restructuring of the UNESCO SHS sector within UNESCO's overall reform process. MOST continues to be hosted by one of SHS's four divisions: the Division of Social Science, Research and Policy. The SHS environment provides closeness to the other three divisions: 1) Ethics of Science and Technology, 2) Human Rights and Democracy, 3) Anticipation, Philosophy and Human Security, as well as to the Coordination Section of the Cross-Cutting–Theme on Poverty.

Within the Division of Social Science, Research and Policy, MOST is now managed by the **"Section on Policy and International Cooperation in the Social Sciences (SHS/SRP/POL)".** In comparison to MOST Phase I, the transfer of MOST to a section (SHS/SRP/POL) translated into a far more contained set-up in terms of human and financial resources. Two former thematic orientations of MOST-Phase I have been merged and transferred to an independent section within the same division: the section dealing with Migration and Multi-Cultural Policies; especially in Urban Environments. The third former MOST theme on "Globalisation and Governance" is now dealt with by the Byblos Centre, Lebanon. Following the basic structure laid out for sections in UNESCO, the section responsible for MOST is headed by a Chief of Section (P5) and ideally staffed by a programme specialist (P3), an assistant programme specialist (P1) and a secretary (GS5). As a result of restructuring and reform, the latter staff positions are

not yet fully settled within section SHS/SRP/POL. Financial resources are likewise subject to the principles guiding the management of SHS sections: in 32 C/5, the overall budget for a section revolved around US$ 350,000.- whereas it will be further reduced in 33 C/5.

1.6   MOST National Liaison Committees: The National Liaison Committees (NLCs), which are presently established in 61 countries, are important bodies for the national programme development and implementation.

History: They are established following Recommendation 7 of the Intergovernmental Council (IGC) of MOST during its First Session of 7-10 March 1994 and Recommendation 2 of the IGC's Second Session of 3-7 July 1995. Member States are free to establish the structure and composition of a MOST National Liaison Committee according to their own priorities. Liaison Committees are generally constituted with the support of UNESCO National Commissions, in conformity with Resolution 13.1 of the 28th General Conference. Alternatively, any institution with responsibility for scientific policy, such as a national research council, may host a liaison committee.

The composition of NLCs may include social science researchers based in universities or other research institutions and representatives of bodies co-ordinating research funding and of research-user groups such as governments, the private sector, trade unions, professional associations, NGOs or community based organisations.

Their mandate is to create and enhance the links between the MOST Programme and national social science and policy communities. Member States, United Nations Agencies, and Funding Agencies (UNDP, UNFPA, UNODCCP)[1], as well as bilateral funding sources, should thus be in a position to draw on the Programme for increased technical assistance in social policy planning. The MOST Clearing House on the Internet is an important tool for sharing and disseminating knowledge in the fields covered by the Programme.

The key functions of the MOST NLCs , as established during MOST-Phase 1 included:
▪ identify and motivate national institutions concerned with social science research related to the principle thematic interests of the MOST Programme, with particular emphasis on involving younger generations of researchers and university teachers;
▪ regularly disseminate information about MOST Programme activities sent by the MOST Secretariat to National Commissions;
▪ constitute a permanent forum to facilitate the flow of information between UNESCO-MOST and interested national institutions;
▪ assist the constitution of national research networks; and
▪ assist in obtaining funding for groups participating in MOST projects from national bodies such as national research councils, or appropriate government Ministries (Research, Education, Science and Technology, Social Development, Foreign Affairs etc.).

MOST NLCs have so far been established in the following 61 countries: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Colombia, Congo D.R., Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Egypt, Finland, France, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Latvia, Lithuania, Malawi, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Papua

---

[1] UNDP = United Nations Development Programme
 UNFPA = United Nations population Fund
 UNODCCP = United Nations Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention

New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Tanzania, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vietnam.

2. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

2.1 Legislative mandate for this evaluation: At the Sixth Session of the Intergovernmental Council (IGC) of the MOST Programme held in Paris on 19-21 February 2003, the Members adopted a number of measures, including the Director General's recommendation that "the MOST Secretariat in collaboration with National Commissions should undertake a review of the structure, operations and impact of the NLCs during the 32 C/5 with recommendations and proposals to be submitted to the IGC Bureau. Evaluations will be carried out throughout the course of the programme." [2] The Director- General's actions to be taken in response to the MOST evaluation, submitted to UNESCO's 166th Executive Board in March 2003, reaffirms the prior call to the IGC Bureau and Secretariat to conduct this evaluation.[3]

2.2 Purpose of the evaluation: In accordance with the recommendation of the Director General to the 166th Executive Board and the recommendations of the Sixth Session of the Intergovernmental Conference of the MOST Programme, the purpose of the evaluation is to review the structure, operations and impact of the National Liaison Committees. The overall purpose of the evaluation is to identify lessons and provide recommendations to strengthen the work of the NLCs that will support the Social and Human Science sector in achieving the MOST Programme objectives. On a more general level, the evaluation aims to contribute to a culture of learning in UNESCO, to improve programme performance and results-based management and to assist decision-making through the provision of evidence-based evaluation knowledge.

2.3 Scope of the evaluation: Bearing in mind the recent reorientation of the Programme (described in section 1.3), the work of the NLCs needs to be reoriented accordingly. It is important to highlight that the evaluation aims to contribute to the accomplishment of the expected results for Phase II of the Programme. This implies that the evaluation should not focus on MOST Phase I (1994 - 2002) but rather emphasize the transition process currently underway, with a view to strengthening the Programme for the future. Therefore, the evaluation should provide adequate elements to answer the following fundamental question: "***How to adjust the structure and operations of the NLC's in order to implement the new mission of the Programme?***"

This suggests that the evaluation must result in setting a profile of the appropriate institution(s) to serve the refocused Programme. The final outcome of the evaluation exercise should give the MOST Secretariat a clear orientation on how the MOST NLC's should be structured and operate in order to best fit the Phase II requirements of the Programme. Consequently a general overview of MOST NLC's activities during Phase I of the programme, should only be useful as a way to identify lessons from the past, recognizing some (4 or 5) NLC's "success stories" that best suit the re-orientation of the MOST Programme on the science-policy link, in order to inspire the MOST NLC's future modus operandi..

2.4 Key evaluation questions: The evaluation commitment as announced above in section 2.1 specifies that the evaluation review the structure, operations and impact of the National Liaison Committees. Several key questions pertaining to these issues are listed below under (1) Structure; (2) Operations (Practice and Processes); and (3) Added Value / Impact. The questions below are intended to be illustrative and not exhaustive. They should serve as a framework within which the consultant(s) is

---

[2] Refer to document (SHS-2003/CONF.201/10), 21 February 2003.
[3] Refer to "Comments by the Director General on the external evaluations reports submitted in the 2000-2001 and the 2002-2003 biennia" – Document 166EX/41

expected to provide further refinements in the Evaluation Plan. The classic evaluation criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact) should serve to carving out the specific niche for NLCs that will allow them to enact the role of a science-policy interface mechanism, drawing strength from appropriate coalitions and carefully avoiding duplication of efforts.

3. Structure (Stocktaking and Outlook)

3.1 What is the composition / structure of the NLC and how is it legally and institutionally anchored? Which local obstacles must be taken into account? What are the primary roles / functions that NLCs perform within their respective country? How is the NLC linked to other institutions (universities and research centres, decision-making bodies at national and local level, National Commissions for UNESCO and the MOST Secretariat)? Does the NLC reach out to "like-minded" ventures, such as research-policy networks, UNESCO Chairs, other UNESCO allies, such as the national representation bodies of UNESCO's other scientific programmes (MAB, IHP, IGCP, IOC)? To other UN joint ventures in its own country (such as WHO Collaborative Centres etc)? Does it reach out to donors, media, business in its country? Does it have alliances with "like-minded" NLCs in its (Sub-) Region? Is it involved into the creation of/ follow-up to MOST Regional Fora of Social Ministers?

3.2 What lessons can be learned and applied from other institutions in the different regions that could inspire an improvement for the structure of the MOST NLCs ? What are the best-suited modalities to strengthen the NLCs function as a platform for the MOST programme?

3.3 Which incentives (other than funding) are needed to assert the NLCs' identity, image and sustainability? How to promote their autonomous raison d'être? How should the NLCs be structured in order to improve their links to other institutions (Universities and research centres, decision-making bodies at national and local level, National Commissions for UNESCO and the MOST Secretariat), with a view to fostering closer ties between social science research and policy-making? What are the key factors that either facilitate or prevent the NLC from fully carrying out its roles/functions? How can the NLC ripe benefits from increased networking opportunities, such as ICTs, synergies between partners, shared resources, shared work load, increased comparative capacities etc?

Operations (Practices and Processes: Laboratory of ideas, knowledge broker, advocacy agent, promoter of democracy, standard setter,)

3.4 What do NLCs receive from UNESCO? (i.e. what kind of support - intellectual, technical including ICTs, financial, material, advisory or other - is UNESCO delivering to the NLCs?) How does this correspond to the kind of support the NLCs want to receive from UNESCO under the new MOST focus? What arrangements do NLCs have in place for dealing with UNESCO? (i.e. for benefiting from MOST programme offers, as well as for the purpose of making MOST aware of NLC requirements)? What modalities are in place for monitoring trends in social transformations at national/regional level, and keeping MOST up-dated on a regular basis etc.?

3.5 What are/were NLCs' primary activities (i.e. what NLCs do with input and/or support provided by UNESCO?) Who are / were the primary target groups of the NLC activities? How do these activities correspond to the kind of support the target groups want/ed to receive from NLCs? What arrangements do NLCs have in place for dealing with the target groups? (i.e. for the purpose of making NLCs aware of target groups' requirements, informing NLCs about their satisfaction/wants/needs, etc.) What are the primary challenges experienced?

3.6 Which arrangements are needed for NLCs becoming proficient advocacy agents for integrating evidence into policy-making? How to improve the communicative competence of NLCs? How to spur on NLCs' developing means for supplying user-focused access to knowledge? How to ensure scientific evidence is disseminated where and when most needed? How to improve evaluation and monitoring capacities? How can NLCs improve their negotiation capacity?

3.7 What arrangements are needed for NLCs dealing with the decision-making level? For being turned into non-partisan, action-oriented policy analysis centres? Are institutional practices and structures of the NLC appropriately matched to the country's political structures? What products are sought for by policy-makers, and at which point in time? What does the NLC need for providing an intellectual space of debate for alternative ideas and fostering participatory arrangements? For training MPs and other policy-actors? For being effectively linked to the policy-making community?

3.8 How to maintain/ and/or expand the NLC over time? How to assert good management practices? How to get the best out of intellectual resources that are loosely connected with the NLC?

3.9 How provide the NLC with a reasonably sound financial basis? How to strengthen strategic alliances and skills in fund-raising?

Added value and Impact: Enabling research to be useful, usable and used

3.10 What is the added value of the NLCs' action in terms of their contribution to the goals and objectives of MOST? Was/is there any articulation of expected results? Do the various stakeholders (primarily the UNESCO Secretariat and NLCs) share a common understanding of what is to be accomplished ?

3.11 Are NLCs proactively creating opportunities for research to play its role alongside the other forces shaping policy? Are NLCs building "formative evidence" networks to support change processes, that is, s ensuring multi-stakeholder involvement in the knowledge generation process? Have NLCs been involved in the design, undertaking and dissemination of research that impacted policy in their country? Are there examples of NLCs having delivered "the right information to the right people at the right time"?

3.12 What do the NLCs do differently as a result of having received UNESCO support, as demonstrated by several successful activities / achievements?

3.13 What do NLC target groups do differently as a result of having received NLC support, as demonstrated by several successful activities / achievements?

Feedback

What are the NLC's view s about
-Their Committee?
-UNESCO?
-The MOST Secretariat?
-The action to be taken?

Draft Terms of Reference for evaluation of MOST NLC's **Version 12** of **21March 2005**

-This evaluation?

4. Evaluation Planning and Implementation Arrangements

4.1: Evaluation Plan: The Consultant(s) will prepare an evaluation plan to operationalize the evaluation. The evaluation plan should clearly describe how the evaluation will be carried out and how data will be collected and analyzed. It is important that the evaluation plan complies with the TOR, but the Consultant(s) should also provide any refinements necessary to explain their proposed approach to the evaluation.

The evaluation plan should include, but not be limited to, the following elements[4]:
- Programme context. A description of the programme being evaluated, its external context, and previous significant evaluation findings.
- Programme logic / theory. A description of how the programme is supposed to work: its objectives, activities, outputs and outcomes and their interrelationships.
- Evaluation objectives. A clear statement of the objective of the evaluation; the matters the evaluation will conclude on.
- Evaluation criteria. The criteria the evaluation will use to assess performance, and an explanation of where the criteria came from.
- Evaluation scope. The scope of the evaluation; what aspects or elements of the programme in question will be examined.
- Evaluation methodology. An outline of the methodology to be followed – what will be done in conducting the evaluation – and the cost involved.

4.2 Draft Evaluation Report The Consultant(s) will prepare an evaluation report that describes the evaluation and puts forward the evaluator's findings, recommendations and lessons learned. The presentation of results is to be intrinsically linked to the evaluation issues, establishing a flow of logic development derived from the information collected. The report must include an Executive Summary corresponding to the following format: background of the programme evaluated, major findings (key achievements and key challenges), lessons learned and recommendations. IOS will submit written comments on the draft report to the Consultant(s) within a pre-determined time period.

4.3 Final Evaluation Report: The final evaluation report should follow the same formula outlined above.

4.4 Evaluation team composition: The Consultant(s) should be selected after a competitive process. The individuals must have experience in conducting organizational / institutional evaluations or assessments. The Consultant(s) should possess (a) 10 years programme evaluation experience, ideally within areas related toUNESCO's fields of competence, (b) demonstrated experience and professional standing in the social sciences, and (c) some demonstrated knowledge of UNESCO's mandate, structure and processes. The Consultant(s) should also possess appropriate linguistic competencies necessary for fieldwork (English, French or Spanish).

The Consultant(s) will need to rapidly develop a sound knowledge of the MOST programme and NLCs activities, especially a proper understanding of what the transition period after Phase I should lead to. UNESCO will provide all available documentation for that purpose. However, the Consultant(s) should

---

[4] Excerpt from paper by John Mayne, "Ensuring quality for evaluation: lessons from auditors".

have not been directly involved in any MOST-related activities, nor held any key positions (Presidents of NLCs, leaders of research teams, etc.) for the obvious reasons of objectivity and transparency.

4.5 Evaluation budget: The estimated budget available to carry out the evaluation is $20,000. The Consultant(s) will have to be self-sufficient with regard to logistics (office space, administrative and secretarial support, telecommunications, printing of documentation, etc.). However, the Social and Human Sciences sector will provide appropriate office space for time spent in UNESCO Headquarters.

4.6 Evaluation schedule: The following timetable is suggested for the evaluation process:

A: Circulation of Terms of Reference to potential evaluators	March- April 2005
B: Submission deadline for evaluation proposals	23 April 2005
C: Submission of document review, evaluation plan and draft terms of reference for any case studies, questionnaires, etc.	30 April 2005
F: Meeting of Evaluation Reference Group to approve above	3rd May 2005
G: Consultant(s) briefing in Headquarters	4 May 2005
H: Implementation of evaluation	4 May – 30 June 2005
I: Submission of draft final report	4 July 2005
J: Meeting of Evaluation Reference Group	7 July 2005
K: Presentation of draft final report to MOST IGC 7th session	26 July 2005
L: Submission of Final Report	1 August 2005

4.7 Evaluation deliverables: The Consultant(s) will submit the following deliverables for the review and approval of IOS: draft and final evaluation plan; Terms of Reference for any data collection instruments (e.g. surveys, questionnaires, etc.); and the draft and final evaluation report.

ANNEX

Background Documentation

Documents to be provided by UNESCO: The Social and Human Science sector (SHS) will provide the Consultant(s) with the documents listed below at the signing of the contract.

- Intergovernmental Council of MOST, First Session, Paris 7-10 March, 1994, Final Report (See : VIII. The Organization of MOST at the National and Regional Levels)
  http://www.unesco.org/most/igc94re.htm
- Intergovernmental Council of MOST Second Session, Paris, 3 to 7 July 1995, Final Report (See Funding and National MOST Liaison Committees and ANNEX I, RECOMMENDATION 2)
  http://www.unesco.org/most/igc95re.htm
- MOST Evaluation Report (1994-2001), - O. V. Lindqvist (Finland), R. Radhakrishna (India), R. de Oliveira (Brazil).
- Bridging research and policy, MOST Annual Report 2001
- Research-Policy Linkages, MOST Annual Report 2002
- Proposal for Phase II (2002-2009) of the MOST Programme, Elvi Whittaker (former Chairperson of the Scientific Steering Committee, 1994-97), University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
- Recommendations of the Sixth Session of the IGC MOST (19-21 February 2003)
- Report by the IGC MOST, General Conference 32nd session, Paris 2003
- Joint Communication of the Chairpersons of the Five Scientific Programmes to the Director-General and to the 165th session of the Executive Board - Fourth meeting of the Steering Group of the Five Chairpersons, Paris, 3-4 October 2002
- Joint Communication of the Chairpersons of the Five Scientific Programmes to the Director-General and to the 31st session of the General Conference - Third meeting of the Steering Group of the Five Chairpersons, Paris, 17-18 October 2001
- Joint Communication of the Chairpersons of the Five Scientific Programmes to the Director-General and to the 161st session of the Executive Board - Second meeting of the Steering Group of the Five Chairpersons, Paris, 18 May 2001
- - Mid-term evaluation report of the Management of Social Transformation (MOST) Programme (1994-1998), 156 EX/12, http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0011/001156/115696e.pdf
- Report on the refocusing of the Management of Social Transformation (MOST) Programme, 160 EX/12
- Document (SHS-2003/CONF.201/10), 21 February 2003.
- "Comments by the Director General on the external evaluations reports submitted in the 2000-2001 and the 2002-2003 biennia" – Document 166EX/41
- A preliminary STRATEGY for the MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS (MOST) PRPGRAMME, C.v. Furstenberg, 29 June 2003.
- More information on MOST National Liaison Committees : http://www.unesco.org/most/partlist.htm
- MOST National Liaison Committees Contact Persons by countries:
  http://www.unesco.org/most/nlccp.htm

Documents from MOST NLCs

- République Algérienne Démocratique et Populaire: Centre de recherche en Anthropologie Sociale et culturelle. Rapport final de la Journée d'étude du 31 octobre 2001: "Quel développement durable pour l'Algérie ? Contribution à un débat."   - http://www.unesco.org/most/nlcalgeria2001.htm
- Comités de liaison MOST dans la sous-région du MAGHREB (MOST National Liaison Committees of Maghreb Countries, available in French) - http://www.unesco.org/most/nlcmaghreb.htm

- Uruguay: <u>Informe de Gestion 1999-2001</u> (Annual Report of Activities for 1999-2001, available in Spanish) - http://www.unesco.org/most/nlcurgay2.htm
- Uruguay: <u>Informe Anual de Actividades, Año 2000</u> (Annual Report of Activities for 2000, available in Spanish) - http://www.unesco.org/most/nlcurgay.htm
- <u>Public Opinion Is a Barometer of the Civil Society Situation</u>, organized by the MOST National Liaison Committee of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 27 September 2002 - http://www.unesco.org/most/nlcuzbek.htm
- ADVA Centre: http://www.adva.org
- Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation (TESEV): http://www.tesev.org.tr/eng/