



**INTERNATIONAL FORUM ON THE
SOCIAL SCIENCE – POLICY NEXUS**
Argentina and Uruguay, 20-24 February 2006
www.unesco.org/shs/ifsp

FINAL REPORT

Preliminary observations

Section I: Introduction

- Rigorous investigation and effective policy
- A creative environment for a new kind of dialogue
- The five themes

Section II: The social science – policy nexus: achievements and challenges for the future

- Contemporary challenges require that the nexus between policy and social science be redefined
- Situations where the nexus already exists and has become a reality
- Identification of the problems and challenges facing the social science – policy nexus
- The road to overcome the gap between policy and social science

Section III: Conclusions

Buenos Aires Declaration calling for a new approach to the social science – policy nexus

Preliminary observations:

This report focuses on the existing nexus, the challenges and the ways to overcome the gap between policy and social science, based on the work and conclusions of the five day Forum. However, due to its wealth and diversity, the work presented during the Forum, shall be further analyzed and published in the near future.

Section I - Introduction

Rigorous investigation and effective policy

1. History's first truly global society faces significant challenges which could alter its nature, its democratic potential and its very survival. However, at precisely the time when the greatest capacity for change is required, there is a lack of confidence both in our understanding of these challenges and in our ability to adequately face them. Chaotic urbanization, emerging pandemics, uncontrolled globalization, widespread poverty and hunger: can we simply and fatalistically observe these challenges, as though we lacked the knowledge to understand how and why they occur and the capacity to achieve change?
2. A negative response implies a challenge to the formulation of policy and, inseparably, to social science. Only a rigorous analysis of social dynamics can provide policymakers and policy implementers – or those who aspire to make policy – with the means necessary to determine why well-intended reforms can fail, what effects can result from proposed actions, and how best to achieve socially desirable objectives. Conversely, the absence of analytical rigour opens the door to prejudice, dogma and spurious “common sense”.
3. The problem is not insoluble. Of course, social scientists and policymakers pose different questions, work with different timeframes and are judged by different criteria. Nonetheless, both relate to the same society. The knowledge developed by social science is precisely the knowledge needed for policy to be effective and democratically accountable.
4. The objective of UNESCO's Management of Social Transformations Programme (MOST) is precisely to reduce the gap between social science and policy, giving scientific meaning to policy concerns and providing political meaning to the knowledge produced by social science. It is imperative that mutual understanding is nurtured and creative environments are generated in order to make this possible.
5. Under the auspices of the MOST Programme, the International Forum on the Social Science – Policy Nexus (IFSP) established a new type of connection between social science research and policy making. Jointly organized by the governments of Argentina and Uruguay, the cities and universities of Buenos Aires, Cordoba, Montevideo and Rosario, and with the support of a wide range of academic, political and NGO partners, the Forum provided an innovative space to develop a new kind of dialogue, bringing

together social science and policy in the search for a common language and a common commitment.

A creative environment for a new kind of dialogue

6. The objective of the International Forum on the Social Science – Policy Nexus, held in the cities of Buenos Aires, Cordoba, Rosario and Montevideo from February 20 to 24 2006, was to explore the different regional and thematic dimensions of the nexus between public policy and social science research, and to suggest ways to overcome the existing gap between these two areas.
7. Distributed among the 4 host cities, 2000 participants from 80 countries took part in 99 workshops, 5 high-level round tables and 2 technical consultation meetings. These included 13 Social Development and Education Ministers from Africa, Asia and Latin America, 5 regional organization Secretaries-General, numerous officials from local and national governments, university professors and scholars, project coordinators and representatives of society at large.
8. With the purpose of recognizing and building on the work of the Forum in its entirety, UNESCO implemented an innovative experimental system to document each workshop, round table and technical meeting practically in real time. This also allowed for a condensed summary of the presentations and their results during the Forum's closing session.
9. Through the debate, the key elements of five themes were identified and analyzed, and the essential characteristics which define the challenges of contemporary social reality in Africa, the Americas, Asia, Europe and the Middle East were highlighted: global problems and dynamics, social policies, population and migration, regional integration, and urban policy and territorial decentralization.
10. The Forum reached three fundamental results, detailed in the central section of this report. First, the nexus between policy and social science was analyzed, identifying its strengths and weaknesses and comparing them across the five topic areas. Second, a certain number of problems were detected which slow down or prevent the nexus from forming. Based on these findings, the Forum recommended specific strategies aimed at overcoming the policy – social science gap.
11. Finally, with the aim of promoting the creation, development and permanence of channels of communication among policymakers, social scientists and development agents, the Forum decided to adopt a Declaration. The Declaration calls for the creation of permanent and creative channels of communication, the strengthening of existing channels, and the creation of new networks, particularly at the regional level, and in contact with existing channels such as the Forum of Ministers for Social Development.

The five themes

12. The workshops under each of the five themes were specifically organized to take into account the nexus between social science research and the development of policy. The presence of policymakers, researchers, NGO representatives and private citizens in each of the workshops allowed for the development of a new form of cooperation between policy and social science, with the intention of producing better answers to today's challenges.
13. The theme "Global Issues and Dynamics" took on the characteristics and impact of globalization (including commerce, finance, information technology, international migration, employment and poverty). The paths to improved world governance were analyzed (international norms and regulations, the role of international organizations, States, regional organizations and civil society).
14. The theme "Social Policies" stressed the analysis of successes and failures in applying social science to policy, in areas such as the eradication of poverty, social integration, health, social security, housing, employment, education, and urban and territorial policy.
15. "Population and Migration" dealt with the central aspects of modern migration: forced migrations and exile; globalization and transnationalization of migrants' lives and identities; cultural and environmental impact of population flows; demographic trends; the legal framework for migration and migrant rights; intergovernmental and regional cooperation for development of migratory policy and future migratory scenarios.
16. The theme "Regional Integration" explored the reasons behind the resurgence of regional integration efforts, the various forms of this integration today, and several specific successful or failed experiences. Also analyzed were different means of achieving a better balance between the economic and social dimensions of these integration efforts, as well as the existing relationship between the State and regional integration mechanisms.
17. "Territorial Decentralization and Urban Development" analyzed the experiences of many of the territories where these crucial social changes took place. The key challenges faced as a result of current transformations (planning instruments, territorial integration, socio-economic insertion, local democracy and citizenship, municipal action, among others) were discussed, as well as the most common responses currently offered (cooperation, development of legal frameworks, quality of public spaces, enhanced analytical capabilities, specialized expertise, and the commitment of professionals to innovation).

Section II - The social science – policy nexus: achievements and challenges for the future

Contemporary challenges require that the nexus between policy and social science be redefined

18. The new reality generated by the advent of the first global society has forced the social sciences to redefine their subject and policymakers to redefine their methodologies. The dynamics and complexity of global society require a shared effort between scholars and policymakers to identify its problems and propose adequate courses of action.
19. As a result of the complexities of social policy, the need to rest on a foundation of research in the social sciences appears to be common among all the regions represented at the Forum.
20. The presence of policymakers, researchers and NGO representatives at the International Forum on the Social Science – Policy Nexus highlighted the need to define a new form of cooperation between social science and policy, with the purpose of providing a better response to contemporary challenges. In this respect, the presentations and workshops turned on two main issues:
 - The need and the challenge to analyze and identify *nodes or connections* between researchers and policymakers, based on the difficulties the latter have in accessing reliable, relevant and efficient information; and, on the other hand, based on the difficulties that researchers face when generating timely and relevant information for the development of actual public policies and programmes.
 - In this sense, the majority of the workshops and presentations were based on specific experiences of public policy, especially as related to social, cultural and environmental programmes, where existing bonds between the two “worlds” – policy and science – were identified. The experiences presented belonged to such diverse countries and regions as: Russia, South Africa, Mozambique, Chile, the Anglophone Caribbean and New Zealand.
21. In addition, it should be emphasized that, in the context of globalization, the emergence of new international social problems (migration, HIV/AIDS, human rights violations, child pornography and sexual exploitation networks, etc.) calls for the definition of international social policy and, of course, its accompanying quantitative and qualitative investigation.

Situations where the nexus already exists and has become a reality

22. The creation of a nexus between social scientists and policymakers as an essential element and facilitating factor for development lies at the heart of several successful experiences, both institutional and governmental, as well as in innovative cases of private citizen organizations. The Forum was the occasion to mention these unanimously recognized experiences, as well as to present the innovative elements involved.

23. The first to be recognized was the role of think tanks as links between knowledge and political decision-making. The importance and quality of the relationship is in a way defined by the type of institution included in this category, ranging from private research centres and foundations that sponsor research related to political parties and economic groups, to organizations that promote sectoral or other specific interests. There are four basic roles that these centres fulfill:
 - a. Communication;
 - b. Policy legitimation;
 - c. Establishment of knowledge networks;
 - d. Support for specific policy.
24. Links between knowledge and society promoted by this type of institution have characteristics easily differentiated from those established by institutions such as universities, not only in terms of scientific quality and subject matter diversity, but also with regard to the type of interests that play a role in the definition of the nexus.
25. In some parts of the world, specific experiences within organizations or forums where policymakers and/or social scientists participate have permitted successful relationships between social science and policy, as presented in the following cases: Imbizos in South Africa, the Regional Councils in Queensland, Australia, and the participatory budgets of various municipalities in Brazil.
26. Positive experiences have also occurred when NGOs incorporate public officials and civil society (businessmen, media directors, etc.) into their boards of directors or action committees, where policy decisions regarding social problems are discussed with an eye toward the social sciences (several Latin American examples exist in Brazil, Ecuador, Chile and Peru).

Identification of the problems and challenges facing the social science – policy nexus

27. Although the preceding paragraphs show that a nexus exists and operates effectively, at least in some regions of the world, one must stress the fact that social scientists and policymakers still act primarily along paths that are not only independent, but also contradictory.
28. A debate arose as to the degree of independence from public power that social scientists can, or should, maintain under different circumstances. While some argue that a close government nexus may shape research along financial, political or ideological lines, others consider that social sciences can receive adequate financing without losing their independence.
29. There is no agreement regarding the role of the social scientist in public policy design. For some, this role should focus exclusively on explaining the causes and the context, and even evaluating the effects of policy, while remaining outside actual policy implementation. Others state that it is important for the social scientist to be involved in the development and administration of policy. There are several reasons behind this

difference in the interpretation of the role, notably differences in the “ethic” implicit in each profession, levels of experience, and the sustainability of technical decisions others.

30. On one hand, there are areas of investigation as yet unexplored, even though they involve problems that are a priority for our societies. Even if political decision makers generated the specific demand, social science does not include these priorities in its agenda, for reasons such as a legitimate need for autonomous research or a lack of adequate funding, but also due to differences in timeframes between the academic and political worlds. Finally, one can also observe a certain distrust of politics in the academic world (for example, a question was raised regarding the possibility of successful communication between specialists and public officials, stating that politics contaminates science). This lack of trust does not prevent social scientists from making demands on policy from a dogmatic perspective that precludes dialogue.
31. On the other hand, there are research topics where a significant level of understanding has been reached, but this knowledge is not taken into account – or only partially or marginally considered – by policymakers. This shows the skepticism with which policy decision-makers view the results produced by social science. Subject to requests and demands with very short deadlines, policy makers have serious difficulties using research which responds to a completely different timeframe. At the same time, the demands of the electoral calendar, as well as the communication requirements imposed by global political culture, represent obstacles to the use of scientific research and raise the question of the political sustainability of technical decisions and research results.
32. This conflict, which is both thematic and temporal, becomes a difficulty that social science faces in ensuring its accessibility and impedes the development of a solid and effective nexus. An exception arises where consulting is applied to overcome this barrier, although the results generated tend to respond to the specific needs of the stakeholders and may sometimes be lacking in scientific rigour. However, the Forum has pointed out specific problem areas that call for the attention and contribution of the social sciences.
33. For example, the importance of collective action and citizen participation as a source of innovation has become clear, but despite major impact on society, it has yet to be interpreted by social science. The environment gives a prime example of the divergence between the two extremes, where the absence of coordination between academia and public policy translates into a lack of strategic thinking. International agencies can play a fundamental role in this regard: on the one hand developing national development policy, emphasizing the incorporation of policy strategies and implementation; and on the other strengthening the bond between academia and public policy, especially with regard to the financing and promotion of research focused on generating strategic thinking.
34. The lack of concerted collaboration between researchers and political decision-makers can lead to important consequences and errors in strategic focus, both in the implementation of policy and in the definition of truly pertinent areas of investigation. This is what calls for a common agenda for both sectors. Inversely, when research and policy agendas converge, policymakers may have access to scientific data. For example, this has allowed for the proper handling of epidemics in Africa. Likewise, positive synergies have been generated for the implementation of policy through community involvement.

35. Social science can offer notable advances in concrete applications. An interesting example highlighted in the workshops is the creation of innovative frameworks for analysis, capable of generating debate on partially or completely flawed public policy. This topic was brought up in relation to healthcare and education, considered to be social services and thus provided publicly, while a segment of the political community – in various regions of the world – sees the provision of water and electricity as a business. The public provision of drinking water and electricity, acting directly on the health of the population, generates positive externalities and thus represents a social service. This sort of innovative analytical framework makes it possible to illustrate and correct flawed policy through participatory and transparent citizen action.

Bridging the gap between policy and social science

36. The Forum intended to encompass this dichotomy with the purpose of bridging the gap and reducing the distance between the extremes. The presentations during the Forum have highlighted the ways out of this impasse, which give rise to clear policy recommendations.
37. There is a general consensus regarding the lack of tools for social science to understand the processes generated by globalization, which in turn result in problems that policymakers must quickly respond to. There is also agreement on the insufficiency of the conceptual tools available today to social scientists to register the new and changing phenomena resulting from globalization. To this end there was insistence on the need to expand empirical research on existing cases of innovation. Finally, there was criticism of investigations far removed from reality and which do not address the requirements of the current situation.
38. In the same manner, the complex transformation processes that today's societies are going through and their impact on the various dimensions of social life have determined that social science must strive to define new paradigms useful to policy formulation. This is the basis for agreement on the need to redefine the scope and logic of the available categorization, and perhaps the invention of more appropriate alternatives resulting from the need for new theory in the course of empirical research. For example, regarding the family, it was pointed out that the policies that govern the production of information, and even those concerned with social intervention, remained biased by the traditional nuclear family model. The lack of gender focus in policies implemented in this area, and even in academic events, was also noted.
39. Researchers were urged to transmit their knowledge to public authorities using precise and direct language. Up to now, they have not been able to communicate their research findings because they neglect to consider the different "languages" and timeframes that each sector employs. A useful link can be found in the technical teams of the various ministries, since one assumes they are capable of policy development as well as understanding of scientific advances. Governmental technical teams should act as translators of scientific developments into policy programmes.

40. Additionally, the need to overcome technical barriers to access to the results of social science research was stressed, with relation both to physical access and to their language and format. Facilitating access to scientific output is the first concern, through the development of information systems that can simply connect policymakers with full text scientific documents, as well as condensed policy briefs. Secondly, a new methodology to publish the results of social science research is required. The policy recommendation derived from this conclusion points to the development of a complete information system – for example, within the scope of the MOST Programme – that can facilitate this link between policy and social science.
41. A necessary corollary to the use of these systems is the development of networks and connections between those who generate knowledge and those who need it. These networks – this Forum is the first example – would organize events to bring together and connect scientists with decision-makers. Thus, the need for a worldwide database of organizations involved with public policy was established, with the objective of improving communication among them and a view to building a network that would streamline the exchange of knowledge and experience.
42. Likewise, academic centres would be the location of choice to reestablish the nexus through the development of research agendas linked to local and national concerns. This raises the necessary issue of agenda coordination. There was agreement that, to achieve this objective, it was necessary for these institutions – in many cases the leading social science research centres – to achieve or regain strength, vitality, and autonomy in order to train analytical intellectuals, who will work to bridge the research-policy gap and take advantage of the enormous capacity these centres of production enjoy, in order to create closer ties between science, policy and social change.
43. There was a fundamental recommendation to strengthen regional coordination in the field of social policy. Focus was placed on the need for joint planning and evaluation, and on facilitating contact with research centres that could collaborate in this sense, that is, that could produce in relation to social demand.
44. Continued consolidation of the networks linking social development ministers is planned. In this sense, the consolidation of such a forum in Latin America, the establishment of one in Africa, and the planned inauguration of one in Asia are pointed out. Simultaneously, connections were established between different research centres and the attending ministers, in order to promote a collaborative relationship that will permit social policy, particularly at the regional and sub-regional level, to use social science research evidence and results. Emphasis is placed on the fact that the need to share experiences and coordinate existing resources must spread to intercontinental levels since, for example, Latin America and Africa could collaborate in several ways.
45. The need was indicated for UNESCO to develop a research programme that encompasses the social aspects of regional integration, and facilitates both analysis and dialogue on the subject. This programme will attempt to map and evaluate the progress made by regional organizations in the development of a social policy dimension within their integration projects. With the goal of promoting the social dimension of regional integration, an inter-regional dialogue will be facilitated, as well as policy exchange and capacity reinforcement processes among the regions. These initiatives may be implemented at

different levels that would include integration personnel, the academic community and society at large.

46. Importance was placed on promoting participation mechanisms for communities or society at large in the development of public policy, as well as developing awareness in individual actors of the importance of promoting the nexus between production and utilization of knowledge.
47. The fundamental role of international organizations in the promotion of the social science – policy nexus must be highlighted. It was agreed that, with the collaboration of the United Nations organizations and other pertinent international institutions, it was possible to intensify the analysis of the existing gap between both “domains” on the one hand, and on the other to search for adequate solutions and build the best possible mechanisms to overcome these obstacles.
48. The debate on human development in the face of new world realities established the need to rethink the issue in terms of reaching more egalitarian and balanced societies, based on the development of citizenship and democratic strengthening. Human development reports, such as the World Development Report and the Report of The World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization are real contributions derived from productive cooperation among United Nations organisms and the world of social research.

Section III - Conclusions

49. The various debates conducted during the Forum reconfirm the need for articulation between policy and social science. Integration between decision making and social science thinking is required in order to face the complex problems affecting the international community, and particularly the most vulnerable sectors, with greater efficiency.
50. However, as a result of the Forum, a certain opacity or pessimism is in evidence in the comments of a significant number of participants in reference to the nexus between the two domains. The difficulty of finding nodes to link together is a significant point in itself. It is the clearest demonstration that there exist structural elements that make integration of these two dimensions difficult, which therefore must be addressed by both policymakers and the academic world.
51. In any case, there is general agreement that globalization has created new social issues that transcend the national context. Migration, environmental degradation, the drug traffic and commercial sexual exploitation of children are, among others, social problems the description and explanation of which go beyond the national scope. In this sense, it has become a fundamental challenge of social science to contribute to the construction of regional and international social policy.
52. In particular, it should be a priority in creating this nexus to develop joint and coordinated solutions to the most urgent and dramatic problems facing our societies today, such as hunger and poverty, educational shortcomings, health, and the degradation of the environment, which are the five areas referred to in the eight Millennium Development Goals.
53. Economic integration can help resolve some of the problems associated with the competitiveness, growth and development of countries, but this is not enough. The social and cultural dimension of integration is necessary. Because of this, the important regional integration processes that have begun and are being consolidated on several continents require the formulation of integrated social policy that will allow them to face the problems of social exclusion. In this sense, the tools provided by social science, in terms of methodology and content, are essential.
54. It is important to view social policy from a broader, more integrated perspective, where the State, academia, civil society and international organisms create positive synergies to articulate policy and social science. The university has been identified as one of the best institutions to generate the knowledge that enriches the formulation of public policy.
55. A broad consensus arose around the need to strengthen public participation forums at the local, regional and national level, in order to identify, formulate and evaluate policy directed at resolving social problems and imbalances. To this effect several “best practices” were highlighted, practices which should be the focus of systematic documentation which would facilitate their widespread transmission.

56. From the collection of national and regional experiences presented in the Forum's workshops, one can identify other "nodes" or "bridges" of articulation between public policy and social science:
- a. The relationship between programme and project information and administration which can be established based on research-action processes and perspectives, for example, in participative diagnoses for policy formulation.
 - b. The identification and communication of real-world experiences in analogous cases – best practices – which allow greater possibilities for decision makers to build consensus for a particular policy decision.
 - c. The evaluation of public policy as a information gathering, processing and analysis process, with the objective not only of transparency or accountability, but foremost as a learning process to obtain feedback and redefine policy and the social and institutional spaces where it is executed. The Chilean case proposed in the workshop titled "What sort of nexus for what sort of policy?", a comparative study of public policy in five fields of political intervention in Chile, is an absolutely relevant example.
 - d. The use of current – and/or the development of new – information systems for the identification, formulation and follow-up of national and regional policy decisions.
 - e. The establishment of think tanks, national observation centres and research centres for the communication and publication of policy, the establishment of knowledge networks, and the support for specific public policy decisions.
57. A concrete strategy of articulation to develop a nexus between public policy and social science is, without a doubt, to use the conclusions and information resulting from events such as this Forum and link them to the decisions and agreements of the regional Social Development Ministers forums, as well as to those of academic institutions.
58. Therefore, it was deemed that international cooperation has a relevant role to develop in the consolidation of these mechanisms and forums, in the facilitation of international dialogue, in the strengthening of social science research capabilities, and in the financing of scientific investigation relevant to policy, especially for developing countries. The importance of transparent bidding processes for the development of research projects demanded by policy making organisms was also stressed, as well as increased state and private financing, democratically published and granted, and strengthening of university programmes aimed at ensuring these objectives.
59. In order to achieve the mentioned objectives and carry out the related initiatives, it was agreed upon to request the necessary financial support from regional development banks, multilateral agencies, international cooperation organizations and national governments.

Buenos Aires Declaration

calling for a new approach to the social science – policy nexus

We, the participants in the International Forum on the Social Science – Policy Nexus, which has brought together for the first time social scientists and policy makers from more than eighty countries in all the regions of the world, coming from United Nations agencies, universities and governments, representing the full range of involvement in both social science and policy and meeting on the occasion of the closing plenary session of the Forum in Buenos Aires on February 24 2006, after four days of discussions organized in the cities of Buenos Aires, Rosario, Córdoba and Montevideo.

Inspired by the Declaration of the 1995 World Summit on Social Development, the United Nations Millennium Declaration, the 2005 World Summit Outcome Resolution, as well as by flagship reports on human development, world development and inequality by United Nations agencies and the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization.

Taking note of the demands placed on social science research by the development goals of the international community and of the impetus given by these and other international documents and initiatives.

Taking into consideration the Budapest Declaration on Science and the Use of Scientific Knowledge adopted by the World Conference on Science, which emphasizes the necessary enhancement of dialogue between science and society, as well as the Lisbon and Vienna Declarations on Social Sciences, both of which stress the indispensable contribution of social science to the social development objectives of the international community.

Taking into account several United Nations reports highlighting the sharp increase in inequalities between and within countries, and *greatly concerned* that the universal thrust of human rights, human dignity and justice is in many instances being eroded under contemporary social and economic pressure.

Assuming that the Millennium Development Goals and other internationally agreed development goals are not only the statement of new moral purpose but also the minimum threshold compatible with the proclaimed values of the international community, and *affirming* that failure to make serious progress towards achieving them would entail tremendous cost in terms of human lives, quality of life and social development.

Convinced that without moral vision and political will, the challenges of the Millennium Development Goals cannot be met, that meeting these goals requires new knowledge used in innovative ways and better use of existing knowledge, and that, in this regard, the social sciences have a crucial contribution to make in formulating development policy.

Taking note that addressing hunger and poverty, lack of education, poor health and environmental degradation – the five areas to which the eight Millennium Development Goals relate –, is crucial for human welfare, social and economic development, the achievement of social cohesion and the consolidation of democratic governance. None of these areas is solely

within the purview of social science, but without social sciences none is fully comprehensible or capable of being addressed.

We thus state our conviction that better use of rigorous social science can lead to more effective policies and outcomes. Such use requires strengthening linkages between the social sciences and policies for social and economic development. For the knowledge that the social sciences seek is precisely the knowledge that policy needs. The world needs new forms of interaction between social scientists and policy actors – and innovative spaces to make them possible.

Commending UNESCO, the government of Argentina and the government of Uruguay for their initiative in launching the process that has led to the International Forum on the Social Science – Policy Nexus, it is with these urgent concerns in mind that we formulate the following recommendations and bring them to the attention of the international community.

1. We strongly encourage UNESCO to strengthen this initiative and facilitate similar initiatives at the regional level at the request of its member States and in cooperation with other United Nations agencies, funds and programmes.
2. We call upon UNESCO, through the MOST Programme and in close cooperation with the other organizations, institutes, funds and programmes of the United Nations system, to explore the ways and means for ensuring strengthened synergies and complementarities between the various policy-oriented social science research programmes within the United Nations system as a whole and international social science organizations and civil society.
3. With due respect for the autonomy of social science research, we encourage the establishment of new networks and the strengthening of existing ones at the national and regional level to bring together social scientists, policy-makers, and non-governmental and grassroots organizations around their shared concern for the urgent demands of social and economic development.
4. We call attention to the existence of Fora of Ministers for Social Development at regional as well as subregional levels in developing countries and suggest the creation and consolidation of permanent nexuses between the latter and the above mentioned networks.
5. We therefore suggest that the *International Forum on the Social Science – Policy Nexus*, otherwise known as the *Buenos Aires Process*, be organized regularly in order to formalize and promote this linkage between both types of networks at the international level.
6. We call upon the regional organizations such as MERCOSUR and the African Union, in association with social scientists and civil society, to further develop the social dimensions of regional integration, and call upon the United Nations to facilitate inter-regional dialogues on regional social policies.
7. We call upon existing funding programmes, in particular donor agencies and multilateral and regional development banks, to participate in these new spaces of dialogue.

8. We also call upon United Nations, regional and national funding agencies to place particular emphasis in their programming on the development and enhancement of social science research capacities in the developing countries, with special reference to Africa, and to finance policy relevant social science research.
9. We further call upon governments to support social science research and use evidence from research in formulating social and economic policies.
10. We stress that implementation of these recommendations requires relevant funding mechanisms and appropriate institutional structures to support both research capacities and the dissemination of social science research results. We further invite all academic communities, civil society, non-governmental organizations, governments, United Nations agencies, funding agencies and other relevant stakeholders to work towards this end.
11. We call upon all participating national and United Nations agencies to ensure dissemination of this Declaration and of the work of the Forum to all relevant parties that can contribute to the implementation of the present recommendations.

Finally, we thank the governments of Argentina and Uruguay, and the local authorities and universities of Buenos Aires, Montevideo, Rosario and Córdoba, for their major contribution to the success of the Forum and for their warm hospitality. We express our gratitude to the various organizations that contributed to this effort, in particular: UNRISD, UNDESA, ILO, the World Bank, UNU-CRIS, the International Social Science Council and the regional social science networks.