



SHS-03/CONF.201/6
Paris, February 2003
Original: English



MOST Evaluation Report (1994-2001)

Evaluation Team:

O.V. Lindquist (Finland), Chairman
R. Radhakrishna (India)
R. de Oliveira (Brazil)

DIVISION OF SOCIAL SCIENCES,
RESEARCH AND POLICY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| I. | Introduction..... | 3 |
| II. | Terms of Reference and Methodology Adopted..... | 3 |
| III. | The MOST Programme in UNESCO..... | 5 |
| IV. | The role of Social Sciences in UNESCO..... | 5 |
| | A. The Medium Term Strategy of UNESCO..... | 5 |
| | B. The Multiple Contexts of the MOST Programme..... | 6 |
| V. | Programme Assessment..... | 9 |
| | A. Programme overview..... | 9 |
| | B. Impact assessment. | 11 |
| | C. Efficacy of the Programme..... | 12 |
| | D. Strengths and weaknesses..... | 13 |
| VI. | The Governance of the Programme..... | 15 |
| | A. The Intergovernmental Council (IGC)..... | 15 |
| | B. The Scientific Steering Committee (SSC)..... | 16 |
| | C. The National Liaison Committees (NLCs)..... | 17 |
| | D. The Secretariat..... | 18 |
| | E. The budget..... | 18 |
| VII. | Overall Impact..... | 19 |
| | A. Interdisciplinary, Comparative and Policy-Relevant International Research | 19 |
| | B. International, Regional, National and Local Policy..... | 19 |
| | C. Capacity Building (particularly in LDCs)..... | 20 |

| | | |
|--------------|--|-----------|
| | D. How to Measure the (Local) Impact of the Projects?..... | 20 |
| VIII. | Overall assessment..... | 21 |
| | A. Review the mandate and refocus..... | 21 |
| | B. Activities and policy interface..... | 21 |
| | C. Monitoring..... | 21 |
| | D. Refocusing of MOST..... | 23 |
| | E. Profile of Projects (typology)..... | 23 |
| | F. Partnerships..... | 24 |
| IX. | The Recommendations..... | 25 |

ANNEXES

- ANNEX I: Table: Number of visits to each MOST project webpage
- ANNEX II: Table: Website visits
- ANNEX III: Table: Project Management, 1994-2002
- ANNEX IV: Table: UNESCO/MOST Meetings and Conferences - 2002 to 1994
- ANNEX V: Table: Funding of MOST Projects
- ANNEX VI: Modes of Knowledge Production (according to Michael Gibbons)
- ANNEX VII: Assessment of selected MOST projects
- ANNEX VIII: Overview of MOST Documents and Publications, 1994-2002

MOST Evaluation Report (1994-2001)

Evaluators*:

O. V. Lindqvist (Finland), Chairman

R. Radhakrishna (India)

R. de Oliveira (Brazil)

I. INTRODUCTION

This report contains the results of the evaluation of UNESCO's Management of Social Transformations (MOST) Programme (1994-2001), conducted between January and June 2002. The MOST Programme, part of the Social and Human Sciences Sector (SHS) of UNESCO, was launched in March 1994. It was created with the twin goals of (a) improving the understanding of social transformations by generating policy-relevant knowledge on three major issues of our time: multi-ethnic and multicultural societies; cities and urban development; and local and national strategies to cope with global phenomena, and (b) improving the communication between social sciences researchers and decision-makers. MOST promotes the use of social science research in policy formulation, and the development of methodological tools for evaluating the impact of social and economic development policies emanating from major UN Conferences. The principal strength of the MOST Programme is its capacity to mobilise networks, co-ordinate projects from UNESCO's headquarters and field offices, provide high level expertise for the upstream preparation of projects as well as their evaluation at both national and regional levels. This support system reflects the viability of the co-operation between research producers and users that UNESCO Member States deem critical for improved development policies. An Intergovernmental Council (IGC) and an independent Scientific Steering Committee (SSC) govern the Programme. Co-ordination is provided by a small secretariat in UNESCO Headquarters, and National MOST Liaison Committees (NLCs, presently established in 53 countries) which provide the link between the Programme and national social science and policy communities. Member States, United Nations Agencies, and Funding Agencies (UNDP, UNFPA, UNODCCP), as well as bilateral funding sources, can thus 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.

II. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND METHODOLOGY ADOPTED

The goal of the evaluation is to assess the results of activities implemented within the MOST Programme between 1994 and 2001. The year 2002 is considered as a transitional year for the second phase of the Programme, and the particular purpose of this evaluation is to make specific forward-looking recommendations to improve the Programme after 2002, the continuation (of which?) for a second phase spanning over 2002 - 2009 was foreseen in UNESCO's Medium-Term Strategy for 2002 - 2007 (31 C/4, paragraphs 99 and 107), as well as in the Programme and Budget for 2002 - 2003 (31 C/5, paragraph 03301).

* The members of the international evaluation team were Prof. R. Radhakrishna, Director of the Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research, Mumbai, INDIA; Dr. Renato de Oliveira, Secretary of State for Science and Technology, federate-state of Rio Grande do Sul, BRAZIL; and Prof. Ossi V. Lindqvist, University of Kuopio, Chairperson of the Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council, FINLAND. Prof. Lindqvist served as chairman of the evaluation team. Mrs Adriana Paes worked as administrative and research assistant to the evaluation team.

The evaluation covers policy research networks, pilot projects, extrabudgetary projects, the MOST Clearing House and capacity-building activities carried out between 1994 and 2001. The External Mid-Term Evaluation Report (SHS-99/CONF.203/4) and the Report on the Refocusing of the MOST Programme (160EX/12) are background documents in this external evaluation. The present evaluation also draws on the observations and recommendations made by the evaluation of UNESCO's Information Services in Social and Human Sciences¹, particularly as far as the dissemination and the communication strategies are concerned.

The Terms of Reference (ToR) of this evaluation, approved by the SSC and the IGC, indicate that the evaluation is carried out in accordance with the procedures and the evaluation plans of UNESCO, as well as General Conference resolution 1993 on its 27th Session, and Executive Board Document 140EX/11. It was carried out under the responsibility of the Division of Social Science, Research and Policy (SHS/SRP), with the active participation of the Office of Internal Oversight (IOS), in all stages of evaluation.

The main issues covered in this evaluation are:

- a) Assessment in terms of results of the implementation of the MOST strategies (considering the importance of national contexts in analysing the research-policy links);
- b) Assessment of organisational structural conditions of the MOST Programme;
- c) Assessment of the impact of capacity-building activities;
- d) Assessment of MOST as an international social science programme.

The evaluation team carried out its research and analyses by using the following methods: a) quantitative and qualitative analysis of MOST publications and documents; b) individual interviews with research network members and community policy leaders (from Asia, Europe, the Americas and Africa), members of the IGC, the SSC and the NCLs, as well as representatives of UNESCO National Commissions; c) meetings with Mr. Pierre Sané, the ADG/SHS, Dr. Ali Kazancigil, the Executive Secretary of the Programme, and the MOST Secretariat, as well as SHS staff members not directly involved in MOST projects; d) a survey with internal and external users; e) collection of statistical data on the use of the MOST Website. The collected data was analysed in a forward-looking perspective.

The evaluation team had three joint meetings, the first one in Paris on 14-18 January 2002, followed by a meeting in Helsinki (March 24-28), and in Paris (April 22-26). The first meeting served as preliminary contact between the evaluators and the UNESCO Secretariat, particularly the MOST Secretariat. In Helsinki, the team had discussions with Professor A. Shorrocks, Director of the UNU/WIDER (UNU World Institute for Development Economics Research). After a second meeting with the MOST Secretariat between 22 and 24 April, the team presented its preliminary findings to the SSC in Paris on April 26. Moreover, the evaluators made individual travels for interviews to Paris, several universities in the Netherlands, in Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo, the NLC in Montevideo, MOST network members in New Delhi, participated in the Nordic UNESCO Commissions meeting in Copenhagen (27-30 June 2002),

¹ HOBOMH, Hans-Christoph, 2001, Evaluation of UNESCO's Information Services in Social and Human Sciences.

III. THE MOST PROGRAMME IN UNESCO

As an expression of the recognition of the central and crucial role of social sciences for the development of society and the implementation of UNESCO's programme, MOST was launched in 1994 with three main objectives:

- a) Fostering the production of knowledge on social transformations;
- b) Enhancing the relevance of social science research and expertise for policy-making and development;
- c) Strengthening the scientific, professional and institutional capacities especially in developing countries;

Thematically speaking, the current priority areas of the MOST Programme are:

- a) Multicultural and multi-ethnic societies;
- b) Urban development and governance;
- c) Globalisation and governance.

Thus, MOST aims at fostering international, interdisciplinary, comparative research, towards policy-relevant knowledge. It is intended to generate new ideas and new approaches in solving social challenges and issues, such as growing inequalities and unequal access to wealth between and within countries, ethnic tensions and conflict prevention, international migration and multiculturalism, urban development policies, globalisation and democratic governance. Since policy formulation and problem solving cannot be devised on an *ad-hoc* basis, MOST is intended to complement short-term research. It is expected that MOST projects make significant contributions to policy-making partly because of their duration (long-term research), which allow deeper and more significant analyses of the local context and the international situation. Also among the functions of MOST is the provision of various kinds of expertise services, particularly through its networks.

Moreover, the MOST Programme participates in the implementation of the UNESCO's strategy towards poverty eradication. It also fosters interdisciplinary and intersectoral programme development and conceptual work with the different sectors of UNESCO (particularly Natural Science, Education and Culture).

IV. THE ROLE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES IN UNESCO

A. The Medium-Term Strategy of UNESCO

The UNESCO's Medium-term strategy sets the general strategic objectives and targets for the period between 2002 and 2007. UNESCO's functions are described as a *laboratory of ideas*, a *standard-setter*, a *clearing house*, a *capacity builder in Member States*, and a *catalyst for international cooperation*.

The two overarching themes expressed in the strategy, namely *eradication of poverty and contribution of information and communication technologies to the development of education, science and culture and the construction of a knowledge society*, can both be interpreted as having implications also for the structure and execution of the MOST Programme. The first one especially concerns the geographical distribution of MOST projects (for example, what types of projects should the MOST Programme develop in developing countries and regions?), whereas the second one refers mainly to the tools and targets of the Programme (for example, how well

has MOST disseminated its products through the new information technologies?). From the thematic viewpoint, however, there is a danger that too many general themes, policy aims or crosscutting themes for MOST contribute to the lack of clarity of its stated objectives.

UNESCO has five intergovernmental and international scientific programmes, namely IHP, IOC, IGCP, MAB, and MOST. All other programmes were created before MOST, and have already established well-functioning networks and a science base. An interpretation of the Medium-Term Strategy seems to give the MOST Programme a special and central role among the science programmes of UNESCO: for instance, MOST should serve as a coordinating player between natural and social systems, especially in view of the developing global pressures; it should promote principles to guide policy making. Moreover, MOST is the **only** programme in UNESCO fostering and promoting social science research. It is thus in a **very** pivotal position in its relations with UNESCO's other science programmes, and in promoting UNESCO's overall goals. It also has close links with the International Social Science Council (ISSC). At the same time, MOST should be seen as an excellent tool for capacity building, especially in developing countries.

Finally, reading the Medium-Term Strategy can also lead us to the interpretation that the MOST Programme could and should link with and benefit more from the overall strategy of UNESCO, especially as far as capacity-building and education are concerned. The link with the Education sector is already well established in some of the MOST projects, but this could be further developed. It is commonly agreed that education and access to education at large are important tools towards social and economic development and the construction of human and social capital. Thus, the educational dimension could be reinforced in the future development of MOST.

B. The Multiple Contexts of the MOST Programme

The MOST Programme enjoys the advantage of being part of UNESCO's global network of activities, and in this respect it carries a good name and reputation.

On the other hand, the MOST research programme is a small part, at least in terms of volume, of the social science research that is undertaken globally. Thus it is important that it can carve for itself its own particular *niche* and particular objectives that give it the mandate and right to live and to succeed. However, it must also show leadership qualities in its chosen fields and tasks, because the Programme is dependent on the cooperation of and enthusiasm among the social scientists and social science organisations.

The beginning of MOST was characterised by a bottom-up approach whereby scientists were invited to submit proposals for research projects, which admittedly produced some positive diversity. But a strict top-down management of the MOST Programme by its Secretariat in project development may not work either, because it may not be attractive enough for the scientific community, which is the source of new knowledge and innovation. Therefore MOST aims at striking a proper balance between the bottom-up and top-down approaches, to serve both as a framework for developing social science research as well as contributing intellectually to UNESCO's policies and stances.

Indeed, a dimension of MOST which deserves to be further developed is its acting as a tool for generating well researched and documented analyse and policy proposals to be disseminated by UNESCO, in international fora.

The strength of MOST lies in its *international networking capacity*. If properly managed and if a cohesive vision is set up at the Programme level, these international networks should give MOST far more weight than what its mere financial size would imply. The social sciences are rather young from the historical point of view, at least when compared to natural sciences; and they are often characterised as 'national' or 'local'. This of course reflects the most common problem setting frames that social sciences have adopted in answering to social demands and tackling the social and human problems. The (local) cultural element in the practice of social sciences has a major role in the definition of methods, problems and the scientific agenda. Moreover, funding of social sciences often has a strong (and almost exclusive) national base.

The international networking, promoted and provided by MOST, also works for the benefit of the social sciences (and scientists) themselves, helping them to learn and understand possible paradigmatic differences, improve their internal cohesion, and add to a better understanding of the world's problems and challenges. Thus, the international networks also contribute to the proper and timely solution to these global complex problems. In many fields of social sciences, fostering regional and international networking and comparative research is becoming a high-priority for agencies, both in terms of cooperation and funding. One recent example is the European Research Area developed by the European Union.

International studies show that current scientific collaboration is not evenly distributed within and between the major world regions. In developing and transition regions, transnational collaboration is forced by scientific (information seeking) and also by economic needs (degradation of national scientific systems). This collaboration gives scientists better access to information, proper equipment and technologies. For obvious reasons, scientists from a relatively poor region seldom have the probability of collaborating within their region. Therefore, access to the scientific cooperation with the developed world is given priority in the developing regions, and can be interpreted as a modality of capacity building. However, at the same time, social scientists from the developed countries would benefit and learn by access to the new central issues in the developing world. New information technologies help go beyond both interdisciplinary and geopolitical borders. Several international publishing houses and journals have plans to provide free-of-charge access to scientists in developing countries of their electronic publications.

The major role given to MOST is the promotion of research and expertise for policy-making and development. Nowadays, there are new ideas about how to go about influencing policy making. In the past, the relationship between scientists and policy makers was seen as rather linear (i.e., scientist → policy maker, or vice-versa), but the experience has shown that this relationship is more complex and dialectic; therefore we should aim at setting up horizontal networks and lateral extensions under the concept of 'learning organisations'. This means that the scientists themselves are part of the learning process together with the decisions makers and the public at large, and the flow of information is two-way (if not a multiple flow of information and decision). This should also affect the structure and ways of management of MOST research projects.

The relationship between scientists, researchers and policy has many facets. Thus, research and the resulting knowledge can have a number of functions:

- it gives empowerment and legitimacy;
- it can contribute to the definition of public good;
- it can feed advanced warning systems to forecast future developments;

- it clarifies and contributes to the establishment of best practices (or at least tries to avoid bad practices);
- it gives alternative 'solutions' or pathways for policy;
- it contributes to setting aims for policy;
- it adds to the monitoring and evaluation of projects and policies;
- it can clarify the nature and causes of conflicts and differing views in the society and between people;
- it can also be a mutually beneficial learning tool when international and interregional experiences are compared, experiences in which research can have a mediating role;
- knowledge and experience can also move with people (e.g., a scientist moving into a government position and vice versa).

The relationship between research and policy is very complex, and its nature can hardly be clarified in a single research project. Research findings are seldom if ever applied as one-to-one policies. Societal issues and problems seldom appear 'simple', but involve a multitude of players and factors and special interests, good many of which cannot even be openly recognised. For social scientists, to *know* the problem is important, for policy makers, to *solve* problems is important. But to 'solve', many times, means to live with the problem, to adapt to it. And in the social field, problems are seldom 'solved' the same way as in the case of natural sciences, but they are *re-solved* time and time again. However, one can always learn from past successful and unsuccessful practices. And these cases could be documented and analysed.

One should also ask: who are the decision makers? In some instances and cases one can indicate a certain limited number of key decision makers and/or organisations that formulate policies, but in some other instances an informed public can also act as decision maker through pressure groups and NGOs or simply through a strong public opinion (through the mass media). Thus the actual stakeholders come from a very diverse group of interests in the society, from the World Bank to the UN, from the media to associations and population groups.

The definition of the 'public good' is also a complex issue, but certainly good research can also contribute to its formulation. Understandably, the environment for forging the links between research and policies may be quite different in character in different countries and regions of the world, and no single patent formula may be given. Contextual variations influence this relationship, which may assume very different forms.

Thus, the case of social research is very complex: the history of social research affecting public policies and decision making is often seen as less than successful if not quite disappointing. The value of research to potential users depends also on scientists' readiness to reflect on their own policy assumptions. Professionals often see this as a signal of weakness and a potential threat to their professionalism. As one of our respondents also described: "The tendency is for social science professionals to assume they know best. These barriers to change (i.e. the attitudes, assumptions, practices, conception of their own professionalism, etc.) constitute an important focus for research on social and organisational change as yet massively under-explored".

A social science research programme can be either *research-driven*, whereby the "problématiques" (central issues) and methods stem from the scientific domains, or *policy-driven*, whereby the problems and the overall approaches are linked and related to a policy that is being planned or formulated or is already being executed. Currently, social science research has become more policy and problem-oriented, and demands greater resources and better

organisational back up. A negative result of this historical development has so far been the fact that theoretical bases of social science knowledge have not been sufficiently strengthened despite the often-larger expansion in the research output.

The MOST Programme needs both visibility and a human face. Visibility is needed to attract the interest of the scientific community, to educate the general public and to build liaisons with the decision makers properly. Visibility can come in many forms, on many platforms, and it should be enhanced both at the project level (and also nationally), and at the entire MOST Programme's as well as the UNESCO's levels. Part of the visibility issue can be dealt with through the various ways and channels of disseminating the research findings and policy recommendations. The human face is also extremely important, and the role of the Executive Secretary and his colleagues in engaging a dialogue with the scientific and the policy community should not be neglected.

The three main themes of MOST were recognised as most pressing when the Programme was launched in 1994, and as time goes by, it appears that they are not only up-to-date, but they also require even more urgent solutions, since they also become global in nature. Themes including urbanisation, migrations, multiculturalism, democratic governance must not be tackled only in a national or regional perspective; rather, they must be analysed from the interregional and global point of view, particularly because they concern both developing and developed countries. Therefore, it is recommended that, for the sake of continuity, UNESCO maintain these main themes, building around them a cohesive thematic and strategic development. It is also important that, in re-thinking the thematic and strategic development of these themes, the underlying economic and technological factors be taken into consideration with more rigour. It seems, in fact, that economics and technology have not yet been fully integrated into the critical thinking being produced by MOST. Thus, the search for coherence should be rooted in the maintenance of the core identity and the overarching mandate of the MOST Programme: understanding *social transformations*.

The capacity building activities of MOST, be they scientific, professional or institutional, also appear to become very crucial in the future, particularly when we consider the overall 'field' where MOST is playing. Universities in developing countries are caught in the crunch of rapidly expanding their student base and tightening financial resources; and this is seriously hampering their capacity and commitment for research and development work. Investing in and promoting capacity building for social scientists in developing countries and countries in transition, as some projects have already tested in the first phase of MOST, could be a viable solution for the period 2003 onwards. In the eyes of the world social science community, MOST is to be seen as an important programme. It should and could perform a leadership function, also in terms of quality of its work, making distinctive contributions to social science research and capacity building in the international setting.

V. PROGRAMME ASSESSMENT

A. Programme Overview

Among the MOST Programme activities, the networks are the most prominent ones. Currently, there are twelve networks, one Best Practice project, one summer school programme, one working group on governance, research and policy, and a series of UNESCO Chairs directly or indirectly related to MOST. The networks cover all the continents. Furthermore, MOST

organises meetings, produces documents and newsletters and other publications, and it maintains the MOST Clearing House/Webpage, which had over 1,3 million visits last year (2001). It also collects and maintains various databases, among them the Best Practices and the National Liaison Committees Database. It is involved in various activities aimed at capacity building, through its networks or intersectoral projects. Several electronic publications (MOST Electronic Journal on Multicultural Societies, Exploring Religious Pluralism, The Public Management of Religious Diversity, Managing Religious Diversity in a Global Context - Debate Continued, Religious Diversity in the Russian Federation, Lesser used Languages and the Law in Europe, The Human Rights of Linguistic Minorities and Language Policies) were also organised.

Since the beginning in 1994, 105 seminars, conferences and workshops, as well as 12 regional meetings, have been held in the framework of MOST, on the various topics covered by its themes. The Programme publishes an *Annual MOST Report* and a *Newsletter*, in English, French and Spanish. The number of publications the MOST Programme and its projects is impressive, by academic standards.

The currently on-going MOST projects and capacity building activities include:

a) Multi-cultural and multi-ethnic societies

1. APMRN Asia Pacific Migration Research Network;
2. Ethno-Net Africa: a network for comparative studies, monitoring and evaluation of ethnic conflicts in Africa;
3. Monitoring of ethnicity, conflicts and cohesion. Central and Eastern Europe, Central Asia;
4. Best Practices on Indigenous Knowledge.

b) Urban Issues, urban development and governance

5. Cities, environment and gender relations;
6. Growing up in Cities;
7. Urban Development and Freshwater Resources in Small Coastal Cities.

c) Globalisation and Governance

8. Coping locally and regionally with economic, technological and environmental transformations: a northern circumpolar perspective (Second phase to set up a UNESCO Chair);
9. GEDIM (« Globalisation Economique et Droits du Mercosur »), being followed by UNESCO Mexico Office ;
10. Gouvernance démocratique et réduction des inégalités dans les pays arabes (in partnership in UNESCO Beirut and UNESCO Rabat) ;
11. Personal and institutional strategies for management of transformation risks in Central and Eastern Europe.

c) Research-policy linkages

12. Factors that Improve the Use of Research in Social Policy Case Studies. Joint MOST Programme / Harvard University Project;

13. Governance, Research and Policy (Working Group composed of social science and civil society representatives).

d) Capacity-building

14. City Professionals (Latin American Network);
15. Summer School Programme (MOST /ISSC Summer School 2002: Comparative Research in the Social Sciences: Conceptual Models);
16. UNESCO Chairs in Social Sciences directly or indirectly related to MOST (forty in total).

B. Impact Assessment

The impact of the MOST Programme and its various projects cannot be estimated without reference to the very environment and context in which the Programme and its projects are evolving. Furthermore, the current and past MOST projects show a great variety in terms of their content and methodology, ranging from strictly scientific projects to others whose aims are rather developmental or of a demonstration nature (experimental projects). This reflects, at least partly, the diversified interests of Member States as well as the need to follow the various offers of extrabudgetary funds to MOST.

The impact and effectiveness may also vary according to the typology of projects. Some existing projects aim at rather immediate or short-term results. Some others focus on promoting better skills, knowledge and awareness among its participants and stakeholders, in which case the benefits may appear 'hidden' over a longer period of time. Thus, the MOST activities directed at capacity building, especially in developing and newly emerging countries in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, may carry such extra 'hidden' benefits.

Most of the projects have not had any particular monitoring system of their impact or relevance measurement, other than maybe counting the numbers of the seminars and their participants, numbers of publications, etc. In some cases the opinions of the policy groups and capacity building forums have been recorded. This has been done through progress reports for some of the projects. However, a global monitoring system has not been set up at the level of the Programme, which would have helped creating a more cohesive image and picture of the impact and results of MOST.

It is true that the table on the website visits (in the annex) indicates various interests towards different projects. It is estimated that the numbers of visits also indicate the quality of the projects and/or the width of their coverage. However, the MOST Clearing House represents a rather passive form of reaching and influencing the possible stakeholders and policies, since it supposes the visit of the interested parties. The MOST mailing list (announcing the new documents and upcoming events within the MOST Clearing House) is a means to avoid this problem, but it is not enough. This communication tool can be further developed, and accompanied by measures that could be actively directed at certain policy or civil society networks. For instance, there is need for the NLCs to take a stronger role in knowledge transfer, creating thus a better impact at the national level.

New concepts about how to plan and run scientific research at large are emerging. As presented in the Annex, the policy research community moves gradually from a mode wherein the problem definition stems from academic interests, to a new mode of research production

that concentrates on research application and consultation with different interests. Knowledge production is also moving from single-discipline to multidisciplinary and a heterogeneous approach. Organisationally, the research often involves temporary collaboration on a problem, as well as production at several sites and in several institutions at the same time. In this new research production mode, results are disseminated to policy networks and society at large, instead of merely going through institutional channels. Also, funding is raised for each project from a range of public and private sources. Also important for the planning of MOST projects, the impact evaluation should move from an *ex-post* perspective (wherein results are interpreted, lessons are learned and changes are disseminated) to *ex-ante* assessment (when the evaluation is thought already at the moment of defining the agenda, the problems and setting priorities for research). Moreover, quality control is not any more a matter of peer judgement alone, but is also the interest of a number and variable interest groups in the society. Quality evaluation of the scientific production is central (and should be fostered within MOST), but it should not be considered sufficient in assessing the qualitative impact of MOST policy research networks.

Although some MOST projects follow this new kind of knowledge production, it would be advisable and useful that this *ex-ante* approach be explicitly expressed in guidelines for partnership with the Programme. This should be a priority in redefining the terms of cooperation with MOST in the future. It would certainly add to the fund-raising for projects and their potential impact on social policies.

C. Efficacy of the Programme

A questionnaire on policy impact and capacity building of MOST projects was circulated in 2000 among the project members and the MOST secretariat. The returns provide inside opinions and analyse reasons for success and failure of each project. These results are summarised in individual project assessments in the annexes.

The MOST Programme has only provided seed money for projects. Usually a great majority of the funding has come from other sources (national and international). In this sense the MOST Programme has shown good efficacy, since its projects could draw the attention of funding agencies for the development of co-funding strategies. It is not always clear, however, whether or not projects have been executed with or without the MOST label and financial or institutional support. There is here a need to better qualify the label of the Programme, and the funding source of each project. It seems that some projects fall more appropriately within MOST thematic development than others, but it has not been possible to understand the reasons why this is so. What are the institutional constraints that steer some projects to have a MOST label and receive the support of the Programme? Why have some projects gone through the screening of the SSC and not others?

Supporting synergy and horizontal administrative practices within the Programme and between its projects can further enhance the efficacy of the programme. Moreover, results-based management in the Secretariat can contribute to achieve this synergy.

D. Strengths and Weaknesses

(1) *The MOST Programme and its capacity to adapt to a changing global environment*

Strength: Initially, the UNESCO/MOST Programme represents an excellent innovation and during the eight years of its existence it has established a good reputation. The promise of MOST lies in its international, comparative, interdisciplinary and policy-oriented focus. It has been one of the first international programmes to provide examples of the usefulness of social science, and to set up methodologies for research-decision interaction. Thus, it has been very important for social sciences in terms of its prolific scientific production.

Threat: MOST fails to respond to the rapid global changes, and has difficulties to maintain its proper niche within a very competitive world of social science programmes. It is unable to recognise and reach out the true target groups of its various activities. It has over-ambitious goals and expectations of (immediate) results.

Weakness: With a total of 17 past and current networks and numerous other projects and activities, and with a relatively heavy administration that involves several layers and institutional interests, the Programme may be too 'loaded' and slow to respond to the changing environment and societal problems. Currently, the themes as such are sufficiently general to include almost all of the contemporary societies' problems.

(2) *The MOST Programme as a social science cooperation platform within UNESCO*

Strength: Within UNESCO, the MOST Programme represents a unique platform that has numerous international and interregional networks. Also, its proximity to and possibility for cooperation with other UNESCO's scientific programmes is a clear advantage, if used properly. Increased use of social science knowledge, through interdisciplinary research, contributes to better social policy formulations. Achieving sustainable development critically depends on addressing social problems, too.

Threat: In some cases, the Programme is too loose and uncoordinated to fully benefit from the synergy between its various activities and UNESCO's platform at large. Also, the links between the various administrative levels (e.g., between the Secretariat and the NLCs) are weak if not disconnected.

Weakness: The projects seem to have little contact and interaction among them, and this seems to be the case also with the UNESCO Chairs created for MOST projects. Moreover, despite the large number of publications produced, at least by academic standards, their policy-impact may remain diffuse or unrecognised. Quality cannot be compensated by sheer quantity.

(3) *The interdisciplinary dimension of MOST*

Strength: The MOST Programme can serve as a learning experience and a scope-widening forum for all its participants, including also partner NGOs. The drive of the MOST Programme from research to policy-making, with emphasis in interdisciplinary approaches, is its very strength and pillar, but...

Threat: ... the social sciences structures and methods are always not prone to such an approach, which may be constrained by academic or institutional 'rules' that do not necessarily

encourage social scientists to action-oriented and interdisciplinary research. Social scientists may not be that interested in or in a position to transfer pertinent knowledge to users. However, to be fair, policy makers may also resist to accepting the views of social sciences.

Weakness: There is a language barrier between social scientists and scientists from the natural and exact fields of research, particularly when it comes to defining concepts, areas of research, research methodologies, and priorities. Furthermore, the outreach of the Programme is still too much inward looking, and only partly academic.

(4) The dialectics between universal paradigms and the respect for local contexts

Strength: An international, comparative and interdisciplinary research programme is a good way to develop points of view and methods that can apply universally, regardless of the different paradigms and local contexts. The MOST Programme has networks with a very good potential to develop in this direction. Historically, social sciences are 'mature' sciences in developed countries, and in this sense they could have a lot to offer in terms of complex decision-making theories, but...

Threat: ... there is always a contradiction between the global and the local levels. Macro-level policies and global integration may benefit (a majority of) people, but they may also have serious negative consequences at the grass-root levels. Thinking globally and acting locally, but also thinking locally and acting globally are two important issues for MOST to take notice of, also for the sake of its credibility.

Weakness: Social sciences themselves may be too much nationally and locally oriented. They very often lack a true international perspective, which can contribute to the mutual understanding and knowledge of different cultures. They may not always claim to be universal, and paradigmatic gaps between South and North as well as between West and East still exist. Social sciences are only now emerging as part of the science forums in a number of countries, especially in many developing countries as well as in the former Soviet Union republics.

(5) MOST and the need for a more focused and cohesive cooperation platform

Strength: There certainly exists a window of opportunity for MOST if it can further streamline its networks and learn from its methods. Coherence (i.e., strictly following the goals and objectives of MOST, and measuring them) at the level of the Programme is a need for its second phase. During its first eight years, MOST gained an international reputation and became well established. Nevertheless, it must enhance its own solid 'brand' (give a quality status to the MOST label, and avoid its spreading out) and take on a distinctive 'face' of competitive edge and visibility (make the MOST label the result of a different and particular niche in which the Programme develops its projects). The administrative structure of MOST (with NLCs, IGC, SSC and the Secretariat), though heavy, could and should also be used to its advantage. These administrative structures should support (from a scientific, institutional, financial and managerial point of view) MOST and boost its image and role, nationally and regionally, as well as interregionally and globally. Again, MOST because of its institutional environment has a natural access to many stakeholders and linkages with decision-making instances which could better benefit from its networks and research results, but...

Threat: ...the MOST Programme is facing an increasingly tough, internationally competitive environment for scientists, funding, research development, etc. It seems that

MOST cannot compete internationally on its funding capacity. Unless it finds its solid niche and role, it may encounter a danger of becoming obsolete or second rate.

Weakness: UNESCO's internal and external stakeholders need to accept that the MOST cannot engage in all thematic priorities of the UN system. There is a need for MOST to retrieve its founding objectives, streamline its expected results and develop a cohesive vision in terms of its main research and policy questions to be addressed in the coming eight years.

(6) MOST and capacity building in developing countries and countries in transition

Strength: New technologies offer new means of reaching people and organisations. This allows for a rather 'continuous' process of capacity building if the technologies are used in an innovative and creative way. For example, taking part in a virtual university project could open new windows for MOST to develop its capacity-building objectives. One of the real strengths of MOST is its role in the capacity building, where it is in an almost unique position within the social sciences international programmes. This long-term task is especially crucial for developing countries and countries in transition, but MOST can certainly contribute to this aspect in every region of the world.

Threat: Capacity-building projects are currently very diverse within MOST. Also in this domain there is a need to revisit the objectives of the Programme and set up a clear strategy for its second phase. Project profiles differ according to regions and countries, and methods for defining the capacity-building needs should be developed.

Weakness: The capacity-building sector is often seen as being a separate task from the research projects, while it should and could be an integral part of all MOST activities. One should not forget that Education is the major task of UNESCO. Also, MOST projects, when successful, could be planned and executed in such a way that they become autonomous and functional after their conclusion (the sustainability factor of projects). So far, this autonomous functioning of networks is often and exclusively a by-default outcome.

VI. THE GOVERNANCE OF THE PROGRAMME

A. The Intergovernmental Council (IGC)

The Intergovernmental Council (IGC) is composed of 35 Member States. The statutes give to this body the task of guiding and supervising the planning and implementation of the MOST Programme. In particular, it considers proposals on the development and adaptation of the MOST Programme, and define the broad substantive areas of MOST and recommend the broad lines of action that the programme should take. About its structure, the statutes indicate that it would be desirable if the persons appointed by Member States as their representatives were competent in the fields covered by the Programme. The Council meets every two years.

Furthermore, IGC should, as a mediator of policy concepts, be promoting participation of Member States in the MOST Programme, and seeking the necessary resources for the implementation of MOST. Also, it should facilitate the strategy of MOST Programme activities at the national level and also communication between them nationally, regionally and interregionally. In this respect, its role is partly overlapping with what is expected from the NLCs, though overlap in this case could only mean a stronger joint effort at the national level.

In order to avoid an exclusively diplomatic setting, the member states should consider sending social scientists and science policy experts to the sessions of the IGC.

Serious thought should be given to fostering the role of the IGC in channelling the messages and opinions of the countries collaborating or interested in cooperating with the MOST Programme. Closer ties between the NLCs and the Secretariat and between NLCs and projects could also contribute to making the national priorities known in a more informal setting. Also, direct and regular feedback from the UNESCO National Commissions could also contribute to this task.

B. The Scientific Steering Committee (SSC)

The Committee consists of nine regular members, appointed by the Director-General in their personal capacity for a period of three years, and the President of the IGC is *ex officio* member of the SSC. The members are thus explicitly independent intellectuals and scholars.

The main task of SSC is the maintenance of high scientific standards of the MOST Programme, by assessing the scientific quality of projects submitted, and accepting only those proposals that conform to the thematic and methodological orientation of the Programme, thus meeting the required scientific standards. The SSC reports by its Chairperson to the IGC and the Director-General of UNESCO after each of the Committee's sessions.

Since the Mid-Term Evaluation of MOST in 1999, the SSC has not dealt with any direct budget matters for the projects. The SCC has the role for revising projects in terms of their scientific content (the subject, the policy relevance, the methods, the research team and its interdisciplinary). This scientific label should be a warrant for the Secretariat to seek for extrabudgetary contributions. However, this label has not always been enough for fund-raising.

Because SSC is the MOST body to deal directly with the research proposals, it could further strengthen MOST with some initiatives of its own members, such as:

1. To ensure the scientific quality control through regular reviews of MOST projects;
2. To conduct regular research surveys to revisit thematic development and priority setting within MOST;
3. To undertake meta-analysis in main social science fields, and identify major problems for future research (setting up an agenda for UNESCO and the UN);
4. To stimulate discussions on research needs, taking into account the different regions and local needs;
5. To develop suitable conceptual and operational frameworks and doing analysis on the "clustering concepts" for the Programme to work on (such as sustainability, governance, and social cohesion);
6. To help the Secretariat in identifying researcher/expert networks.

Some of these activities have been or are already being executed, mainly within the MOST policy paper series. However, here again, it would be very useful if these tasks were regularly planned and defined as a policy for the Programme (with a particular budget). These are cost-effective functions that may produce good results and increase the visibility of the Programme. The SSC should also plan and develop and implement the monitoring and

evaluation schemes of the major projects, in cooperation with the MOST Secretariat and, where appropriate, with the NLCs.

C. The National Liaison Committees (NLCs)

As for the NLCs, the countries are free to set up their structure, functioning, and funding as they wish. They follow the models of the MAB committees or other UNESCO scientific programmes. There are now 67 NLCs, though their level of activity varies, depending on the available funding and the enthusiasm of their members. Some countries handle the MOST issues directly through their national Commissions for UNESCO.

The National Liaison Committees (NLCs), in co-operation with the MOST Secretariat, aim at:

(a) Participating in the MOST Programme's activities on knowledge use by and knowledge transfer to national and local decision-makers. This function of the NLCs will contribute to an increased impact of MOST projects at the national level.

(b) Initiating MOST related activities at the national and regional levels, in co-operation with the Programme's Secretariat.

(c) Disseminating the MOST Newsletter to relevant government bodies, and promoting the programme through use of its flyer, newsletter, and publications. This function of NLCs will contribute to a strengthened national support for MOST activities.

(d) Feeding the MOST Secretariat with research priority areas as defined by the national social science research council or equivalent funding body, within MOST themes. This will contribute to an increased awareness of MOST within national scientific and policy-making community.

(e) Participate in the MOST research-policy activities on knowledge use.

In general, the NLCs are expected to play a central role in linking national research communities, research funding agencies, and policy-concerns to network in the orbit of the MOST Programme. This function should be streamlined. Also because a new forceful player in research funding is the European Union: some of its Framework programmes aim at cooperation and networking between Europe and developing countries, in the context of the forthcoming European Research Area concept. The MOST secretariat should design a more forceful strategy in order to make this NLC function more effective. The possibility of fortifying this area through the good offices of the IGC member states and their delegations should also be considered (156 EX/12, Para 5.3.15).

The NLCs in different countries show very different levels of development, many of them being almost dormant, few working actively and successfully with the resources available. The main current problems of the NLCs are how to reach the scientific community, and especially the younger researchers, and how to secure supportive links with funding agencies and even how to reach out to the society and the national policy-making bodies. To count upon a variety of active scholars and policy makers who would have different skills and experience could really advance the goals of MOST within NLCs and constitute a partial solution to the problem

of inactivity of NLCs. Moreover, Member States should ensure sufficient rotation of the NLC membership and leadership.

In some cases it has been reminded by Member States that NLCs need to have a picture of the funding structure of MOST and its projects. This would certainly steer the participation of Member States in fund-raising and scientific networking. If since its beginning a project can count on seed money only, it may take time and energy to find and secure additional funding to its development. This has been the case for many MOST projects, and the Secretariat had a difficult time in trying to obtain extrabudgetary funds for projects. Donors must be involved since the beginning. Therefore, the planning of projects requires also a certain time wise funding strategy, which emphasises once more the importance of active links between the NLCs and the Secretariat.

D. The Secretariat

The Secretariat of MOST is responsible for coordination, communication and dissemination of the research findings, especially through the MOST Website. The Secretariat also provides the necessary services for the sessions of the IGC and the SSC. The members of the Secretariat seem to be actively involved in their respective projects, and they constitute a good linkage between MOST and projects in different countries or continents.

However, there is a need to recuperate the internal coherence and streamline the functions of the Secretariat: the responsibilities of the Secretariat vary according to the profile of each Secretariat member. The members' backgrounds also vary: some of them have a more scientific profile (Ph.D. holders), while others are more "administrative" (project manager profile). This division of profiles may not add to the necessary cohesion of the work of MOST Secretariat. An emphasis on a stronger scientific background supported by an outward looking policy evaluation experience would certainly be an advantage for MOST. There is also a clear need to have integrate professionals with background in disciplines such as economics and anthropology.

An active teamwork with a strong participatory management of the entire MOST Programme is also a need. Participation, less vertical and cooperative schemes of work are essential for MOST to develop in a coherent way. Moreover, there is also a need to foster a 'results-based management' of projects, strengthening the overall MOST structure and its internal synergy with other UNESCO divisions and programmes.

E. The Budget

According to the approved UNESCO 30 C/5 for 2000-2001, the Programme funds were US\$2,984.800.

For 2002-2003, (document 31 C/5), the budget for the MOST activities are US\$2,300.000.

In general terms, the MOST projects directly paid by UNESCO consume about one half of the operational budget. The rest covers funding of meetings, statutory development of the Programme (SSC and IGC), publications, Clearing House/Website, general support contracts, among others. However, it seems that the approved budget does not always correspond to the

de facto available budget figures for the implementation of the Programme. This is a major problem, since it prevents a regular planning of activities.

Extrabudgetary funds stand for a) funds that cooperation agencies (mainly bilateral) send to UNESCO for a particular project (and UNESCO manages these funds); b) funds that are given to a project by any donor without necessarily having UNESCO as manager of funds. In the former case UNESCO gets paid for the management of funds, while in the latter case, the project benefits from the financial aid directly.

The UNESCO/MOST is not a funding programme, but provides the seed money and the good services of its administrative bodies for the stated goals of the Programme. In the early phases of MOST, it was expected that the extrabudgetary portion or additional funds would be relatively higher, or that even all of MOST could be based on such funding. However, this could not be accomplished.

Apart from this, the Division of Social Science, Research and Policy (where MOST is located) seems to have less priority in the new institutional framework of SHS in 2002 - 2003. This can be a strategic issue for the Programme. The adequate funding and supporting structures of UNESCO, the goodwill and appreciation of its sectors, are imperative to the Programme to further develop its quality strategy in its second phase.

VII. OVERALL IMPACT

A. Interdisciplinary, Comparative and Policy-Relevant International Research

The analyses of the MOST projects indicate that the real strength of MOST is its interdisciplinary, comparative, policy-relevant and international research. As reminded by individual social scientists working in the MOST projects, these four elements have significantly contributed to widening the scope of social sciences research. It is very important the Programme maintain them as part and parcel of the project development methodology.

B. International, Regional, National and Local Policy

The analyses of projects show that it is possible to have a clear policy impact at the local or provincial level, sometimes also at the regional level (that has been the case, *inter alia*, of APMRN, City Professionals, Growing up in Cities, CCPP project), but more seldom at the national and the international level. However, the research and approaches developed within MOST projects influence raising the awareness to the importance of social issues at every policy level. The impact assessment of this awareness raising is very difficult since it is highly qualitative and long-term. Experience shows, nevertheless, that policy-makers are also deeply interested in international comparisons and comparative perspectives on issues that they deem acute and important for social development.

A possible value-added piece of work in this connection could be the compilation of active lists of international experts/scientists with known skills and experience to be used internationally as advisors in policy making and monitoring the impact of MOST projects. This database could also be made widely available through the MOST Website.

C. Capacity Building (particularly in LDCs)

This evaluation has clearly indicated that capacity building in selected countries and regions, through needs assessment, should be one of the key transversal dimensions of the Programme for the future. Capacity building may not follow strictly the themes of MOST, but should show proper flexibility especially towards the LDCs. Africa should attract more attention in the Programme. There is a particular need for increased intellectual and institutional capacity building in the field of social sciences in this continent. If it is not always possible to directly support institutional capacity building, agreements, for instance, with the European projects could and should offer possibilities for students from developing countries to participate in the research and to obtain academic degrees. Actually, current trends within research funding agencies show that many countries require that every research they finance has also a sizable and measurable training and educational component.

One issue to be taken care of is the needs assessment in capacity-building projects: where and by whose initiative are the projects created? Projects may stem from top-down or some outside funding sources, and the grass root level may not always feel very comfortable with the criteria for choosing subjects and methods. These criteria need to reflect the real problems as perceived at the local and regional level. The NGOs can be used as very good source of information about the local problématiques, and they may be willing and capable of disseminating and transmitting new knowledge into the communities; however, they seldom fully participate in the MOST research projects. The role and value of the indigenous systems of knowledge need to be taken into consideration in the development of MOST projects; they need, however, to be linked more closely and transversally to the main themes and projects of the MOST Programme.

D. How to Measure the (Local) Impact of the Projects?

In higher education at large and in social science research in particular, impact evaluation is being practised at least in the developed countries; a new methodology is being developed. One difficulty to assess the impact of MOST is its international, policy-relevant, comparative and interdisciplinary approach, whose influence may (or may not) spread widely out to many spheres in the society (as it often should). Brussels, for instance, is interested in the regional impact of social science research and teaching institutions, and MOST could certainly draw from new evaluation methods that are currently being developed for this purpose.

The policy impact can be best achieved, as already described, in a situation where both the scientists and policy-makers work together or have frequent communication links. That is, the relationship is rather developed within a "net", and not in a linear way. This "net" resembles a learning organisation that is also rather diffuse in character. There are also numerous survey-type methods of such an assessment, using visits to the web pages, numbers of local articles published on newspapers, opinion surveys, etc. Formal or informal meetings and seminars between scientists and decision-makers (and other stakeholders) can also prepare both sides to evaluate the impacts and receive feedback for future actions.

Already in their planning phase, MOST projects should follow this kind of approach: the *ex-ante* research planning and execution. Of course, this means that the MOST Secretariat should also have the project registry up-dated and functioning properly. This is fundamental for project management and monitoring.

VIII. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

A. Review the Mandate and Refocus

The Document 31 5/C, under Programme III.3, indicates the results expected from MOST at the end of the biennium as follows: "Improved policy making on social issues such as international migration and multiculturalism, urban development and governance through the provision of scientific analysis, empirical evidence and policy recommendations to policy-makers and other stakeholders". The first part of this statement may be a bit too ambitious, and should not be the only and full measure of the success of MOST projects and activities. The latter part, "through the provision of scientific analysis (...)" sets a more realistic goal, also when evaluating and monitoring the projects. The impact of good research in policy making and in society in general may be considered in a broader sense, having many more targets than just the formulation of a social public policy in its narrow sense. MOST should be considered as an instrument within UNESCO to add and contribute to the policy-making, not as a body for the actual formulation of policies.

The real strength of the MOST Programme lies in its international, interdisciplinary, and comparative approach, through networks of scholars, and in some cases, NGOs and policy makers. MOST can show, particularly in developing countries, its comparative advantage as an international platform for innovative scientific cooperation. Its strength is rooted both in the possibility for opening national-based social sciences to international cooperation, and in the intellectual authority ensured by UNESCO.

This analysis has clearly revealed that there is a need to consolidate the MOST Programme, to cover fewer projects, but with the quality concern first and foremost. Thematically, MOST could also focus on building cluster concepts that should be well developed and have a clear strategy for each of the themes. Research surveys (through, for instance, literature review) should also be a focus for the MOST Programme in the future: for instance, MOST should promote the systematisation of research, building clustering concepts, and the review of methodologies and participatory research. But all these activities should be based on scientific quality that makes them open for the international social science society and NGOs.

B. Activities and Policy Interface

Dissemination of MOST research results needs improvement, and it is the responsibility of all MOST administrative levels from the Secretariat, the National UNESCO Commissions and also the IGC. This should also be a job for the professionals in communications and journalism, and it should be reflected in the composition of NLCs.

It would be very important for the Programme to open to NGOs and CSOs in general. The work of the MOST Programme during the World Social Forum, for instance, is an example of this necessary opening to new policy forums.

Another important policy interface is the MOST Clearing House Website. It is a rich source of information, but, unfortunately, it is not yet fully used as a forum for dynamic and targeted

exchange. It requires more frequent updating. To an outsider it gives a rather passive or academic view. Although the MOST 'virtual library' presented in the CH is very rich and complex, it is not very policy-oriented, as required by the MOST mandate. Thus, its restructuring towards more immediate policy approach would be helpful; this could include short pieces of news or abstracts of the results obtained, cross-linkages not only to other projects but also to international e-libraries that provide related information. MOST discussion and policy papers, though many of them are very good by their content and methods, may have little accessibility and impact outside UNESCO. The best of them should be catalogued internationally, if not even published in international science journals. If possible, the projects should also build their databases, and where feasible, make them available through Internet.

Some scientists are gifted with ability to write interesting and attractive articles for the public; news in some of the world's major newspapers or magazines would certainly make an impact. MOST should make an effort to have its conferences and seminars published on local journals: there are very few examples of this practice so far, but they should be encouraged.

Furthermore, one may ask if MOST publications are available in libraries, documentation centres, and policy think-tank bodies. The *International Social Science Journal* is an excellent platform, but should not be the only one. The programme lacks a clear dissemination strategy of its output. Every project could produce abstracts or 'pieces of news' for both the experts and the public in a concise form.

The MOST Secretariat should also assess the educational outreach of the Programme's output: what and how has its production influenced education (mainly higher education) policies and practices? How has the concept of interdisciplinary and comparative research had any influence in University practices?

C. Monitoring

The entire Higher Education sector is undergoing a transformation in Member States by introduction of various evaluation indicators, benchmarking, and quality assurance systems. This means that activities like research, teaching and learning, and various service functions are all being evaluated, which often forms also the basis for their financing. Activities judged to have good or sufficient quality would have always better possibility of becoming financed. An evaluated project with a quality label has a better chance of continuity, and it can also attract more additional funds.

Developing a consistent monitoring system would be an advantage for MOST to seek additional funding for its activities. Such a system should be built already when the project is being planned. An evaluation should not take, however, a disproportionate slice of the funds, but be supportive and a natural dimension of the project. A good evaluation is a good trademark for a project and the entire Programme.

Its is essential for any project monitoring that the MOST Secretariat also maintain an adequate registry of the projects and update it regularly. This system should be structured to allow the study of the long-term trends, impacts, funding, network partners and other necessary links. It should have nearly real-time information about the projects and other MOST activities.

D. Refocusing of MOST

The future of MOST depends on its ability to maintain its niche as one of the five UNESCO scientific programmes. As suggested earlier, there is a need for refocusing of MOST, particularly as far as its research component is concerned. Investing in less but better research networks is a *sine qua non* for its good credibility in the future. In the global field of research programmes, MOST is facing new competitors, which are interested in quality partnerships and would see in a UNESCO's social science programme an interesting partner to reach out governmental and non-governmental constituencies, as well as the general public opinion.

MOST can strengthen its role through the capacity building dimension of its networks, which do not need to be based on the particular themes. Certain regions in the world are very short of even the basic capacity in terms of social science knowledge and methods for innovative knowledge production. Also, every project, despite its thematic orientation, could be used as a vehicle for capacity building. There is need in universities of developing countries to obtain support and assistance in their curriculum development. For instance, the international expert pool could be used for many purposes, including for assistance to public organisations, educational institutions and universities, in the developing countries and countries in transition.

E. Profile of Projects (Typology)

The MOST projects show a wide variety in terms of their profile. There are some 16 on-going projects of different types (listed on page 8), and most of them meet the general relevance and quality criteria set for MOST. Some of them are very action-oriented (6 and 7), with little if any research involved; they may give a confusing signal in relation to the stated mandate of MOST. Some other projects have been built around a strong social science network, which was natural, for instance, in Eastern Europe and other emerging countries in the 1990s (1, 3, 5, 8, 9 and 12). One is focused on African countries in particular (2). Some of the networks were in place before the MOST phase (9), and it may give them some more continuity, while some were created for the purpose of becoming a MOST project (10).

Interdisciplinary approach is strongly present in several projects (1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9), although to some extent it is practised in all of them. The research component is strong especially in projects number 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 10 and 12. The project on research-policy linkages number 13 set up a conceptual and contextual analysis, the results of which can also be used by other MOST projects. Almost all of the projects have also received additional funding.

In the second phase of the MOST Programme, the project typology could be narrower. This would help streamlining the vision and the image of MOST with universities and research institutes, as well as funding agencies.

The Evaluation Team sees at least two types of project profiles as possibilities for the future of MOST: one category within a call for projects (with a specific budget), and a second category in which the SSC, the MOST Secretariat, research and policy communities act together and initiate them (UNESCO/MOST used within a co-funding strategy). Quality should prime over quantity: for instance, MOST should have less networks (but secure their funding and result dissemination); it should refocus its activities related to capacity building (Summer Schools, grants for young researchers). In both categories of project profile, there is a need to use more systematically the IGC as a mediator of policy concepts (with a view to convey the

message and the agenda of social transformations). In order to avoid an exclusive diplomatic setting, a clear message should be sent to member states to send social scientists and science policy experts to the sessions of the IGC.

F. Partnerships

The MOST Programme should continue and strengthen its partnership internally with UNESCO's sectors and field offices, particularly with the other scientific programmes. MOST could add substantially to the success of the Science programmes by helping building bridges between natural scientists and society in general. Such a co-operation is already ongoing in several cases. Partnership with the Education Sector should also be reinforced.

Externally, MOST should continue working with other UN agencies, development banks, the OECD, the UN University and the WIDER Institute, various foundations, as well as NGOs. The European Union's European Research Area offers many possibilities in the future, not only within Europe, but also through the new links that are developing in developing countries. Development Aid organisations in several countries can also offer channels especially for capacity building in developing countries. Thus, MOST could and should aim at arranging regular meetings with donors whereby it could present its own views and the possibilities it can offer in terms of project development.

IX. THE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **The second phase of MOST:** the continuation of MOST is already foreseen in the 31/C-4. According to the Evaluation Team, the continuation and implementation of the second phase of the MOST Programme is reiterated and highly recommended. The Programme has already established itself as a central partner amongst UNESCO's scientific programmes. However, some strategic measures should be taken in order to keep MOST competitive and effective in the future.
2. **MOST as an international, comparative and policy-relevant research programme:** the research dimension of the Programme needs strengthening. The current themes are still valid for understanding the main current world's affairs. However, the Programme needs to develop clustering concepts (such as social cohesion, sustainability and governance) and analyse their linkages with its three themes. The main questions and sub-questions that MOST wants to focus on under each theme must be clearly stated, from the epistemological, methodological and strategic viewpoints. It is suggested that indigenous knowledge be taken into account as a transversal dimension in all MOST projects.
3. **MOST research as an analytical and policy tool for UNESCO:** a major function of the Organization is the production of relevant and innovative policy proposals concerning major contemporary challenges and problems, relating to its fields of activity. Through relatively short-term projects on carefully defined issues, MOST can generate such analyses and policy proposals. It would thus powerfully contribute to UNESCO's analytical capacities and policy formulation efforts, on major contemporary issues in social and human sciences, but also in education, natural sciences, culture and communication.
4. **Capacity Building:** the capacity building actions need to be widened and their role in the entire MOST Programme must be enhanced. Even projects executed in developed countries could support students from developing countries through participation in research and training towards higher degrees. It should be mentioned that MOST has terminated the International Ph.D. Award, which is a good move, especially when the funds are being directed towards Summer Schools that address the needs of young social scientists. Though UNESCO/MOST is not a funding agency, it is advisable to provide higher level of funding to capacity building projects especially in developing countries in order to ensure their continuity.
5. **Chairs and MOST:** The entire UNESCO's Chairs programme was externally evaluated in 2000, and the recommendations seem to be valid also for the Chairs set up under MOST. The relationships between the Chairs and the existing MOST projects are weak. For instance, the Chairs could have an actual role in national policy making, and serve as resource bases for the development of virtual university programmes. It is advisable that the SSC get involved in the preparation of the Chairs under MOST.
6. **The Governance of MOST:** we recommend enhancing the Programme's management practices especially by strengthening its horizontal reach and links for better synergy; this should apply in equal terms inside and outside the Programme. Member States should be encouraged to send, as their representatives to IGC, professionals dealing with social sciences nationally. The

linkages between the administrative levels of MOST (NLCs, IGC, SSC, Secretariat) have to be reinforced.

7. **SSC Initiatives:** Because SSC is the body under MOST that deals directly with the research proposals, certain 'centralised' and forward looking actions can add to the strength of the Programme. Some of them have been identified in this report.
8. **The Secretariat:** the vertical relations between the Secretariat and the projects have been active, but the horizontal network and linkages within the MOST Programme and also with the rest of UNESCO and to the outside, need to be strengthened. Stronger scientific background would certainly be an advantage for the members of the Secretariat.
9. **Publication and Dissemination Strategy:** the Programme needs a clear publication and dissemination strategy of its output, and an assessment of its educational outreach. Dissemination of MOST research results needs improvement, and it is the responsibility of all MOST administrative levels including the Secretariat, the National UNESCO Commissions, the NLCs and the IGC. These actions can take a number of different forms. This should also involve communication professionals. An important policy interface, the MOST Clearing House Website needs to be put into more active use and restructured in terms of possible targeted publics.
10. **Visibility:** for the sake of both funding and policy impact, the Programme needs to take actions to increase its visibility both at the national and international levels. Annual Keynote Addresses by a prominent person could be a step in this direction. This has been used by MOST already, but it should be now implemented on a regular basis. Enhancing visibility requires coordinated effort at all administrative levels, including the NLCs and the Secretariat.
11. **Project Monitoring System:** the Programme and its projects should be monitored and evaluated for better management and for measuring their impact on the policies and the society at large. This would also add to their value towards securing proper funding.
12. **National Impact Assessment:** there is need for the NLCs to take a stronger role in knowledge transfer and impact assessment at the national level. The NLCs should be more active, with the help of the Secretariat, in their effort in both creating an interest in the MOST activities and funding possibilities. The composition of the NLCs should include persons with ties with the national and international funding agencies, those who are professional in disseminating research results to the public and those involved in planning and policy-making. Regionally, several 'like-minded' NLCs (regional networks of NLCs) could pull their efforts together towards building a functional platform for MOST at their level of action.
13. **The Budget:** The structure of the MOST budget is in apparent need of strategic planning to devote a higher percentage to projects. The use of the MOST budget should be strategically planned by the Secretariat with the guidance of the SSC and the IGC. There is a need for UNESCO's internal structures and monitoring systems to clarify the discrepancies between approved budget and the actual available funds for the Programme's development.

14. **Research Funding Strategy:** the research-funding arena is changing. The European Union's Research Framework programme, with the introduction of the European Research Area, for instance, can be considered as a potential partner but, if MOST does not take a strategic move, it can also be a potential competitor for the Programme. The MOST Secretariat should design a strategy to refocus the Programme and redesign the modalities of project development for its second phase.
15. **Regular Evaluation:** for the viability of the MOST Programme, regular and on-going evaluations of at least some key projects are fundamental. The establishment of a rigorous monitoring system has been an advantage; this system should be reinforced and built already at the level of projects. It is essential that, in any project monitoring and evaluation system, the Secretariat maintain an adequate registry of the projects and updates it regularly.

Summary Table of Recommendations

| Secretariat | SSC | IGC | General |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Rec. 1 | | | Rec. 1 |
| Rec. 2 | | | Rec. 2 |
| | | | Rec. 3 |
| Rec. 4 | | | |
| Rec. 5 | Rec. 5 | | |
| | Rec. 7 | | Rec. 6 |
| Rec. 8 | | | |
| Rec. 9 | | | |
| | Rec. 10 | Rec. 10 | |
| Rec. 11 | | Rec. 12 | |
| Rec. 13 | | Rec. 14 | |
| Rec. 14 | | | Rec. 15 |

ANNEX I

TABLE: NUMBER OF VISITS TO EACH MOST PROJECT WEBPAGE

NUMBER OF VISITS TO EACH MOST PROJECT WEBPAGE

| | PROJECT | NUMBER OF VISITS | TOTAL |
|--|--|--|--------------|
| Theme: Multicultural and multi-ethnic societies | | | |
| 1. | Best Practices on Indigenous Knowledge | 5813 | 5813 |
| 2. | APMRN Asia Pacific Migration Research Network | 4349 | 4349 |
| 3. | Ethno-Net Africa : a network for comparative studies, monitoring and evaluation of ethnic conflicts in Africa | 3234 | 3234 |
| 4. | Monitoring of ethnicity, conflicts and cohesion Central and Eastern Europe, Central Asia | 1902 | 1902 |
| 5. | Democratic gouvernance in a multicultural and multi-ethnic societies | 1546 | 1546 |
| Theme: Urban issues | | | |
| 6. | Growing up in Cities | 2936 | 2936 |
| 7. | City Words | 1635 (English) 1256 (French) | 2891 |
| 8. | Urban Development and Freshwater Resources in Small Coastal Cities | 1893 | 1893 |
| 9. | Cities, environment and gender relations | 1828 | 1828 |
| 10. | MOST-MAB Project - Cities: management of social and environmental transformations | 1756 | 1756 |
| 11. | Socially Sustainable Cities | 1548 | 1548 |
| Theme: Globalisation and Gouvernance | | | |
| 12. | Coping locally and regionally with economic, technological and environmental transformations: a northern circumpolar perspective | 2110 | 2110 |
| 13. | GEDIM - Globalisation Economique et Droits du Mercosur (being followed by UNESCO Mexico Office) | Statistics from September 2001 to May 2002: 734 (French), 483 (Portuguese), 303 (English), 499 (Spanish) | 2019 |
| 14. | MERCOSUR: A Space for interaction, a Space for Integration | 1628 | 1628 |
| 15. | Personal and institutional strategies for management of transformation risks in Central and Eastern Europe | 1232 | 1232 |
| 16. | Gouvernance democratique et reduction des inegalites dans les pays arabes (in partnership in UNESCO BEIRUT AND UNESCO RABAT) | Statistics from December 2001 to May 2002: 526 | 526 |
| 17. | Economic and Social Transformations connected with the International Drug | From October 2001 to May | 368 |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|------|
| | Problem | 2002: 368 | |
| 18 | Globalisation, structural adjustment and transformations in rural societies in Arab Mediterranean countries | 2019 (English) 228 (Arab) | 247 |
| Theme: Research-Policy linkages | | | |
| 19 | Factors that Improve the Use of Research in Social Policy Case Studies: Statistics from June to December 2002 | 340 (English), 263 (French) | 603 |
| Capacity-building | | | |
| 20 | City Professionals | 813 (English), 949 (French), 1578 (Spanish) | 3340 |
| 21 | MOST/ISSC Summer School 2002: Comparative Research in the Social Sciences: Conceptual Models | 1226 | 1226 |
| 22 | UNESCO Chairs in Social Sciences and MOST | There is no statistics available for this web page. | - |

Please, remember that:

1. Visits to UNESCO/MOST web pages vary considerably according to many factors.
2. These statistics refer to the period of January to December 2001, unless stated otherwise.
3. Visits to the web pages made from within UNESCO are not counted.

ANNEX II

TABLE: WEBSITE VISITS

WEBSITE VISITS

Visits to UNESCO/MOST web pages vary considerably according to many factors, such as the diffusion that a project may have had, its good implementation, its development, its status and success. These statistics only shows the absolute number of visits to the web pages and refer to the period of January to December 2001.

Visits to the web pages made from within UNESCO are not counted.

The most visited MOST web pages are listed below.

1) Visits to MOST Clearing House homepages (www.unesco.org/most/)

- MOST Clearing House (welcome.htm)²: 17264
- Urban Issues (most2.htm): 7663
- Globalisation and Governance (most3.htm): 7455
- Multiculturalism (most1.htm): 6806
- Calendar of events (agenda.htm): 6315
- Meetings (meetings.htm): 6086
- Poverty issues (povhome.htm): 5848
- Projects (projects.htm): 5811
- About MOST (flyer.htm): 4393
- Newsletter homepage (newslet.htm): 3256
- MOST Forum (mostfora.htm): 1720

2) Visits to MOST Projects pages

- Migration and Population Research: The Asia Pacific Migration Research Network (APMRN) (apmrn.htm): 4349
- Ethno-Net Africa (p95.htm): 3234
- Growing up in cities (growing.htm): 2936
- CCPP (p91.htm): 2110
- Cities environment & gender relations (p66.htm): 1828

3) Visits to MOST Publications pages

- MOST Publications on Intermediate Cities and World Urbanisation (ciudades.pdf): 11093
- Electronic Journal on Multicultural Societies (jmsHOME.htm): 8414
- Article "Multiculturalism: a policy response to diversity" (sydpaper.htm): 7119

² In order to access each web page mentioned below you may type: www.unesco.org/most/_____ (the name you find in-between brackets)

- Article "Building Bridges - Towards effective means of linking scientific research and public policy: Migrants in European cities" (scspbuilding.pdf): 6376
- Entry to MOST publications index (document.htm): 5487
- MOST Discussion and Policy Paper Series homepage (discuss.htm): 4952
- Entry full overview of MOST publications (mostpubl.htm): 3989
- World Social Science Report (wssr.htm): 3826
- UN Conference on Human Settlements (humaniser.pdf): 3531

Policy Papers

- "From social exclusion to social cohesion: a policy agenda". Bessis, Sophie, 1995. Policy Paper n°2 (besseng.htm): 5073
- "Multiculturalism: New policy responses to diversity". Inglis, Christine, 1996. Policy Paper n°4 (pp.4.htm): 4904
- "Sustainability: a cross-disciplinary concept for social transformations". Becker, Egon; Jahn, Thomas; Stiess, Immanuel, 1997. Policy Paper n°6 (pp6.htm): 3235

Discussion Papers

- "Urban research in Latin America. Towards a research agenda". Valladares, Licia; Prates Coelho, Magda; 1995. Discussion Paper n°4 - English version (valleng.htm): 5866; Spanish version (vallspa.htm): 7308
- "Drug trafficking in Mexico: a first general assessment". Astorga, Luis. Discussion Paper n°36 (astorga.htm): 7697
- "The Information Technology Enabled Organization: a major social transformation". Gullede, Thomas R.; Haszko, Ruth A., 1998. Discussion Paper n°14 (guilled.htm): 7509
- "Violence related to illegal drugs, easy money and justice in Brazil: 1980-1995". Zaluar, Alba. 1999. Discussion Paper n°35 (zaluar/htm): 5593
- "Reflections on the challenges confronting post-apartheid South Africa". Makhosezwe, Bernard, 1995. Discussion Paper n°7 (magu.htm): 3942
- "Chile y Mercosur: ¿Hasta donde queremos integrarnos?". Stefoni E., Carolina; Fuentes S., Claudio, 1998. Discussion Paper n°25 (fuentes.htm): 3234
- "The Participatory City. Innovations in the European Union". Mega, Voula, 1998. Discussion Paper n°32 (vmega.htm): 3232
- "Lo Global, lo local, lo hibrido. Aproximaciones a una discusión que comienza". Sonntag, Heinz R.; Arenas, Nelly, 1995. Discussion Paper n°6 (sonntspa.htm): 3122

4) Visits to MOST Databases pages

Best Practices

- Homepage (bphome.htm): 7072
- Best Practices on Indigenous Knowledge (bpindi.htm): 5813
- Database of Indigenous Knowledge (bpikreg.htm): 6209

- Indigenous Knowledge Publication (bpikpub.htm): 2739
- Best Practices on Human Settlements (bphouse.htm): 3083
 - Partnerships for Poverty Alleviation in Cebu City, Philippines - Best Practices database - Human settlements (keyword: poverty eradication) (asia11.htm): 5925

Religious Rights

- Homepage (rr1.htm): 8221

Linguistics Rights

- Homepage (ln1.htm): 3902

5) Visits to Capacity Building Programs pages

- PhD Award 2000-2001 Homepage:
 - English version (phdeng.htm): 3091;
 - French version (phdfre.htm): 1304;
 - Spanish version (phdspa.htm): 1268;
 - PhD 1998-1999 (phd99.htm): 634
- Summer School 2000 Homepage (sumschool2002.htm): 1226

6) Visits' geographical tracking³

Continents data sought - number of visits - percentage

| | | |
|-----------------|-------|--------|
| Unknown | 13439 | 56.31% |
| Europe | 4378 | 18.34% |
| North-America | 3777 | 15.82% |
| Asia | 834 | 3.49% |
| South America | 670 | 2.80% |
| Australia | 540 | 2.26% |
| Africa | 183 | 0.76% |
| Central America | 45 | 0.18% |

Countries data sought - number of visits - percentage

| | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|
| Unknown | 9197 | 38.53% |
| Non-Profit Organ. | 2101 | 8.80% |
| Network | 2097 | 8.78% |
| US Commercial | 1915 | 8.02% |
| France | 1195 | 5.00% |
| US Educational | 842 | 3.52% |
| Canada | 601 | 2.51% |
| United Kingdom | 530 | 2.22% |
| Australia | 421 | 1.76% |
| Germany | 394 | 1.65% |
| Mexico | 297 | 1.24% |
| Netherlands | 290 | 1.21% |
| Belgium | 269 | 1.12% |

³ These statistics refer to the period of 9 March 2000 to 3 June 2002.

| | | |
|-------------|-----|-------|
| Spain | 263 | 1.10% |
| Japan | 250 | 1.04% |
| Argentina | 218 | 0.91% |
| Italy | 217 | 0.90% |
| Brazil | 211 | 0.88% |
| Portugal | 125 | 0.52% |
| Switzerland | 124 | 0.51% |

...

Ressources:

1. Statistics provided by UNESCO/DIT (Office of Documentation, Informatics and Telecommunications):
Consultation externe des pages du Web - Répartition par URLs [most] 2001 (<http://titan.unesco.org/stats/REPORTS/most>).
2. Statistics provided by an external supplier
Extreme Tracking (<http://extremetracking.com/open?login=worst1>)

ANNEX III

TABLE: PROJECT MANAGEMENT, 1994-2002

PROJECT MANAGEMENT, 1994-2002

| | MOST Project | Project Leader(s) | Project start date - completion date | MOST Programme Regular Budget (\$) (meetings, research papers, publishing) | Regular Budget Expenditures (\$) (meetings, research, papers, publishing - includes committed funds) | Outputs (number): MOST Publications; Book (date of publication) | Lag for book publication (manu. completion vs publication date) |
|-----|---|--------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| 1.1 | New migrations and Growing Ethno-cultural diversity in the Asia-Pacific region (APMRN) | Robyn Iredale | 1995 - | 2002/3: 60.000 | Nothing yet | APMRN series: 9 Numerous books, see annual report overview | N.A. |
| 1.2 | Social and political aspects of international migration and growing ethnocultural diversity in the region (APMRN) | Robyn Iredale | 1995 - | 2002/3: 60.000 | Nothing yet | APMRN series: 9 Numerous books, see annual report overview | N.A. |
| 1.3 | Ethno-net Africa | Prof. Paul Nchoji Nkwi | 1996 - | 2001: 17.000 | 2001: Conference: 13.000 Website construction: 4.000 | MOST discussion Paper 61: la question Bamiléké pendant l'ouverture démocratique au Cameroun: retour d'un débat occulté, par Dieudonné Zognong, 2002 | N.A. |
| 1.4 | Democratic governance | Paul de | 1998 - 2000 | | Extra- | Website | N.A. |

| | | | | | | | |
|------|---|--|---------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|--|----------|
| | in a multi-cultural and multi-ethnic society | Guchteneire | | | budgetary sources: 2.000.000 | | |
| 1.5 | Multicultural policies and modes of citizenship in European cities (MPSC) | N. Auriat, Rinus Penning | 30.06.00 - 31.05.01 | 31.276 | | Flyer, in October 2000; Workshop report, in Nov. 2000; City Template book, in April 2001 | N.A. |
| 1.6 | Managing cultural, ethic and religious diversities on local, state and international levels in Central and Eastern Europe | Anton Peliaka | 1999 - 2000 | Around 30.000 | 30.000 | 1 working paper | 3 months |
| 1.7 | Monitoring of ethnicity, conflicts and cohesion | V. Tishkou | 1996 - 2001 | 15.000 per year | 15.000 per year | Some 20 case studies 1 book | 1 month |
| 1.8 | Migration networks in Africa, Central & Eastern Europe, Latin America & the Caribbean | See APMRN Other networks not functional | | | | | |
| 1.9 | Negotiation of Peace Pacts in Arab Countries | | | | | | |
| 1.10 | Best Practices on Indigenous Knowledge (first phase) | Paul de Guchteneire | 1998 - 1999 | 20.000 | 20.000 | 1 book 1 website | 1 month |
| 1.11 | Best Practices on Indigenous Knowledge (second phase) | Jun Morohashi | June/2001 - | 13.100 | All for publication (fee contract) | A publication will be on Internet and in hard copy in October 2002 | N.A. |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--|-----------------------|------------------------|---|---|------|
| 2.1 | City words | Jean Charles Depaule and Christian Topalov | 1995 - 2002 | 1995 - 2001: 57.000 | 1995 -1999: 465.000 | 5 issues (Cahiers) 3 Discussion Papers 3 Books Several Leaflets | N.A. |
| 2.2 | Growing up in cities (GUIC) | N. Auriat | | | | | |
| 2.3 | Socially sustainable cities: building a knowledge base for urban management in the twenty-first century | Geneviève D. Chich | | | | | |
| 2.4 | Cities, the environment and social relations between men and women | François Hainard and Christine Verschuur | 1996 - 2004 | 1996 - 2004: 65.000 | 1996 - 2004: 600.000 for | 3 Books Several leaflets | N.A. |
| 2.5 | City project (MOST-MAB) ⁴ | Geneviève D. Chich | | | | | |
| 2.6 | Urban development and Freshwater Resources in Small Coastal Cities | Coordinated by MOST P.O. B.Colin | Oct. 1997 - Dec. 2004 | For 2002/3: 88.950 | Supported by the funds of NGOs Conventions with France, Convention (partnership cities, around 100.000 for 3 years) | Proceedings of international UNESCO seminars on Balanced Urban Development in Coastal regions, 97/99/2001 (publication in 2002) Website "Small historical coastal cities" and "Maison-laboratoire" | N.A. |

⁴ MOST-MAB projects in six cities: Yeumbeul, Port au Prince, Sao Roque, Santo Domingo, Djenné, Bogotá.

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--|--------------|---------|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| 2.7 | UNU - UNESCO Workshop on Globalization and Mega-city development in Pacific Asia | Fu-chen Lo (UNU/IAS) in 96-98 | 1996 | 10.000 | 54.000 | N.A. | N.A. |
| 2.8 | Industrial Decentralisation and Urban Development in India with consideration of South-East and East Asian States | Coordinating Board ⁵ | 1995 - 1998 | 30.000 | 95.000 | 3 Discussion Papers 1 Publication Several Leaflets | N.A. |
| 3.1 | History and observation of social transformation (HOST) | Michel Schiray Christian Geffray Guilhem Fabre | 1997 2002 | 167.000 | 55.000 (meetings), 670.000 (research), 25.000 (publishing), 20.000 (papers). | 2 books, 8 discussion papers, 1 project website, 1 CD-Rom, 1 Cartographic CD-Rom, 3 Research Reports (1 from Rio de Janeiro, 1 from New Delhi, and the Final Report) | Between 1 year and 1 year and a half |
| 3.2 | Globalisation and structural adjustment and transformations in Arab Mediterranean countries | Mohammed Elloumi | 1997 2002 | 30.000 | 25.000 (meeting), 5,000 (Publishing) | 1 project website, 1 book | 2 years |
| 3.3 | MERCOSUR: A space | Elizabeth Jelin | 1996 | 47.500 | 25.000 | 7 discussion papers, 1 | Between 1 year |

⁵ Co-ordinating Board with the participating institutions: Sardar Patel Institute, Ahmedabad, Madras Institute of Development Studies, Department of Planning, University of Amsterdam, French Institute of Pondicherry. Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU), New Delhi.

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---------------------------------------|---|--------|--|---|-----------------------|
| | for interaction | | 1998 | | (Meeting), 15.000 (Publishing), 7.500 (Research) | book, 1 project website | and 1 year and a half |
| 3.4 | Institutional modernization of social policies in Latin America | Francisco Arocena | 1996 1998 | 22.500 | 20.000 (Meeting), 2.500 (publishing) | 1 research report (booklet), 1 project website | 6 months |
| 3.5 | Coping locally and regionally with economic, technological and environmental transformations (CCPP) | Niels Arsaether Jorgen Baerenholdt | Phase I: 1996 - 2001 Phase II: 2002 - 2005 | 40.000 | 25.000 (meeting), 15.000 (research) | 2 books, 2 discussion papers, 1 project website | 1 year |
| 3.6 | Personal and institutional strategies for management of transformation risks in Central and Eastern Europe | Nikolai Genov | 1997 - 2001 | 60.000 | 60.000 | Some 3 books, see Annual report overview | 2 months |
| 3.7 | Sustainability as a Concept of the Social Sciences | Christine Von Furstenberg | | | | | |
| 3.8 | GEDIM – Economic Globalisation and Human Rights | André-Jean Arnaud | 1999 2002 | 40.000 | 20.000 (research), 10.000 (networking) , 10.000 | 2 books, 1 project website | 1 year |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------|--|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| | | | | | (publishing) | | | |
| 3.9 | NGOs and Governance in the Arab Countries | Sarah Ben Nefissa | 1999 2000 | 45.000 | 30.000 (meeting), 10.000 (local surveys), 5.000 (publishing) | 1 book in three languages (Arab, French and English), 1 discussion paper, 28 research reports, 1 project website | Between 1 year and 1 year and a half | |
| 3.10 | MOST ALFA Network | Paul de Guchteneire | Project abandoned | | | | | |
| 4.1 | Factors that improve the use of research in social policy case studies | N. Auriat | May/2000 - April/2003 | 275.519 | 1 book to be published in 2002/2003 | | N.A. | |
| 4.2 | UNESCO Chairs | | | | | | | |
| | UNESCO-ITESO, México | Rosaluz Mejía (ITESO) | 1999 | 52.000 | 75.000 | 5 Discussion Papers 3 Books in preparation Several Papers | N.A. | |
| | ETVÖS University, Hungary | | | | | | | |
| | UNESCO Chairs in Social Sciences and MOST | | | | | | | |
| | UNESCO Chairs on Sustainable Development | | | | | | | |
| 4.3 | Clearing House | Paul de Guchteneire | 1994 | 30.000 | 30.000 | Extensive website, CD Rom | N.A. | |
| | Discussion Forums on | Paul de | 1994 | 30.000 | 30.000 | Extensive website, CD | N.A. | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------|------|
| | Social Transformations and on Multicultural and Multiethnic societies | Guchteneire | | | | Rom | |
| | Electronic Journal on Multi Religious | Paul de Guchteneire | 1999 - | 15.000 per year | 15.000 per year | 6 issues | None |
| | Best Practices | Paul de Guchteneire | 1996 - | 15.000 per year | 15.000 per year | 2 databases | None |
| 4.4 | MOST International PhD Award 2000-2001 | C. Milani | 1998 - 2001 | Phase-out period | - | - | - |
| | | | | | | | |

ANNEX IV

Table: UNESCO/MOST MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES - 2002 TO 1994

UNESCO/MOST MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES - 2002 TO 1994

| Type | Project title | Year | Starting date | City | Country |
|----------------------|---|------|----------------------|--------------|-----------|
| Seminar | Australian Migration and Ethnic Relations in a Period of Changing International Relations | 2002 | 9 - 10 May | Sydney | Australia |
| Seminar | Education et transformation sociale: Interrogeons nos pratiques. Croisement des savoirs et des pratiques autour de Paulo Freire | 2002 | 2 - 4 May | Recife | Brazil |
| Workshop | Enth-Net/MOST workshop on "ICTs, Training and International Scientific Cooperation" | 2002 | 18-21 March | Yaoundé | Cameroon |
| Colloquium | Défaire le développement, refaire le monde | 2002 | 28 Feb. - 3 March | Paris | France |
| Workshop | Growing Up in Cities: "Is there a place for children in the city?" | 2002 | 17 February | Amman | Jordan |
| Round- Table | Citoyenneté, identité et intégration sociale en milieux urbains: les enjeux pour les collectivités | 2002 | 06 February | Toronto | Canada |
| Round-Table | "Vivre et habiter le Paysage" remise du Prix UNESCO 2001 d'architecture du paysage | 2002 | 04 February | Paris | France |
| Workshop | Democracy and Citizenship (within the World Social Forum 2002) | 2002 | 04 February | Porto Alegre | Brazil |
| Meeting | Fonction de l'Architecte: Programme de travail de UIA/UNESCO | 2002 | 01 February | Paris | France |
| Workshop | Urban Planning (within the World Social Forum 2002) | 2002 | 01 February | Porto Alegre | Brazil |
| Work meeting | Comité de suivi de la Charte UIA/UNESCO sur la formation de l'Architecte | 2002 | 15-16 Jan. | Paris | France |
| Inter-sector Meeting | ISSC sur les conséquences socioéconomiques des désastres naturels | 2001 | December | Paris | France |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| Colloquium | Lutte contre la pauvreté urbaine: quelles politiques? Leçons d'un projet de recherche-action de l'UNESCO | 2001 | 3 December | Paris | France |
| Seminar | NGOs, Governance and Development in Latin America | 2001 | 28-30 Nov. | Montevideo | Uruguay |
| Seminar | MOST Seminar on the concept of Social Transformations and the Methodology of the Programme | 2001 | 22-23 Nov. | The Hague | Netherlands |
| Methodological Workshop | Formation des agents du développement durable. | 2001 | 18-19 Oct. | Bordeaux | France |
| Meeting | MOST Expert Meeting on the themes of the eJournal on Multicultural Societies | 2001 | 12-13 Oct. | Paris | France |
| Meeting | 3 ^{ème} Réunion du comité de validation de la charte UIA/UNESCO de la formation des architectes | 2001 | 8 Oct. | Paris | France |
| Workshop | City Professionals launching workshop | 2001 | 3-5 October | Paris | France |
| Seminar | Villes intermédiaires et urbanisation mondiale | 2001 | 20-22 Sept. | Beirut | Lebanon |
| Colloquium | Sciences sociales dans le monde arabe d'aujourd'hui | 2001 | 18-22 Sept. | Marrakech | Morocco |
| Workshop | IsoCaRP/UNESCO-MOST young planners workshop Capacity building for City Professionals | 2001 | 13-15 Sept. | Twente | Netherlands |
| Round-Table | Gouvernance et démocratie au Mexique | 2001 | 4 July | Paris | France |
| Workshop | Local Governance, Democracy and Development Policies: A Critical Analysis of the Mexican and the Pakistani Cases | 2001 | 25-27 June | Barcelona | Spain |
| Seminar | Les Sciences sociales et la Lutte contre la pauvreté | 2001 | 19-22 June | Yaoundé | Cameroun |
| Round-table | Participatory Governance: A key issue in combating poverty | 2001 | 8 June | New York | USA |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| Conference | MOST CCPP Concluding Conference 2001 | 2001 | 6-10 June | Storfjord | Norway |
| Seminar | Small historical coastal cities: Urban development - finding a balance among land, sea and people | 2001 | 28-31 May | Saïda | Lebanon |
| Conference | Ethno-Net Conference on Complex Political Emergencies in Africa | 2001 | 21-23 May | Douala | Cameroon |
| Conference | Fifth session of the Intergovernmental Council of the MOST Programme | 2001 | 14-17 March | Paris | France |
| Conference | Eight session of the Scientific Steering Committee of the MOST Programme | 2001 | 12-13 March | Paris | France |
| International Meeting | Migrations, Economic Changes and Multiculturalism in Asia Pacific countries (APMRN) | 2001 | March | Manilla | Philippines |
| Seminar | Democracy and World Governance in the 21st Century | 2001 | 29-30 January | Porto Alegre | Brazil |
| Colloquium | L'Islam dans la Cité | 2000 | 14-15 Dec. | Paris | France |
| International Conference | Social Transformation in the Asia Pacific Region | 2000 | 04-06 Dec. | Wollongong | Australia |
| Workshop | MOST CCPP workshop: Coping Strategies and Regional Policies in the North | 2000 | 15-19 Nov. | Joensuu/ Huhmari | Finland |
| International Forum | Action solidaire pour le développement social | 2000 | 14 Nov. | Paris | France |
| Meeting | Cities, the Environment and Social Relations between Man and Women: Project Assessment and Follow up | 2000 | 12-17 Nov. | Havana | Cuba |
| Seminar | Management of Social Transformation in Indonesian - in Search of Models for Conflict Prevention | 2000 | 25-27 Sept. | Bali | Indonesia |
| Conference | Open Conference on Collective Cognition and Memory Practices: Building the Infrastructures of | 2000 | 19-20 Sept. | Paris | France |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|------|------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| | Distributed Collective Practices | | | | |
| Symposium | Social Capital Formation in Poverty Reduction: Which Role for the Civil Society Organizations and the State | 2000 | June | Geneva | Switzerland |
| Conference | OECD Conf. on Social Sciences and Policy-Making | 2000 | 26-28 June | Bruges | Belgium |
| Workshop | Geography, Peace-Building and Development at the Dawn of the 21 st Century | 2000 | 26-27 June | Paris | France |
| Summer School | MOST/ISSC Summer School: International Comparative Programmes in the Social Sciences | 2000 | 20-25 June | Sofia | Bulgaria |
| Seminar | Sociétés rurales et mondialisation en Méditerranéen : Etat, société civile et stratégies des acteurs | 2000 | 08-10 May | Tunis | Tunisia |
| Seminar | Sociétés rurales et mondialisation dans les pays méditerranéens | 2000 | 04-06 May | Tunis | Tunisia |
| Conference | From social science to policy making | 2000 | 26-27 April | Santo Domingo | Dominican Republic |
| Seminar | NGOs and Governance in the Arab countries | 2000 | 29-31 March | Cairo | Egypt |
| International Conference | Social Sciences and Governance | 2000 | 20-21 March | Utrecht | Netherlands |
| Workshop | Best Practices in Poverty Reduction | 1999 | 10 Nov. | Amman | Jordan |
| Thematic Meeting | Indigenous and Local knowledge in sustainable dev. | 1999 | 08 Nov. | Paris | France |
| Round-Table | Democracy and Global Governance in the XXI Cent. | 1999 | 08 Nov. | Paris | France |
| International Conference | Economic and Social Transformations connected with the International Drug Problem | 1999 | 1-5 Nov. | New Delhi | India |
| Conference | Religion and Cultural Diversity | 1999 | 31 October | London | England |
| International Conference | Society, Nature and History | 1999 | 30 Sep. - 2 Oct. | Vienna | Austria |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|------|------------------|--------------|------------|
| International Meeting | New Trends in Asia Pacific Migration and Consequences for Japan | 1999 | 23-27 Sep. | Tokyo | Japan |
| Workshop | Challenges for Scientific and Technical cooperation in research and among universities (within Europe and the South in the 21 st Century: Challenges for Renewed Cooperation) | 1999 | 22-25 Sep. | Paris | France |
| International Seminar | Cities, the Environment and Social Relations between Men and Women | 1999 | 17-25 Sep. | São Paulo | Brazil |
| Conference | World conference on Science | 1999 | 26 June - 1 July | Budapest | Hungary |
| International Seminar | Développement urbain durable en zone côtière | 1999 | 21-24 June | Mahdia | Tunisia |
| International Conference | Au-delà du Consensus de Washington | 1999 | 16-17 June | Paris | France |
| Conference | Social Sciences in Africa: Assessment and Prospects | 1999 | 7-11 June | Libreville | Gabon |
| International Seminar | Frontiers, Nations and Identities | 1999 | 26-28 May | Buenos Aires | Argentina |
| International Conference | Transformation Risks | 1999 | 25-26 Feb. | Sofia | Bulgaria |
| Meeting | MOST Intergovernmental Council | 1999 | 22-26 Feb. | Paris | France |
| Workshop | UNESCO/MOST Sub-regional Workshop on "Globalization and the Drugs Phenomenon in Central Asia" | 1998 | 14-15 Dec. | Tashkent | Uzbekistan |
| Workshop | MOST ALFA Network | 1998 | December | La Serena | Chile |
| Colloquium | Re-thinking development: do we need a paradigm shift? | 1998 | 30 Nov. | Paris | France |
| Meeting | II Tunisia-France Meeting of PhD Candidates and Young Researchers | 1998 | 04-06 Nov. | Tunis | Tunisia |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| Meeting | Monitoring of ethnicity, conflicts and cohesion Project | 1998 | 02-06 Nov. | Huav | Croatia |
| International Conference | Poverty, from an international point of view | 1998 | 22-23 Oct. | The Hague | Netherlands |
| Conference | The Conference of Rio de Janeiro – International Drug Problem | 1998 | 19-22 Oct. | Rio de Janeiro | Brazil |
| Conference | First Virtual Conference on Anthropology and Archaeology | 1998 | October | | |
| 2 nd International Seminar | Cities, the Environment and Social Relations between Men and Women | 1998 | 19-26 Sept. | Dakar | Senegal |
| Round-Table Seminar | Roundtable Democratic Governance | 1998 | 09-11 Sept. | Kyrgyzstan | Bishkek |
| Seminar | New Initiatives for Children and Youth: building Partnerships | 1998 | 22-24 June | Paramaribo | Suriname |
| Conference | 2nd European Social Science Conference: Europe: Expectations and Reality. The Challenge for the Social Sciences | 1998 | 13-18 June | Bratislava | Slovakia |
| Conference | Images de l'immigré - Représentations, identités et "menaces" | 1998 | 05 June | Paris | France |
| Colloquium | Images de l'immigré – Représentations, identités et "menaces" | 1998 | 05 June | Paris | France |
| International Meeting | The Second International Meeting of the Asia Pacific Migration Research Network (APMRN) | 1998 | 23-25 Feb. | Hong-Kong | China |
| Meeting | Meeting of young people for a 21 st Century free of drugs | 1998 | 09-10 Feb. | Paris | France |
| Seminar | Central and Eastern Europe: Assessment and Management of Transformation Risks | 1998 | 06-07 Feb. | Sofia | Bulgaria |
| International Seminar | City Words International Seminar 1997 | 1997 | 04-06 Dec. | Paris | France |
| Seminar | Training Seminar on the use of Internet | 1997 | 03-05 Dec. | Dakar | Senegal |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|------|----------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| Conference | International Scientific Conference on Multiculturalism and Post-Communism, Tradition and Democratic Processes | 1997 | 27-30 Nov. | Dubrovnik | Croatia |
| Conference | EUMENESS-MOST Conference on Stereotypes and Alterity | 1997 | 27-29 Nov. | Valletta | Malta |
| Colloquium | "Partnerships"- A new solution to urban challenges? Social sciences perspectives on Habitat II Agenda | 1997 | 24-25 Nov. | Paris | France |
| 1 st International Seminar | Cities, the Environment and Social Relations between Men and Women project | 1997 | September | Santo Domingo | Dominican Republic |
| International Symposium | Forms and Dynamics of Exclusion in Contemporary Societies | 1997 | 23-26 June | Paris | France |
| Meeting | MOST Intergovernmental Council | 1997 | 16-20 June | Paris | France |
| Conference | International disciplinary Conference on Urban Childhood | 1997 | 09-12 June | Trondheim | Norway |
| Symposium | The Roskilde Symposium | 1997 | 03-06 April | Roskilde | Denmark |
| International Colloquium | The Situation of Drugs in Sub-Saharan Africa | 1997 | 01-04 April | Paris | France |
| Workshop | Globalisation, structural adjustment and transformations in rural societies in Arab Mediterranean Countries | 1997 | 20-22 Feb. | Tunis | Tunisia |
| International Conference | Poverty and Exclusion | 1997 | 28-30 Jan. | San José | Costa Rica |
| Symposium | Regional Integration and Social Policy Reforms | 1996 | November | Buenos Aires | Argentina |
| Workshop | Coping locally and regionally with global economic, technological and environmental transformation: a circumpolar perspective (CCPP) | 1996 | August | Tromso | Norway |
| Conference | Democracy, National Unity and Cultural Diversity | 1996 | 30 June – 02 July | Istanbul | Turkey |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|------|-------------|----------|------------|
| International Meeting | The first International Meeting of the Asia Pacific Migration Research Network (APMRN) | 1996 | 11-13 March | Bangkok | Thailand |
| Workshop | Subregional Workshop on the Problems of Poverty in Central Asian Countries | 1996 | 04-06 March | Bishkek | Kyrgyzstan |
| Symposium | Social Sciences and Governance | 1995 | 08-09 Dec. | Ankara | Istanbul |
| Meeting | "Towards the City of Solidarity and Citizenship" | 1995 | 11-12 Oct. | Paris | France |
| Meeting | Coping locally and regionally with economic, technological and environmental transformations | 1995 | 11-12 Sept. | Paris | France |
| Meeting | Meeting of Experts on Women in the Informal Sector | 1995 | 25-27 Sept. | Gigiri | Kenya |
| Seminar | Coping locally and regionally with economic, technologic and environmental transformations | 1995 | March | Tromso | Norway |
| International Symposium | From Social Exclusion to Social Cohesion: Towards a Policy Agenda | 1995 | 02-04 March | Roskilde | Denmark |
| Seminar | Expert seminar on Cities | 1994 | February | Vienna | Austria |
| Regional Meetings | | | | | |
| Regional Meeting | Mitos y Falacias en el debate sobre el desarrollo económico y social y la gobernabilidad en América | 2001 | 28-30 Nov. | | Uruguay |
| Regional Meeting | Réunion sous régionale de Comités de liaison MOST du Maghreb | 2001 | 4-5 Oct. | Tunis | Tunisia |
| Regional Meeting | Secretariat Report on the Regional and Sub-regional Meetings of the MOST Programme | 1997 | 16-20 June | Paris | France |
| Regional Meeting | Regional consultative meeting in the Caribbean on the MOST programme | 1997 | 24-26 Feb. | Kingston | Jamaica |
| Regional Conference | Arab States Regional Conference | 1996 | 26-28 Feb. | Tunis | Tunisia |
| Regional Meeting | Report of the Nordic MOST meeting | 1996 | 11-12 Jan. | Helsinki | Finland |

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--|------|-------------|--------------|------------|
| Regional Meeting | African Regional MOST Meeting | 1995 | 28-30 Sept. | Gigiri | Kenya |
| Regional Meeting | Central and Eastern Europe MOST Meeting | 1995 | 29-31 May | Budapest | Hungary |
| Regional Meeting | Pacific sub-regional MOST Meeting: Multiculturalism: a policy response to diversity | 1995 | 28-29 April | Sidney | Australia |
| Regional Meeting | 1 st Latin America and Caribbean Regional Conference on MOST | 1995 | 28-31 March | Buenos Aires | Argentina |
| Regional Meeting | Regional Conference in Asia on MOST | 1994 | 21-25 Nov. | Bangkok | Thailand |
| Regional Meeting | Regional consultative Meeting in Central Asia on the MOST | 1994 | 25-27 Oct. | Bishkek | Kyrgyzstan |

MOST PROJECTS

Funding (in US dollars, unless stated otherwise) from UNESCO's regular budget, additional funding (funds that go directly to project) and extra-budgetary funds (under UNESCO's execution)

Funding as reported by project leaders and MOST Secretariat.

| TITLE OF PROJECT | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | SUBTOTAL |
|---|---|--------|---|----------|
| Multicultural and multi-ethnic societies | | | | |
| 1. New migrations and Growing Ethno-cultural diversity in the Asia-Pacific region (APMRN) | ? | | | |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | | | |
| 2. Social and political aspects of international migration and growing ethnocultural diversity in the region (AMPRN) | ? | | | |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | | | |
| 3. Ethno-net Africa | ? | 0 | 25,000 (including 8,000 US\$ from Human Rights division) | 25,000 |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | | 7,000 (workshop organised in cooperation with LIMSI-CNRS) | 7,000 |
| 4. Democratic governance in a multi-cultural and multi-ethnic society | | | | |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | 195,000 from the Swiss Government | | | 195,000 |
| 5. Multicultural policies and modes of citizenship in European cities (MPMC) | | 31,276 | 31,276 | 62,552 |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | | | |
| 6. Managing cultural, ethnic and religious diversities on local, state and international levels in Central and Eastern Europe | Concluded | | | |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | | | |
| 7. Monitoring of ethnicity, conflicts and cohesion | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 45,000 |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | 100,000 from Carnegie Foundation ⁶ | | 150,000 from Carnegie Foundation | 250,000 |
| 8. Migration networks in Africa, Central & Eastern Europe, Latin America & the Caribbean | | | | |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | | | |

⁶ Those are estimations, for no data was received from project leaders.

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| <i>agency)</i> | | | | |
| 9. Negotiation of Peace Pacts in Arab Countries | | | | |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | | | |
| 10. Best Practices on Indigenous Knowledge (first phase) | 15,000 | 15,000 | | 30,000 |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | 30,000 from CIRAN | 30,000 from CIRAN | | 60,000 |
| 11. Best Practices on Indigenous Knowledge (second phase) | | | 13,100 | 13,100 |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | | | |
| Cities | | | | |
| 12. City words | 2,000 | 5,000 | 4,000 | 11,000 |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | CNRS + Maison des Sciences de l'Homme + Université d'Aix | | | |
| 13. Growing up in cities (GUIC) | | | | |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | | | |
| 14. Socially sustainable cities: building a knowledge base for urban management in the twenty-first century | | | | |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | | | |
| 15. Cities, the environment and social relations between men and women | 5.000 | 20,000 | 15,000 | 40,000 |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | 66,225 (100,000CHF): Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation 14,569 (22,000CHF): Swiss National Commission for UNESCO | | 49,668 (75,000CHF) Swiss Agency for Development and cooperation 14,569 (22,000CHF) Swiss National Commission for UNESCO | 115,894 (175,000CHF): Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation 29,139 (44,000CHF): Swiss National Commission for UNESCO |
| 16. City project (MOST-MAB) ⁷ | | | | |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | | | |
| 17. Urban development and Freshwater Resources in Small Coastal Cities | 150,000 (RP + extra budgetary funding) | 120,000 (RP + extra budgetary funding) | 180,000 (RP + extra budgetary funding) | 450,000 |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | | | |
| 18. UNU - UNESCO Workshop on Globalization and Mega-city development in Pacific Asia | This project was concluded in 1997. A publication was preparation for 2002 by Pekin UNESCO Office | | | |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | 14,274 donated Trust Funds (Japan) from the 1 st Period. Achieved in 1996-1997 | | | 14,274 |

⁷ MOST-MAB projects in six cities: Yeumbeul, Port au Prince, Sao Roque, Santo Domingo, Djenné, Bogotá.

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 19. Industrial Decentralisation and Urban Development in India with consideration of South-East and East Asian States | Concluded in 1998 | | | |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | Concluded in 1998 | | | |
| Global-local | | | | |
| 20. History and observation of social transformation (HOST) | 50,000 | 50,000 | 55,000 | 155,000 |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | 255,000 (UNODCCP) | | | 255,000 |
| 21. Industrial decentralisation and urban development in India | Concluded in 1998 | | | |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | Concluded in 1998 | | | |
| 22. Globalisation and structural adjustment and transformations in Arab Mediterranean countries | | 25,000 | 5,000 | 30,000 |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | 25,000 (IRMC, Tunis) | 5,000 (IRMC, Tunis) | 30,000 |
| 23. MERCOSUR: A space for interaction | Concluded in 1998 | | | |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | Concluded in 1998 | | | |
| 24. Institutional modernization of social policies in Latin America | Concluded in 1998 | | | |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | Concluded in 1998 | | | |
| 25. Coping locally and regionally with economic, technological and environmental transformations (CCPP) | 10,000 | | | 10,000 |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | 40,000 (Univ. Tromsø) | | 40,000 ⁸ |
| 26. Personal and institutional strategies for management of transformation risks in Central and Eastern Europe | 20,000 | 15,000 | 20,000 | 55,000 |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | | | |
| 27. Sustainability as a Concept of the Social Sciences | | | | |

⁸ Funding UNESCO and MOST CCPP

Overview funding MOST CCPP (all numbers in USD)

| Year | Total | UNESCO | Others | % UNESCO |
|------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|
| 1996 | 20.000,- | 10.000,- | 10.000,- | 50 % |
| 1997 | 59.000,- | 0,- | 59.000,- | 0 % |
| 1998 | 107.000,- | 10.000,- | 97.000,- | 9,35 % |
| 1999 | 92.000,- | 10.000,- | 82.000,- | 10,87 % |
| 2000 | 88.750,- | 0,- | 88.750,- | 0% |
| 2001 | 33.500,- | 0,- | 33.500,- | 0% |
| Sum | 400.250,- | 30.000,- | 370.250,- | 7,5 % |

Compiled by MOST CCPP secretariat Tromsø, May 2002,

Please note, the funding does not include the costs for the publication of the reports:

Northern Future – Young Voices, UNESCO November 2000.

Coping under Stress in Fisheries Communities, MOST Discussion paper no. 55 (forthcoming by 30. May 2002)

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | | | |
| 28. GEDIM – Economic Globalisation and Human Rights | | 25,000 | 15,000 | 40,000 |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | | | |
| 29. NGOs and Governance in the Arab Countries | | 30,000 | 15,000 | 45,000 |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | 25,000 (CEDEJ, Cairo) | | 25,000 |
| 30. MOST ALFA Network | | | | |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | | | |
| Research, Action & Capacity Building | | | | |
| 31. Factors that improve the use of research in social policy case studies | 2000/2001: 88,155 | 2001/2002: 89,963 | 2002/2003: 97,401 | 275,519 |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | | | |
| 32. UNESCO Chairs | | | | |
| UNESCO-ITESO, México | 20,000 | 7,000 | 25,000 | 52,000 |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | ITESO: 2,000 Gouv.: 2,000 CONACYT: 20,000 | ITESO: 1,000 Gouv.: 10,000 CONACYT: 20,000 | ITESO: ? Gouv.: ? CONACYT: 20,000 | ITESO: 3,000 Gouv.: 12,000 CONACYT: 60,000 |
| ETVÖS University, Hungary | | | | |
| UNESCO Chairs on Sustainable Development | | | | |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | | | |
| 33. Clearing House | | | | |
| Discussion Forums on Social Transformations and on Multicultural and Multiethnic societies | 30,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 90,000 |
| Electronic Journal on Multi Religious | | | | |
| Best Practices | | | | |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | | | |
| 34. MOST International PhD Award 2000-2001 | | | 35,000 | 35,000 |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | | | | |
| 35. City Professionals Network | 4,000 | 24,000 | 79,000 | 10,000 |
| <i>Additional funding (please specify agency)</i> | 12 universities are involved in this project with indirect costs (data non available) | | | |
| GRAND TOTAL | 1.093.949 | 734.033 | 906.014 | 2.733.996 |

ANNEX VI

MODES OF KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION (ACCORDING TO MICHAEL GIBBONS)

**MODES OF KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION
(ACCORDING TO MICHAEL GIBBONS)**

| | MODE 1 | MODE 2 |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| Problem definition and solution | In the context of the essentially academic interests of a specific community | With a view to applications, on the basis of consultation with different interests |
| Field of research | Single-discipline Homogeneous | Transdisciplinary Heterogeneous |
| Organisational method | Hierarchical Specialised (by type of institution) | Temporary collaboration on a problem, production at several sites and in several institutions at the same time |
| Dissemination of results | Through institutional channels | Within the network during production and then, by a reconfiguration to address new problems, in society |
| Funding | Essentially institutional | Raised for each project from a range of public and private sources |
| Assessment of social impact | <i>Ex-post</i> , when results are interpreted or disseminated | <i>Ex-ante</i> , when defining problems and setting priorities for research |
| Quality control of results | Essentially peer judgement of the scientific contribution made by individuals | Includes a varied body of intellectual, social, economic and political interests; quality is no longer simply a scientific question, which is why it is criticised by participants of mode 1 |

- Decisions on how MOST reviews its working methods based on this first matrix should then feed the second table, according to the profile of projects and the geographical and cultural contexts. This means that the definition of method, content and focus depends on both the profile of the project and the necessary contextualisation.

| Mediterranean region | | |
|---|---|--|
| Long-term international comparative research networks | | |
| Capacity-building in the thematic areas covered by MOST, with an emphasis on how to go beyond traditional dichotomies such as discipline/interdiscipline, public/private, top-down/bottom-up, | <p>Two key factors to be taken into account :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the profile of the project (topic, partners, funding, timetable, policy-relevance, etc.) - context (local needs) - the MOST "offer" | |
| Strategic and policy mediation (contributing to the policy agenda, building clustering concepts) | | |

ANNEX VII

ASSESSMENT OF SELECTED MOST PROJECTS

Assessment of selected MOST projects

The Evaluation team has analysed a sample of the MOST projects. The sample was chosen and has been analysed in terms of their content, impact and overall quality. Below is a summary of this assessment.

Asia Pacific Migration Research Network (APMRN): in the pursuit of the theme "Multicultural Societies", the SSC approved in 1995 the Asia Pacific Migration Research Network (APMRN) with the objective to develop institutional links in order to facilitate better understanding of the contemporary international migration processes in the Asia-Pacific region and to promote policy-relevant knowledge. The University of Wollongong, Australia is the secretariat of the project. APMRN has 93 academic, governmental and NGO members from 18 countries in the region. Active networks have been those in Australia, New Zealand and the Philippines. The networks have made significant progress in stimulating research interest among the scholars of the region in various immigration-related topics.

Though the funding of the project has somewhat fluctuated, many national networks have been successful in forging good working relations with their governmental officers, policy-makers and the NGOs engaged. The network is also bringing about occasional policy briefs on its forum discussions as well as data banks and websites for wider use. Some national networks have had significant impact on the national immigration policy formulations; examples are New Zealand and the Philippines. The number of meetings, conferences, publications and Newsletters is very impressive. The Network has also started, in co-operation with UNESCO-MOST, the Asian Migration and Ethnic Relations Working Paper.

This project meets, in an exemplary way, the MOST criteria for interdisciplinarity, network building, policy impact, continuity, poverty reduction and also capacity building. Its web page has been actively visited. Besides, the MOST seed money was only modest, a total of US\$100.000 for four years.

Ethno-Net Africa (ENA): a network for comparative studies, monitoring and evaluation of ethnic conflicts in Africa: the main objective of this network is to foster better understanding of ethnic conflicts in Africa through collection, analyses and dissemination of information in order to provide an early warning system and prevent conflicts. This objective was undertaken through comparative research on specific ethnic issues in several African countries, capacity building (training and tutoring young scholars) and a database on ethnic conflicts (in Cameroon). This is a timely project and can be best undertaken by African scholars themselves; the social issue in Africa, where ethnic and tribal traditions are strong, need to be brought visible to the Social Sciences community elsewhere in the world. The specific social and historical problems related to nation building in Africa need to be addressed to close the gaps between the South and the North. The project has produced numerous activities, in the form of publications, training, national monitoring units in several African countries. It has addressed the former OAU and other policy-making organisations in Africa, and its web page has been actively visited. However, and unfortunately, its capacity building role has been rather weak, mostly in the form of training courses and workshops; yet it has succeeded also in putting together a database of African scholars and other members of civil society who can support conflict management processes in Africa. This is a good MOST project, although it has serious limitations. The funds received from MOST (total US\$25.000 + support for a workshop) are very modest.

Best Practices on Indigenous Knowledge: MOST in collaboration with the Centre for International Research and Advisory Networks (CIRAN) has established a Database of Best Practices on Indigenous Knowledge. This Database contains several examples of projects that illustrate the use of this knowledge towards the development of sustainable survival strategies. The second phase of the project has been started, and in its own way it also represents a capacity building activity within MOST. It is the most frequently visited website among MOST projects! This project is important and deserves good support also in the future.

Multicultural Policies and Modes of Citizenship in European Cities: this project aims at assessing the development and interplay of both community-led initiatives and top-down social policies in terms of their capacity to better integrate migrant communities and ethnic minorities in public decision-making processes. The project analyses the ways in which migrants and minorities can gain access to decision-making processes, including matters related to public funding, economic development, housing and health care as well as cultural policies. It covers 17 large European cities. It has produced a number of working papers, and other publications, a workshop and conferences, and "City Templates" of the 17 cities (which are in-depth stock data and analyses of the chosen cities) for international comparative research.

City Words: this project is based on a network of networks, in 12 different linguistic areas. The sub-themes of the project are, among others, "Naming the new urban areas", "Town and city, urbanisms categorised", "Learned and technical languages", etc. This is a very interesting socio-linguistic analysis of urbanisation; it has produced a number of publications. It is based on an interdisciplinary approach. However, it may not respond to the very core objectives of the MOST Programme. Its policy impact has been difficult to assess; probably it has been very meagre if any at all.

Cities: Management of Social Transformations and Environment: this intersectoral project worked for the improvement of living conditions in peri-urban areas with the participation of inhabitants and local NGOs, and the scientific support of UNESCO's Man And Biosphere Programme and Management of Social Transformations Programme. The project has been made possible through the support of United Nations Development Programme, bilateral co-operation and the participation of UNESCO's Sector for Education. Its final evaluation, presented to the IGC session in 2001, showed that this project responded to the criterium of policy-relevance of MOST, although its research component was not fully developed.

Growing up in Cities: this project is actually a remake of an earlier UNESCO project (under MAB). The purpose of the project was to engender children's participation in urban policies. It has covered cities in several continents, including Africa. This project has produced several publications and popular articles, as well as symposia. In local communities, the project has received variable amount of enthusiasm and support, though in developing countries it has been better welcome. Its research component is rather small, as the project is action-oriented and mostly based on demonstrations and local activities; its main impact has been to involve young people in local social and urban problems. It has been also a very concrete 'lesson' about the relationship between research and decision-making. This is an interesting exercise, but its better 'home' in the future would be some other international organisations (e.g. UNICEF).

Industrial Decentralisation and Urban Development in India (Southeast and East Asian States): the main objective of this project was to improve the understanding of the processes

underlying industrial growth in small and medium-sized town, and their integration with national and international production systems in Asia. The initial workshop with teams from India, the Netherlands and France was organised in 1996; the workshop results have been published. However, the four-year programme was discontinued for a number of reasons. The external support, in addition to the MOST seed money, failed to appear. The geographical spread of the research team members of the network created coordination problems, and there was no monitoring system. Some members had expected a stronger coordinating role from MOST.

Coping locally and regionally with economic, technological and environmental transformations: a northern circumpolar perspective: the long-term objective of this project is to contribute to social innovations and sustainable development in the Circumpolar Region, thereby avoiding marginalisation. The participating countries are Canada, Denmark, the Faroe Islands, Finland, Iceland, Russia and Sweden. The project has involved a number of universities and research centres, as well as NGOs, has built effective networks, with good interdisciplinary and comparative approach as well as capacity building. Its policy impact has been estimated good especially at the local community and regional level, which is partly the result of the structure of the project that involved scientists and local communities from the very beginning through common meetings, publications, etc. The project was executed in several phases as a MOST project in 1996-2001; it has come to an end now, but it continues with other support systems. The share of direct MOST funding was 7,5 % of the total budget. The spin-off effects have been, among others, the Nordic Research School of Local Dynamics (NOLD), and the establishment of the Centre for Local and Regional Development in the Faroe Islands. This is an exemplary project within the MOST Programme, meeting all its core requirements and aims.

Economic and Social Transformations Connected with International Drug Problem. Approved in 1996, it involved several research institutes, in France, Brazil, Mexico, India, Germany and China. The project continues until 2002, when its final report and CD-Rom are being published. The project had several aims, among others the production of comparative analyses and the creation of an international network, as well as analytical tools for the decision-makers. Before becoming a MOST project, the national nets working on the subject already existed, and thus they continued the work they were already engaged in. In terms of output, the project has produced books, discussion papers, two CD-ROMs and various research reports, as well as several meetings.

Our analysis is that the project has been relevant, but also generated new knowledge about the drug issue and new perspectives of an integrated analysis on the drugs economy. The main instrument for interaction has been the Internet. The project's impact on the public administrators and policies is difficult to measure, but at least from an academic point of view it has been seen as 'fruitful'. Also, its capacity building role is difficult to assess. The total cost of the project has been US\$422.000, with the support of UNODCCP (extrabudgetary contribution to UNESCO).

The GEDIM Programme: this project ("Globalisation économique et droits au Mercosur") existed before being labelled as a MOST project. GEDIM is an autonomous network of researchers, and its goal is to study the effects of globalisation on the legal structures of some key organisations and institutions within MERCOSUR (mostly Brazil, Argentina, Chile and Uruguay). The major topics covered are company and business law; international crime, mapping the judiciary, and privatisation of public services.

The 'weak' point indicated in the evaluation was that there would have been room for many more scientists from other MERCOSUR countries, which would have equally benefited from it. The strong feature here was that the public sector and thus the decision makers were involved 'naturally' and there was an demand for this kind and method of knowledge production. The project end as a MOST project in 2002, but it will continue to be followed by the UNESCO office in Mexico. The project is assessed as being very relevant with original contributions to the issues under study, and its capacity building role can be seen as important, also in relation to the policy makers. Thus it meets well the main criteria of the MOST Programme.

Globalisation, structural adjustment and transformations in rural societies in Arab Mediterranean countries: This project, implemented in direct cooperation with the IRMC ("Institut de recherches sur le Maghreb contemporain") from Tunis, organised two seminars for the researchers of the network, and two young researchers' training seminars. These events were partly funded by UNESCO/MOST; other partners were the French Embassy in Tunis and the "Ministère des Affaires Etrangères" of France. The main outcome is a book, expected to come out in September 2002. With modest financial contribution from MOST, this project has produced good quality scientific work, and has involved young scholars in the seminars held. The collaboration with IRMC was a key factor in the development of this project.

MERCOSUR: A space for Interaction, a Space for Integration. This project was concluded in 1998. One of the major aims of this project was the shed light on the societal mechanisms that underlie and foster dialogue among societies and cultures, and the structures and institutions that promote intercultural creativity. The project produced several discussion papers and seminars. The approach in the project was rather 'academic', and it showed that it is difficult to build functional networks between researchers and policy-makers in this particular area involving the larger cultural dimension of regional processes. This kind of debate could be started at the university level first, and then gradually expanded to reach the policy-makers.

Sustainability as a Concept of the Social Sciences. This has been a funds-in-trust project and has been completed. It has produced several publications that deal with the concept of 'sustainability'. As with other similar concepts, the papers implicitly or explicitly also indicate the many inherent problems in the issue. Any definition of this concept is very value-laden, if not paradigm-dependent, and it can be interpreted in a variety of ways by scientists from different fields or by people from different cultures. Another problem involved is that the list of possible methodologies and approaches becomes very extensive and all-embracing that adds little that is new. Again, in these issues there seems to be a big language barrier between scientists in different fields, which is again an indication of the difficulties in transdisciplinary thinking and cooperation.

MOST Chairs. The UNESCO Chairs programme has been functional since 1992; currently there are in Social Sciences and MOST over 40 Chairs with several networks in some 30 countries. This is a way of engaging university partnerships in the pursuit of the goals of the MOST Programme, especially by emphasising courses and outreach programmes for different stakeholder groups in the society. They will enhance social responsiveness and contribute to sustainable development. Moreover, they add to the institutional capacity in the host institutions and countries.

The entire UNESCO's Chairs programme has been recently (2000) externally evaluated. The Chairs' relation with the existing MOST projects is often absent (two chairs related to the

MOST/Drugs project, one chair related to urban development in Mexico). Some of the Chairs are very active, some apparently dormant. The funding and its continuity are a problem in many cases. Also, the possible involvement of Chairs in other MOST activities, including the projects is an open issue; but the crucial issue would be assistance to policy making. The general recommendations of the external evaluation are valid; also the involvement of the SSC in the planning of the Chairs for the MOST programme is advisable.

ANNEX VIII

OVERVIEW OF MOST DOCUMENTS AND PUBLICATIONS 1994-2002

OVERVIEW OF MOST DOCUMENTS AND PUBLICATIONS 1994-2002

1. MOST Annual Report 2001

Bridging Research & Policy (<http://www.unesco.org/most/annualreport2001.htm>)

2. Books

Forthcoming

L'Agent de développement local - Émergence et consolidation d'un profil professionnel.

Najim, Annie; Vedelago, François

La Lauze/UNESCO

Governance and NGOs in the Arab world.

Ben Néfissa, Sarah; Hanafi, Sari; Sanchez Milani, Carlos (eds.)

Series The City Words in co-edition with Maison des sciences de l'homme de Paris and UNESCO (MOST Programme): Les catégories de l'urbain.

Marin, Brigitte (ed.)

Social capital formation in poverty reduction. Which role for the civil society and the State. MOST/CROP

Démocratie et Gouvernance Mondiale: quelles régulations pour le 21^e siècle ?

Arturi, Carlos; de Oliveira, Renato; Hermet, Guy; Kazancigil, Ali; Aureano, Guillermo; Preciado, Jaime; Ben Néfissa, Sarah; da Graça Bulhões, Maria; Osmont, Annik; Westendorff, David; Ribeiro Dias, Márcia; Roy, Bunker; Milani, Carlos; Solinis, German

2002

Creating Better Cities with Children.

Driskell, David ; Members of the GUIC Project

UNESCO Publishing, EARTHSCAN Publications, 2002

Democracia e Governança Mundial. Que Regulações para o Século XXI?

Milani, Carlos; Arturi, Carlos; Solinis, Germán (org.); Editora da

Universidade/UFRGS, 2002

Filipinos in Global Migrations: At home in the world?

Aguilar Jr, Filomeno (ed.)

A Philippine Migration Research Network (PMRN) / Philippine Social

Science Council (PSSC) / UNESCO/MOST Publication. Quezon City, PSSC, 2002

Growing up in an Urbanizing World.

Chawla, Louise (ed.)

UNESCO Publishing, EARTHSCAN Publications, 2002

Series The City Words in co-edition with Maison des sciences de l'homme de Paris and UNESCO (MOST Programme): Les divisions de la ville

Topalov, Christian (ed.)

UNESCO/Ed. de la Maison des sciences de l'homme, 2002

2001

Anthropology. Theoretical Practice in Culture and Society.
Herzfeld, Michael
UNESCO-MOST, Blackwell Publishers, 2001

Journal of Mediterranean Studies: History, Culture and Society in the
Mediterranean World. Vol 11, No. 1
Spiteri, Anthony (ed.)
Mediterranean Institute, University of Malta, 2001

Reflexive North, The.
Aarsæther, Nils; Bærenholdt, Jørgen Ole (eds)
Copenhagen, Nordic Council of Ministers, 2001

Series The City Words in co-edition with Maison des sciences de l'homme de Paris and UNESCO
(MOST Programme): Nommer les nouveaux territoires urbains
Rivière d'Arc, Hélène (ed.)
UNESCO/Ed. de la Maison des sciences de l'homme, 2001

Transforming the local.
Aarsæther, Nils; Bærenholdt, Jørgen Ole (eds)
Copenhagen, Nordic Council of Ministers, 2001

2000

Développement social durable des villes. Principes et pratiques.
Bailly, Antoine S.; Lawrence, Roderick J.; Brun, Philippe; Rey, Marie-Claire (ed.),
Éditions Economica, Paris, 2000

Labour Migration in Indonesia: Policies and Practices.
Sukamdi; Haris A.; Brownlee P. (eds)
Population Studies Center Gadjah Mada University, Indonesia, 2000

Rethinking Development. Putting an end to poverty.
Bartoli, Henri
UNESCO/Ed. Economica, 2000

1999

Best Practices on Indigenous Knowledge
MOST-CIRAN, 1999

Europe: Expectations and Reality. The Challenge for the Social Sciences.
Falt'an, L'ubomir (ed.)
Institute for Sociology - Slovak Academy of Sciences, published with the support of UNESCO, 1999

Intermediate Cities and World Urbanisation
Municipality of Lleida, UNESCO, UIA, Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Lleida, 1999

Managing Transformations in Eastern Europe.
Genov, Nikolai
UNESCO-MOST / Regional and Global Development, Paris-Sofia, 1999

Prospérités du crime, Les. Trafic de stupéfiants, blanchiment et crises financières dans l'après-guerre froide.

Fabre, Guilhem
Editions de l'aube, La Tour d'Aigues, 1999

Repenser le Développement. En finir avec la pauvreté.
Bartoli, Henri
UNESCO/Ed. Economica, 1999

Unemployment: Risks and Reactions.
Genov, Nikolai (ed.)
UNESCO-MOST / Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Paris-Sofia, 1999

Sustainability and the Social Sciences.
Becker, Egon; Jahn, Thomas (eds)
Institute for Social-Ecological Research (ISOE)/MOST, 1999

1998

Central and Eastern Europe Continuing Transformation.
Genov, Nikolai (ed.)
Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Bonn-Sofia, 1998

Coping Strategies in the North. Local Practices in the Context of Global Restructuring
Nordic Council of Ministers, Copenhagen, 1998

Drogues en Afrique subsaharienne, Les.
Observatoire géopolitique des drogues,
Karthala, Paris, 1998

Modernización de las Políticas Sociales en América Latina.
Faúndez, Alejandra (ed.)
UNESCO-MOST/FLACSO, 1998

Philippine Migration Studies: An Annotated Bibliography.
Perez, Aurora E.; Patacsil, Perla C.
Philippine Migration Research Network;
Philippine Social Science Council, Quezon City, 1998

Sustainable Development and the Future of Cities.
Hamm, Bernd; Mutttagi, Pandurang K. (eds)
Oxford & IBH Publishing CO, New Delhi, 1998

1997

Pobreza, Exclusión y Política Social.
Menjívar Larín, Rafael; Kruijt, Dirk; van Vucht Tijssen, Lieteke (eds)
FLACSO - Sede Costa Rica, San José, 1997

Population, migration et développement dans le Pacifique Sud.
Rallu, Jean-Louis
UNESCO, Paris, 1997

Ukraine & Croatia: Problems of Post-communist Societies.
Kukov, Mislav; Polokhalo, Volodymyr (eds), 1997

Multicultural Policies and Modes of Citizenship in Europe.
MPMC Editorial Board (ed.)
(Collection of City Profile Templates)

Social Sustainability of Cities, The. Diversity and the Management of Change.
Polèse, Mario; Stren, Richard (eds)
University of Toronto Press

3. Policy Papers (<http://www.unesco.org/most/discuss.htm>)

1. Searching for New Development Strategies. The Challenges of the Social Summit.
Sachs, Ignacy, 1995 (also in French & in Spanish)

2. From Social Exclusion to Social Cohesion: A Policy Agenda.
Bessis, Sophie, 1995 (also in French & in Spanish)

3. Cybernetics of Global Change: Human Dimension and Managing of Complexity.
Mesarovic, Mihajlo D.; McGinnis, David L.; West, Dalton, A., 1996

4. Multiculturalism: New Policy Responses to Diversity.
Inglis, Christine, 1996 (also in French & in Spanish)

5. Democracy and Citizenship in the City of the Twenty-First Century.
Sachs-Jeantet, Céline, 1997 (also in French & in Spanish)

6. Sustainability: A cross-disciplinary Concept for Social Transformations.
Becker, Egon; Jahn, Thomas; Stiess, Immanuel, 1997

7. Nouvelles configurations villes-campagnes.
Ricardo Abramovay and Ignacy Sachs, 1999

8. Fight Urban Poverty: A general framework for action.
Merklen, Denis, 2001.

4. Discussion Papers (<http://www.unesco.org/most/discuss.htm>)

2002

Centro y regiones en México ante la gobernabilidad democrática local.
Preciado Coronado, Jaime, 2002

Democratising Global Governance: The Challenges of the World Social Forum.
Beausang, Francesca, 2002

Gobernanza y gobernabilidad democráticas en México.
Mesa Redonda, 2002

La question Bamiléké pendant l'ouverture démocratique au Cameroun : retour d'un débat occulté.
Dieudonné Zognong, 2002

Education for Democratic Governance: Review of Learning Programmes.
Carlos Santiso, 2002

2001

Industrial growth in small and medium towns and their vertical integration: The case of Gobindgarh, Punjab, India.

Kundu, Amitabh; Bhatia, Sutinder, 2001

Governance, Civil Society and NGOs in Mozambique.

Stefano, Belluci, 2001

Keeping Away from the Leviathan: The Case of the Swedish Forest Commons.

Carlsson, Lars, 2001

Logic of Globalisation: Tensions and Governability, The.

Dulpas, Gilberto, 2001

NGOs, Governance and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Balbis, Jorge, 2001 (also in Spanish)

Urban Development Projects: Neighbourhood, State and NGOs. Final Evaluation of the MOST Cities Project.

Merklen, Denis, 2001 (also in French)

Coping under Stress in Fisheries Communities.

Skaptadottir, Unnur Dis; Morkore, Jogvan; Riabova, Larissa, 2001.

2000

Coping with global economic, technological and environmental transformations: towards a research agenda.

Alagh, Yoginder K., 2000

NGOs, Governance and Development in the Arab World.

Ben Néfissa, Sarah, 2000 (also in French)

El Crepúsculo del Estado-Nación.

Français, Ariel, 2000

Urban Development, Infrastructure Financing and Emerging System of Governance in India: A Perspective.

Kundu, Amitabh, 2000

Quelques aspects du développement économique, social et politique aux Iles du Cap-Vert (1975-1999).

Andrade, Elisa, 2000

Managing cultural, ethnic and religious diversities on local, state and international levels in Central Europe: the case of Slovakia.

Ronen, Dov, 2000

1999

Gestion urbaine et participation des habitants: quels enjeux, quels résultats? Le cas de Yeumbeul, Sénégal.

Bulle, Sylvaine, 1999

Cannabis in Lesotho: A Preliminary Survey.

Laniel, Laurent, 1999

Violence related to illegal drugs, easy money and justice in Brazil: 1980-1995.
Zaluar, Alba, 1999

Drug trafficking in Mexico: a first general assessment.
Astorga, Luis, 1999

Amérique Latine : les discours techniques et savants de la ville dans la politique urbaine.
Rivière d'Arc H.; Bitoun J.; Martins Bresciani M. S.; Caride H.; Hiernaux D.; Novick A.; Jatahy
Pesavento S.; 1999

Socio-economic Transformations and the Drug Scene in India.
Britto, Gabriel; Charles, Molly; 1999

Geography of illicit drugs in the city of Sao Paolo.
Mingardi, G., 1999

The comparative social science approach. Outline for a debate on methods and objectives based
on three MOST projects carried out by international networks of researchers.
Ghorra-Gobin; Cynthia, 1999 (also in French)

Scientific Diasporas: A New Approach to the Brain Drain.
Meyer, Jean-Baptiste; Brown, Mercy; 1999

Science, Economics and Democracy: Selected Issues.
Foray, Dominique; Kazancigil, Ali; 1999

Impact économique et social de la culture du pavot sur la Communauté des Yanaconas au sein du
Massif Colombien.
Colombié, Thierry, 1999

Relationship between research and drug policy in the United States, The.
Laniel, Laurent, 1999

Aspectos Culturales de las Migraciones en el Mercosur.
Szmukler B., Alicia; Calderón G., Fernando, 1999

1998

Societies at Risk. The Caribbean and Global Change.
Girvan, Norman, 1998

VIH/SIDA et entreprise en Afrique: une réponse socio-médicale à l'impact économique? L'exemple
de la Côte d'Ivoire.
Aventin, Laurent; Huard, Pierre, 1998 (also in French)

Human Development: Conceptual Issues and Foundations of an Economic Policy.
Fongang, Siméon, 1998 (also in French)

Status of Wage Earners and State Intervention in the Globalization: Argentina and Mercosur.
Peñalva, Susana, 1998 (in French & Spanish)

Financial Flows and Drug Trafficking in the Amazon Basin.
Osório Machado, Lia, 1998 (also in French, Spanish & Portuguese)

Cities Unbound: the Intercity Network in the Asia-Pacific Region.
Friedmann, John, 1998

Género y Nación en el Mercosur. Notas para Comenzar a Pensar.
Jelin, Elizabeth; Valdès, Teresa; Bareiro, Line, 1998

Chile y Mercosur: Hasta dónde Queremos Integramos?
Stefoni E., Carolina; Fuentes S., Claudio, 1998

Globalización, Regiones y Fronteras.
Abinzano, Roberto, 1998

Navegación Incierta: Mercosur en Internet, Una.
Ford, Anibal, 1998

Historiadores y la Producción de Fronteras: el Caso de la Provincia de Misiones (Argentina), Los.
Jaquet, Héctor Eduardo, 1998

Democratic Governance in Multicultural Societies.
König, Matthias, 1998

Participatory City, The. Innovations in the European Union.
Mega, Voula, 1998

Information Technology Enabled Organization: A Major Social Transformation, The.
Gulledge, Thomas R. Haszko, Ruth A., 1998 (also in French & Spanish)

1997

New Social Morphology of Cities, The.
Martinotti, Guido, 1997

Public Policy and Ethnic Conflict.
Premdas, Ralph R., 1997

1996

City Partnerships for Urban Innovations.
Godard, Francis, 1996 (also in French)

Management and Mismanagement of Diversity.
Ibrahim, Saad Eddin, 1996 (also in French)

Global Transformations and Coping Strategies: A Research Agenda for the MOST Programme.
Milani, Carlos; Dehlavi, Ali, 1996

1995

Managing Social Transformations in Cities: A Challenge to Social Sciences.
Sachs-Jeantet, Céline, 1995 (also in French & in Spanish)

Differentiating between Growth Regimes and the Management of Social Reproductions.
Byé, Pascal, 1995 (also in French & in Spanish)

Urban Research in Latin America. Towards a Research Agenda.
Valladares, Licia; Prates Coelho, Madga, 1995 (also in French & in Spanish)

Management of Multiculturalism and Multiethnicity in Latin America.
Iturralde G., Diego A., 1995 (also in French & in Spanish)

Global, lo Local, lo Híbrido. Aproximaciones a una Discusión que Comienza, Lo.
Sonntag, Heinz R.; Arenas, Nelly, 1995

Reflections on the Challenges Confronting Post-Apartheid South Africa.
Makhosezwe Magubane, Bernard, 1995

Urbanization and Urban Research in the Arab World.
Kharoufi, Mostapha, 1995 (also in French)

Coping Locally and Regionally with Economic, Technological and Environmental Transformations.
Report of the Sub-Regional Meeting of MOST, Tromsø, March 1995 (also in French, Russian & Spanish)

1994

Multicultural and Multi-ethnic Societies.
Giordan, Henri, 1994 (also in French & in Spanish)

Producción Mediática de Nacionalidad en la Frontera. Un Estudio de Caso en Posadas (Argentina)
- Encarnación (Paraguay), La.
Grimson, Alejandro

Some Thematic and Strategic Priorities for Developing Research on Multi-ethnic and Multi-cultural Societies.
Díez Medrano, Juan

Replicating Social Programmes: Approaches, Strategies and Conceptual Issues.
Van Oudenhoven, Nico; Waszir, Rekha (also in French)

5. Research Reports

2002

Migration Research and Policy Landscape: Case studies of Australia, the Philippines and Thailand.
Lyon, Kerry (ed.)
APMRN, 2002 (Asia Pacific Migration Research Network Working Papers n° 9)

Natural Disasters and Their Impact upon the Poorest Urban Populations
Ahlinvi, Messanh; Wisner, Ben
Report prepared by the International Social Science Council, Paris, 2002

2001

Change and Continuity: Female Labour Migration in South-East Asia.
Wille, Christina; Passl, Basia (eds)
ARCM (Asian Research Centre for Migration)
Institute for Asian Studies, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, 2001

Special issue on: Children's participation - evaluating effectiveness.
 pla notes (participatory learning and action) 42
 International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), October 2001

Current Trends in South Pacific Migration
 Naidu, Vijay; Vasta, Ellie; Hawksley, Charles (eds)
 APMRN, 2001 (Asia Pacific Migration Research Network Working Papers n° 7)

Flowers, Fale, Fanua and Fa'a Polynesia
 Bedford, R.; Longhurst, R.; Underhill-Sem, Y. (eds)
 APMRN, 2001 (Asia Pacific Migration Research Network Working Papers n° 8)

Management of Social Transformations.
 Choucri, Nazli; Laponce, Jean; Meadowcroft, James (eds.)
 International Political Science Association, 2001 (International Political Science Review vol. 22 n° 1)

2000

Développement urbain durable en zone côtière. Mahdia, Tunisie, 21-24 juin 1999. Actes du Séminaire international. Programmes MOST / CSI / PHI, UNESCO 2000

International Symposium on Management of Social Transformation in Indonesian Society: In Search of Models for Conflict Prevention.
 Koestoer, Raldi; Warsilah, Henny (eds.)
 UNESCO-MOST / Indonesia, PMB-LIPI, 2000

The MPMC Workshop in Zeist
 MPMC, 2000 (Multicultural Policies and Modes of Citizenship in European Cities, Working Paper n° 4)

Northern Future - Young Voices
 Bjørndal, Cato R. P.; Aarsæther, Nils (eds.)
 UNESCO MOST secretariat, Paris, November 2000.

1999

Immigrants' Participation in Civil Society in a Suburban Context
 Marques, Maria Margarida; Santos, Rui; Ralha, Tiago
 MPMC, 1999 (Multicultural Policies and Modes of Citizenship in European Cities, Working Paper n° 2)

Northern India
 City Words, 1999 (City Words Working Paper n° 4)

Work and Mobility: Recent Labour Migration Issues in China
 Fitzpatrick, Stephen (ed),
 APMRN, 1999 (Asia Pacific Migration Research Network Working Papers n° 6)

Migration and Citizenship in the Asia Pacific: Legal Issues
 Brownlee, Patrick (ed.)
 APMRN, 1998 (Asia Pacific Migration Research Network Working Papers n° 5)

Migration Research in the Asia Pacific: Australian Perspectives
 Brownlee, Patrick; Mitchell, Colleen (eds)
 APMRN, 1998 (Asia Pacific Migration Research Network Working Papers n° 4)

Urban Development and Freshwater Resources: Small Coastal Cities.
UNESCO Unit on Coastal Areas and Small Islands, 1998 (CSI Info n° 5)

Nommer la ville et ses territoires.
City Words, 1998 (City Words Working Paper n° 3)

1997

Barrios, Colonias y Fraccionamientos.
City Words, 1997 (City Words Working Paper n° 2)

Global Knowledge and Development Prospects: Blending Science and Culture in Education for the 21st Century.
Brochure. Unesco Secretariat, 1997

Industrial Decentralization and Urban Development.
Bénéï, Véronique; Kennedy, Loraine
Institut Français de Pondichéry, Pondichéry, 1997
(Pondy Papers in Social Sciences n° 23)

Migration and Citizenship.
Castles, Stephen; Spoonley, Paul
APMRN, 1997 (Asia Pacific Migration Research Network Research Papers)

Migration Issues in the Asia Pacific.
APMRN, 1997 (Asia Pacific Migration Research Network Working Papers n° 1)

Migration Research in the Asia Pacific: Theoretical and Empirical Issues.
Brownlee, Patrick; Mitchell, Colleen (eds)
APMRN, 1997 (Asia Pacific Migration Research Network Working Papers n° 3)

MPMC project statement, December 1997
Steering Committee
MPMC, 1997 (Multicultural Policies and Modes of Citizenship in European Cities, Working Paper n° 1)

Language Registers and Linguistic Practices.
City Words, 1997 (City Words Working Paper n° 1)

Renewal of Inner City Areas: Restoration of Historical City Centres, Urban Redevelopment, Reconstruction of Destroyed or Damaged Urban Centres.
(Brochure) MOST Secretariat, 1997

1996

Diferenciación de los Regímenes de Crecimiento, La.
Un Análisis de Largo Plazo.
Red Host, ILDIS, La Paz, 1996

1994

Social Development and the Differentiation of Growth Patterns, a Comparative Historical Analysis of Industrialisation Patterns in Argentina, Bolivia, Vietnam, Thailand, Algeria, Benin, Madagascar, and Turkey

Host Network, 1994

Ethnic associations, political trust and Political participation (A.)/Creating Networks within the Turkish Community (B.)

A. Fennema, Meindert; Tillie, Jean

B. Tillie, Jean; Fennema, Meindert; Kraal, Karen

MPMC (Multicultural Policies and Modes of Citizenship in European Cities, Working Paper n° 3A and 3B)

6. Ethnological Monitoring Series

Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow (available in Russian)

Bashkiria, Russian Federation

1999

Republic of Buriatia, The.

Abaieva, Lubov; Tcyrinov, Sogto, Moscow, 1999

Republic of Tatarstan, The.

Abdrachmanov, Rafik; Mavrina, Elmira, Moscow, 1999

1998

Bashkiria, Russian Federation.

Gabdrafikov, El'dar, Moscow, 1998

Republic of Karelia, The.

Klementiev, Eugeni, Moscow, 1998

Khanty-Mansi Region, Russian Federation.

Kosikov, Egor; Kosikova, Lydia, Moscow, 1998

Krasnodarski Region, Russian Federation.

Kritski, Evgueni; Savva, Mikhail, Moscow, 1998

Omsk Region, Russian Federation.

Lotkin, Ilya, Moscow, 1998

1997

Republic of Kalmykia, The.

Guchinova, Elza-Bair, Moscow, 1997

Republic of Kazakhstan, The.

Masanov, Nurbulat; Savin, Igor, Moscow, 1997

Orenburg Region, Russian Federation.

Amelin, Venali, Moscow, 1997

1996

Republic of Tuva, The.

Anaiban, Zoya, Moscow, 1996

7. Training Materials

Globalization and Sustainable Development: What Regulators Are Needed? (12 fact sheets)
Solagral / MOST Secretariat, May 2000 (also available in Arab and in Albanian)

OGM : Le Champ des Incertitudes. (5 fiches pédagogiques)
UNESCO Programmes MOST/MAB/CIB, Solagral, 2000

Société civile mondiale : la montée en puissance
Courier de la Planète N°63, Vol III, 2001
co-édité par UNESCO-MOST et Solagral

8. MOST Newsletter

Issues 1 - 10, 1994-2001
MOST Secretariat, Paris

9. ISSJ - International Social Sciences Journal (<http://www.unesco.org/issj>) (Blackwell Publishers, Oxford)

Issues related to MOST

N° 147. Cities of the Future: Managing Social Transformations, 1996

N° 155. Governance, 1997

N° 156. Social Transformations: Multicultural and Multiethnic Societies, 1998

N° 160. Globalization, 1999

N° 162. Policy Options for Social Development, 1999

N° 165. International Migration 2000, 2000

N° 166. The development debate: beyond the Washington Consensus, 2000

N° 167. Federalism, 2001

N° 168. Science and its Cultures, 2001

N° 169. Drug Trafficking : Economic and Social Dimensions, 2001

10. Electronic Publications

Exploring Religious Pluralism. Vol. 1, No. 1, 1999

The Public Management of Religious Diversity. Vol. 1, No. 2, 1999

Managing Religious Diversity in a Global Context - Debate Continued. Vol. 2, No. 1, 2000

Religious Diversity in the Russian Federation. Vol. 2, No. 2, 2001

Lesser used Languages and the Law in Europe. Vol 3, No 1, 2001

The Human Rights of Linguistic Minorities and Language Policies. Vol 3, No 2, 2001

11. World Social Science Report (<http://www.unesco.org/most/wssr.htm>)

1999, 352 pp.

ISBN: 92-3-103602-5

Editors: UNESCO Publishing / Elsevier