

Hundred and fifty-sixth Session

156 EX/12
PARIS, 13 April 1999
Original: English

Item 3.4.1 of the provisional agenda

**MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT OF THE
MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS (MOST) PROGRAMME**

SUMMARY

Pursuant to the feasibility study of the MOST programme (140 EX/Decision 5.4.1) and resolution 5.2 adopted by the General Conference at its 27th session, an external mid-term evaluation of the UNESCO-MOST programme was undertaken. The external evaluators have taken full account of the themes and guidance suggested by the MOST Intergovernmental Council report of its third session (July 1997) and have recommended lines of action for the coming four years of the MOST programme, in addition to recommending that a strategic vision be developed in 1999 for this period (1999-2002).

Decision required: paragraph 7.

INTRODUCTION

1. The content of the MOST programme was defined in a feasibility study approved by the Executive Board at its 140th session in 1992 and the General Conference at its 27th session in 1993. This mid-term evaluation was requested in the feasibility study, which also asks for a full evaluation in the year 2002.

2. It is worthwhile to note that the MOST programme is the only one of the five intergovernmental scientific programmes within UNESCO to have built in two evaluations over an eight-year period. The purpose of the mid-term evaluation was to assess the functioning of the MOST programme in terms of its original objectives and, on the basis of this assessment, to make specific recommendations to the programme for the coming four years (1999-2002).

3. In its 3rd session (July 1997), MOST-IGC discussed the preparation of the mid-term evaluation and provided guidelines for it. These included:

- (a) the need to include within the evaluation itself, the possibility of questioning whether the original objectives of the programme remain appropriate, or whether they need to be adapted to further enable the programme to achieve its overall purpose;
- (b) the possibility that the evaluation take into account gaps in coverage within MOST activities, either geographic or issue-based, such as, for example, the need for placing more emphasis on project development focusing on questions related to citizenship, democracy and pluralism;
- (c) the importance of selecting evaluators who have experience with other international research programmes that share the innovative aims and objectives of the MOST programme;
- (d) consulting national liaison committees and UNESCO National Commissions to provide national information on the MOST programme and using survey questionnaires as part of the evaluation methodology;
- (e) IGC in their last session also suggested that it would be inappropriate to attempt to assess any policy impact at this mid-term stage of the MOST programme.

4. The Government of the Netherlands offered the Secretariat the possibility of drawing on the experience cumulated in evaluation procedures embedded within the Dutch policy and academic systems. With their support, the Secretariat established an agreement with the Faculty of Social Science, Utrecht University, which took responsibility for the evaluation.

5. The report (Annex I*) was examined by the Scientific Steering Committee of the MOST programme, in its sixth session, on 18 and 19 February 1999. SSC transmitted their views in their report to the fourth session of the MOST Intergovernmental Council (22-26 February 1999), which formulated a recommendation (Annex II).

6. The Director-General has the following observations to make on the report which is included as Annex I:

* The report is available only in English, French and Spanish.

- (a) This external evaluation was foreseen in the feasibility study of the programme. It is a mid-term evaluation, the overall purpose being to learn from the programme's four years of activity (1994-1998) in order to adjust its functioning and to ensure that it operates so as to achieve its stated objectives.
- (b) The evaluation was conducted by an external team of evaluators from the Netherlands, through a contractual agreement between the MOST programme and the University of Utrecht, with the backstopping of the Central Programme Evaluation Unit (BPE/CEU).
- (c) The professionalism and frank tone of the report have been appreciated. The idea of an independent mid-term evaluation is a viable way of improving the Organization's capacity to monitor its programmes, and to focus on their management results.
- (d) This report was presented to and debated at the fourth session of the MOST Intergovernmental Council. The Director-General took into account the Council's recommendations on the mid-term evaluation report in formulating these comments.
- (e) The relevance of the original objectives of the programme is confirmed by the evaluators. Hence the prominent position given to it in Major Programme II for the 2000-2001 biennium (draft 30 C/5). The evaluators note that the "nursery context" is at the same time a weak point, justifiable for an initial phase but requiring considerable streamlining thereafter.
- (f) The report points to the growth in the number of themes treated within the MOST programme, and suggests streamlining them so as to enhance the programme's coherence. While agreeing with the need to focus the programme on its key objective of relating research to policy, the Director-General supports the MOST Council's recommendation to maintain the thematic diversity, in conformity with 155 EX/Decision 4.1, paragraph 49, that the programme further address the issue of poverty reduction and social exclusion. The evaluators also stress that MOST has been capable of generating several social science research projects with an explicit policy component worldwide or with an international and regional span. A majority of MOST projects are linking northern and southern networks and research capacities.
- (g) The need for extrabudgetary support for MOST activities was highlighted. The Director-General would like to invite the Member States to provide such support, both financial and institutional, through, for example, MOST national liaison committees. The evaluators note that the MOST objective of establishing and supporting linkages between social scientific research and key policy issues and policy-makers, is, of course, laudable and attainable. The aim of international networking and interdisciplinary and comparative approaches is a long-term objective, that requires a programme of long-term duration. This is a major point, since such linkages should be the distinctive feature and the value added of MOST.
- (h) In view of improving the functioning of the programme, the Director-General supports the proposal made by the evaluators aimed at the Secretariat developing a strategic vision for the programme. In a number of cases, MOST projects have

produced a valuable institutional impact since new research centres, inspired by MOST projects, have been set up in Australia (CAPSTRANS) and Argentina (a Social Development Observatory, financed by the World Bank). Turkey recently declared its intention to create a MOST Centre on Social Integration and Migration.

- (i) In a number of projects fruitful cooperation between MOST and natural science research programmes is ongoing (like IHP and CSI for a network of Historic Coastal City Centres; the Cities, Social Transformations and the Environment Project; and the Northern Circumpolar Regions Project).

7. Taking account of the mid-term evaluation report and the Director-General's comments, the Executive Board may wish to consider a draft decision along the following lines:

The Executive Board,

1. Having examined document 156 EX/12,
2. Underscoring the importance of the mid-term evaluation as a positive means to monitor and improve the MOST programme,
3. Welcoming the objective and external nature of this mid-term evaluation,
4. Supporting the measures recommended by the Director-General in his observations on the conclusions and recommendations of the external evaluators,
5. Invites the Director-General to continue to develop and reinforce the MOST programme.

ANNEX I

**MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE UNESCO PROGRAMME
*MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS (MOST)***

FINAL REPORT

Dirk Kruijt & Kees Koonings

Research assistance: Chris van der Borgh

*Utrecht University/CERES Research School
The Netherlands*

14 January 1999

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

1. Terms of reference (ToR), methodology, evaluation procedure	1
2. Core business of the MOST programme: Objectives, Themes, Fields of Action	4
3. The project portfolio of the MOST programme	6
4. Funding	14
5. Staff and Management of the MOST Programme, Institutional and Organisational Context	17
6. Conclusions	20
Appendix 1	21
Appendix 2	22

Executive Summary

Preamble

This report contains the results of the *mid-term evaluation* of the UNESCO intergovernmental social science research programme on the *Management of Social Transformation* (MOST). MOST was approved by the UNESCO General Conference at its 27th session in 1993, and started operation at the beginning of the 1994/1995 biennium. MOST is part of the Social and Human Science Sector (SHS); the MOST secretariat is located in the Social Research and Policy division (SRP) of SHS. The MOST programme is part of UNESCO Major Programme II (Sciences in the Service of Development) as sub-programme II.5.1 within (programme II.5: Social and Human Sciences and Social Development) (29 C/5).

The main objective of MOST is to promote and support international networks that conduct interdisciplinary and comparative social scientific research with a manifest policy relevance and impact.

The general Terms of Reference for this mid-term evaluation were to assess the relationship between objectives, resources, and scope of the programme; to assess the functioning of the programme; to assess the impact of the programme; to provide specific and implementable recommendations for the second four year term of the programme

The evaluation team (or mission) carried out its research and analysis between October 1, 1998 and January 8, 1999. The mission made use of the following research methods: analysis of relevant documentation; open interviews; a survey of project leaders by means of an e-mailed questionnaire; a query of National Liaison Committee chairpersons (also by e-mail). The fourth session of the Intergovernmental Council of MOST will be consulted on this report and formulate their recommendations to the Director-General.

The main findings of the evaluation mission are summarized below, addressing subsequently the core business of the programme, the project and network portfolio, funding, organisation, management and institutional context.

Core business: objectives, themes, fields of action

Merits. During its first phase (1994-1998) the MOST programme was established as the only intergovernmental social science programme within UNESCO. This has strengthened the role of the social sciences within UNESCO and has enabled UNESCO to support the formation of a number of research networks across the world that address problems of multiculturalism, cities, globalization, as well as cross-cutting issue areas of migration, governance, and social exclusion. MOST seed money has been important to set up these networks and the MOST label has provided many of them with the necessary legitimacy to broaden their scope. The basic objective of supporting comparative research and policy linkages is laudable.

Flaws. After this first phase, the MOST themes show little consistency in themselves. In addition, a number of non-research, 'action-oriented' development projects has been added to the programme. This has led to some confusion as to the core fields and specific field of action of the programme. Also there seems to be less than optimal clarity as to the funding role of MOST: to provide seed money rather than to fund research activities in full.

Project portfolio

Merits. MOST projects and networks show a good representativeness in terms of thematic and geographical coverage. More than half of the projects for which sufficient information has been obtained qualify either as 'good' or 'fair' in terms of relevance, academic output (quantity), additional funding, and overall performance, MOST seed money and labelling has been important for setting up a number of quite promising research and policy networks.

Flaws. The MOST project portfolio shows too much heterogeneity in terms of focus within the official programme themes. In addition, financing difficulties, member states' requests, and other factors have led to the incorporation of a number of rather conventional development projects which lack a research component, thus blurring the core programme objective of supporting international comparative research and policy projects and networks.

Among those projects and networks that fit this objective, a number of them has failed to secure sufficient additional project-level funding in relation to their original size and scope. This may hinder the execution of project activities and the sustainability of networks.

Although the quantity of academic output seems overall fair, much less clarity exists at this stage regarding the policy linkages and impact of the projects. To expect that the MOST Clearing House serves as an effective vehicle for this objective is unwarranted.

The selection procedure is insufficiently rigorous with respect to the expected academic and policy impact of the proposals and to their financial feasibility. The role of the SSC is to be adjusted to the priorities of the second phase of MOST.

Project monitoring needs to be done on the basis of systematic criteria and reporting.

The contribution of MOST National Liaison Committees in supporting projects and networks falls short of expectations.

Funding

Merits. MOST has a consolidated regular budget in the same order of magnitude as the major natural science counterpart programmes. Given the objectives of the programmes, there seems to be a good potential to strengthen additional (extra-budgetary) funding at the programme level.

Flaws. MOST encounters uncertainty and instability with respect to the real allocation of its regular budget and decentralized funds. In addition, the availability of extra-budgetary funding is unclear and limited. Efforts by the MOST Secretariat to attract additional programme level funding could be increased and must be fine-tuned within SHS and UNESCO as a whole.

Staff, management, organisational and institutional context

Merits. MOST has consolidated its staff and governance structure within UNESCO, despite the sometimes complex and contradictory elements that exist within the UNESCO bureaucracy. MOST enjoys support among the IGC member states and counts with an independent SSC of international senior scholars of reputation.

Flaws. There appears to be an overall problem of programme-level intra-institutional demarcation, (strategic) management, monitoring, documentation, reporting, profile, and visibility of the MOST programme. Policy with respect to result dissemination and publication must be made more professional academically and more effective.

Recommendations and Plan of Action

We recommend the implementation of the second phase of the MOST programme, during which the strong points of the programme are further consolidated. To address the flaws that the evaluation mission identified, a large number of specific recommendations are listed in the reports, addressed to either the MOST Secretariat, the IGC, the SSC, or to MOST/UNESCO in general. The recommendations are listed in Table A1. They reflect, in summary, recommended actions on the following issues (Box 3 in the conclusions of the Report):

1. Strengthen the profile and visibility of the Programme both within UNESCO and towards the outside research and policy community.
2. Improve the publication policy within the programme.
3. Streamline the organisation and staffing of the core MOST Secretariat.
4. Enhance the Programme's management practice and performance.
5. Adopt more rigorous and consistent procedures relating to the MOST project portfolio so that it is in line with the core MOST programme objectives.
6. Design and implement additional programme level funding strategies.
7. Stimulate reflection on the thematic priorities and coherence of the programme in the longer term.

As a final and overall recommendation, the mission strongly recommends that a strategic vision be developed that incorporates these issues. Subsequently, this should result in a concrete *Plan of Action* to be prepared by the MOST Secretariat, in consultation with the SSC and the Bureau of the IGC, to be presented to the Director General for approval and subsequent implementation. This Plan of Action should be concluded by the end of this calendar year (1999).

Section 1

Terms of reference (ToR), methodology, evaluation procedure

1.1 Preamble

This report contains the results of the *mid-term evaluation* of the UNESCO intergovernmental social science research programme on the *Management of Social Transformation* (MOST). MOST was approved by the UNESCO General Conference at its 27th session in 1993, and started operation at the beginning of the 1994/1995 biennium. MOST is part of the Social and Human Science Sector (SHS); the MOST secretariat is located in the Social Research and Policy division (SRP) of SHS. The MOST programme is part of UNESCO Major Programme II (Sciences in the Service of Development) as sub-programme II.5.1 (programme II.5: Social and Human Sciences and Social Development) (29 C/5).

The preparation of the Programme started in 1992, with a Feasibility Study, which involved two international meetings and extensive consultations with close to 400 individuals and institutions. As a result of this process, the generic title of the Programme and its three rather broad themes were selected and submitted to the approval of UNESCO's governing bodies.

MOST is organised as an intergovernmental social science programme (similar to a number of older programmes in the natural science sector). MOST is governed by an Intergovernmental Council (IGC), while also an independent Scientific Steering Committee (SSC) exists for the selection of projects and the supervision of overall scientific standards. MOST is directly administered by an Executive Secretary (at the same time the director of SRP) and a number of project specialists (also indicated as 'staff members', 'project officers', or 'monitors') posted within SHS/SRP or smaller related units. MOST is expected to operate in close co-operation with local and regional UNESCO offices, with UNESCO National Commissions, with MOST National Liaison Committees (NLC), and with multilateral, national, non-governmental and private donor and research funding agencies.

The main objective of MOST is to promote and support international networks that conduct interdisciplinary and comparative social scientific research with a manifest policy relevance and impact. Under the broad umbrella of the 'management of social transformations', the programme - following the feasibility study issued in August 1992 - focuses on three main themes:¹

- (1) the management of change in multi-cultural and multi-ethnic societies;
- (2) cities as arenas of accelerated social transformation;
- (3) coping locally and regionally with (global) economic, technological and environmental transformations.

These themes are short-handed as multicultural societies, cities, and local/global. In the course of the first 4 years of the programme, 3 cross-cutting issue-areas have been added as relevant dimensions of the three major themes: governance, poverty and exclusion, and migration, in response to UN system-wide priorities.

1

Feasibility Study on the Establishment of an Intergovernmental Programme in the Social Sciences. UNESCO, 140 EX/11, Paris, 20 August 1992, pp. 9-10.

At the start of the MOST programme, a mid-term evaluation was planned, to be carried out after the first 4 years of the execution of the programme (1994-1998) to assess the overall quality, functioning and impact of MOST and to formulate specific and implementable recommendations for the 1998-2002 stage of the MOST programme. The Terms of Reference for the evaluation mission are reproduced in section 1.2. In September 1998, the evaluation was contracted out to a research team from the CERES research school and the Faculty of Social Sciences of Utrecht University. This team was composed of Dirk Kruijt, Kees Koonings, and Chris van der Borgh.

1.2 ToR

In September 1998, the following Terms of Reference for the evaluation were established, bearing in mind the observations of the June 1997 session of the IGC.

1.2.1 To deliver, between October 1, 1998 and January 31, 1999, a publishable evaluation report based upon a mid-term review study of the MOST programme. The report length will be 20-30 pages.

1.2.2 The report will consist of:

- * an executive summary
- * global argumentation of the ToR terms based on data gathered by the mission
- * series of explicit recommendations

1.2.3 General ToR statement

- * To assess the relationship between objectives, resources, and scope of the programme
- * To assess the functioning of the programme
- * To assess the impact of the programme
- * To provide specific recommendations that can be implemented for the second four year term of the programme

1.2.4 Operational issues

- 1.2.4.1 The review will cover the process level of the programme, organisational mechanisms, target public, key partners, and network structure
- 1.2.4.2 The review will assess the impact in terms of desired academic networks and desired academic and policy publics
- 1.2.4.3 The review should supply an assessment of the 'real' functioning of the national MOST liaison committees, and the institutional context of MOST (including internal monitoring procedures and external quality control)
- 1.2.4.4 The review will assess the balance between MOST funding and other donors financing (cost sharing with multi- and bilateral donors, other official and private scientific funding agencies)

- 1.2.4.5 The review will assess the pathways of selected projects from idea-proposal-handling and approval-execution-reporting
- 1.2.4.6 The review will assess the balance between available funding and activities (input-output)
- 1.2.4.7 The review will generate proposals and, if necessary, suggestions for improvements for the next four years

1.2.5 Methodology

The review will be based on desk study of relevant programme documents, open interviews (in situ or by telephone) with MOST governing bodies, staff members, other relevant UNESCO staff members, and representatives of partners, and an e-mailed survey of a sample of relevant specific projects and partnerships.

1.3 Methodology and procedure

The evaluation team (or mission) carried out its research and analysis between October 1, 1998 and January 8, 1999. The mission made use of the following research methods:

- (1) analysis of relevant documentation
- (2) open interviews
- (3) a survey of project leaders by means of an e-mailed questionnaire
- (4) a query of NLC chairpersons (also by e-mail)

These data were gathered during three visits to the UNESCO office in Paris in October (5-8 and 20-22) and November (23-25), 1998; the survey was conducted from Utrecht.

The mission consulted a wide variety of documents: the C/5 programme and budget statements; the MOST feasibility study; MOST basic texts with rules, bylaws and procedures; the reports of the meetings of the IGC; the reports of the meetings of the SSC; a number of working papers and policy papers issued by MOST; a number of MOST Newsletters; a variety of project-related documents and reports.

The mission conducted extensive, in-depth interviews with the MOST Executive Secretary/SRP Director, with all project specialists active within the MOST programme, with representatives of other SHS levels and units (AO/SHS, SHS/ADG, Chief/CFD), natural science units (IHP, ADG/ENV [by telephone from the Netherlands]), and the central services (BPE). In general, responsiveness was felt to be good and open.

The response to the project leaders survey was quite satisfactory and valid, providing additional insights with regard to a sample of 26 MOST projects (from complete project inventory listed in Table A2). The response to the NLC query was very unsatisfactory: only three questionnaires were returned prior to our deadline. As a consequence, the mission's insight in the role of the NLC is sketchy, so is that part of the 1.2.4.3 point of the ToR given above.

Preliminary findings and recommendations were presented and discussed at UNESCO on December 17, 1998. The results of this discussion have been incorporated in the present report. Subsequently this report will be presented to the fourth session of the IGC in February 1999 who will transmit it with their comments and recommendations to the Director General. Hence this report concludes the external appreciation of the programme but the discussion in the IGC remains an explicit part of the evaluation process.

Section 2

Core Business of the MOST Programme: Objectives, Themes, Fields of Action

2.1. Outline and merits

- 2.2.1 MOST is the only intergovernmental UNESCO programme in social sciences, which gives it a certain visibility, coherence and attractiveness for additional funding from outside.
- 2.1.2 The fact that the MOST programme, after four years of its functioning, has acquired prestige within UNESCO, in other UN organizations and in the social sciences community, is a strong merit. Other comparable UNESCO programmes, all of them natural science programmes, do recognize its early start and rapid expansion, as well as its capacity to acquire prestige inside and outside UNESCO, as an indication of success.
- 2.1.3 On several occasions, the MOST label has been successfully applied as fund raising instrument and as a kind of mechanism obtaining government support.
- 2.1.4 MOST has been capable of generating several social science research projects with an explicit policy component world wide or with an international and regional span. A majority of MOST projects are linking Northern and Southern networks and research capacities.
- 2.1.5 The creation of networks between several national social sciences communities is another strong point of the MOST programme. The MOST programme has contributed to discontinue the tendency of a certain regional provincialism and an over-concentration of agenda-setting and research designing in a very few countries.
- 2.1.6 The MOST objective of establishing and supporting linkages between social scientific research and key policy issues and policy makers, is, of course, laudable and attainable. The aim of international networking and interdisciplinary and comparative approaches is a long term objective, that requires a programme of long term duration. This is a major point, since such linkages should be the distinctive feature and the value-added of MOST.

- 2.1.7 Concerning the fields of action of the MOST programme, during its first phase (1994-1998), a broad thematic approach has been followed, as a kind of safety net and a 'nursery context' for a variety of bottom-up initiatives and projects. In fact, around thirty projects, international networks and MOST-related activities have been developed during the first phase.
- 2.1.8 Beyond its core projects, MOST has been instrumental in establishing working partnerships with other organizations and programmes, and in developing jointly MOST-related activities.

2.2. *Flaws*

- 2.2.1 The 'nursery context' is, at the same time a weak point, justifiable for an initial phase but requiring considerable streamlining thereafter.
- 2.2.2 The three broadly defined original themes (multiculturalism, cities, global-local) show, after the initial phase 1, limited focus in themselves. Three additional cross-cutting dimensions have been added since the inception of the programme (poverty and social exclusion, governance, migration), mainly in response to demands from the Member States and the UN System.
- 2.2.3 The development of action-projects which do not have research components has led to a situation in which there is less clarity as to the nature and purpose of MOST activities.
- 2.2.4 There seems to be also an ambiguity with respect to the MOST programme instruments, at least in the earlier stages. Does the programme provide seed money or project funding? It was meant to provide seed money only, but its procedures leave the impression that it is a funding programme, all the more so that the SSC has been approving the projects. Furthermore, the submission criteria are not very specific about this.

2.3. *Recommendations*

- 2.3.1 For the next, more mature phase of the MOST programme, we recommend various streamlining operations, the most important of them being *distinguishing* between core MOST activities on the one hand, and activities associated with them, or developed as spin-offs on the other.
- 2.3.2 We recommend the reconfirmation of the social research and policy interface as the major *raison d'être* for MOST. To the extent that MOST is to implement development-projects, the latter should include a strong research and policy component.
- 2.3.3 The core programme activities should be guided by the original criteria of international comparative and inter- or multidisciplinary research with an explicit policy component.

- 2.3.4 We recommend the application of the quality statement as expressed during the first meeting of the SSC of the MOST programme²: "There will be a relatively few number of major projects, rather than numerous small projects".
- 2.3.5 We recommend a clearer focusing of the MOST research and policy mission. Our clear preference for the future stages of MOST (possibly after 2002) would be the adoption of one, central guiding theme that would position the MOST programme in a niche with respect to other UN agencies and within the international social science community.

Section 3

The project portfolio of the MOST programme

Disclaimer: the ToR of this mid-term evaluation did not ask for in-depth and specific appreciation of performance at the project level. Hence we do not claim that our general appreciation of the project portfolio does full credit to all detailed merits; neither does it point to all flaws of each individual project. Our qualifications are based upon in-depth interviews with all MOST project officers, scattered available project documents and output at UNESCO HQ, and an e-mailed questionnaire sent out to all project co-ordinators. Eventually, our information allowed for the more or less systematic consideration of a sample of 26 projects of varying size, scope and duration. Projects started between 1994 and 1998; a few projects have been concluded or discontinued. In this overview, we will address the following issues: content, impact (academic research as well as policy), network building and sustainability, project funding (separate from programme funding, addressed in section 4), selection and monitoring procedure.

3.1 Outline and merits

- 3.1.1 The projects cover all themes established by MOST as key areas of activity. They include several social scientific disciplines such as demography, human geography, sociology, anthropology, political science. Also, the project portfolio covers a wide range of countries in East-Asia, Oceania, South Asia, Central Asia, Middle East, Sub-Saharan Africa, Eastern Europe, Western Europe, North America, Latin America, Caribbean.

3.1.2 More than half of the projects can be considered “good” in terms of their relevance for the core MOST objective of stimulating research and policy and in terms of attracting additional project funding. More than half of the projects can be considered overall as performing “good” or “fair”. Before discussing in some detail the different dimensions of the project portfolio, we present a summary aggregate overview of the portfolio in terms of our appreciation of relevance, academic output, policy impact, additional funding of each of the 26 projects, as good, fair or insufficient. It is important, however, to observe the caveat expressed at the beginning of this chapter. The purpose of this exercise is not to assess the merits and flaws of each individual project (which was beyond the ToR and the capabilities of the mission), but to show the variety in performance to underline the need to aim at a more consistent good performance of the projects in the portfolio.³

Table 1: Overall assessment of MOST project performance (number of projects reviewed in the sample, N=26)

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>good</i>	<i>fair</i>	<i>insufficient</i>	<i>Not clear/too soon</i>
Relevance to the MOST research and policy	14	7	4	1
Quantity of academic output	13	2	6	5
Policy impact	9	5	5	7
Additional funding	16	3	5	2
Overall	12	9	2	3

Source: project survey and staff officers’ interviews

3.1.3 The MOST programme has provoked considerable interest within academic circles world-wide. Many more proposals (over 120 so far) have been received than could be approved.

3.1.4 A number of projects demonstrate interesting linkages of research efforts, local policy-makers, target groups and NGOs. Slightly more than half of the reviewed projects appear to be good or fair in indicating policy impact. The mission identified 4 ways in which the policy impact of projects was outlined by project leaders or MOST project officers:

(a) projects generate new information that are useful to policy makers (like in the case of the New Migrations in the Asia-Pacific Region, see below in 3.3).

(b) projects offer a new angle on certain problems that can lead to a more effective or innovative (like in the case of the Drugs Trafficking project, see below in 3.3.) perspective on the issues.

³ The qualifications are based upon joint ratings by the two evaluators on the basis of all available project information.

- (c) research projects include contacts and joint efforts with policy makers, at all levels.
- (d) projects that are set up to train policy makers in certain areas, particularly when the training curricula are designed on the basis of MOST research results.

- 3.1.5 Some projects demonstrate relevant and probably sustainable international network building. Such networks arose out of the joint assessment of research and policy priorities by UNESCO, governments, and scientific institutions. In some cases, these networks started as national research groups which, through MOST, were able to acquire an international dimension.
- 3.1.6 More than half of the projects demonstrate a good co-funding track record, especially when the project leader is active and has good liaisons with donor agencies, and/or when optimal use is made of the leverage of the UNESCO label to access national funders, and UNESCO funding, like the Participation Programme.
- 3.1.7 In a number of cases, the MOST label proved helpful or even decisive in forming networks, in getting high level access to funders or governments, to convince researchers of the quality of the project, or to lend legitimacy to the networks activities. 10 of the 26 projects reviewed indicated clearly that the MOST label had been important in one or more of these ways. In a slightly higher number of projects, the MOST seed money has been important to start the projects and to sustain the international co-ordinating work. One project co-ordinator stated that "The UNESCO/MOST label was invaluable in opening doors. MOST seed money for co-ordination was invaluable too. Few funders will fund research co-ordination."

The two boxes below contain examples of exemplary MOST projects with regard to the issues outlined above.

Box 1

New Migrations and Growing Ethno-Cultural Diversity in the Asia-Pacific Region: Social and Political Issues (APMRN).

Twelve participating networks have been established by an equal number of national co-ordinators at research institutes and/or universities in Australia, Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, the Philippines, China (viz. Hong Kong SAR), Korea, Singapore and Thailand, all migrant receiving countries. The project leader acts as the general project manager.

With initial seed money from the Secretariat, additional funding was awarded through the participation programmes from countries such as New Zealand, Korea, Thailand and the Philippines. Other contributions have been provided by the Australian UNESCO Commission, Japanese and Australian universities (financial support and in kind contributions). The team leader considers the MOST seed money crucial but insufficient. The UNESCO/MOST label, however, has been very important in enlisting colleagues to participate and attracting governments and international agencies to offer support. A number of governments finance directly the national share of the project. The Centre for Asia Pacific Social Transformation Studies (CAPSTRANS), financed through the Australian social science research council for 8 years has recently been established in connection with the MOST APMRN project. By and large, the project and the centre could assure its institutional sustainability. The relative institutional weakness is the research capacity to be improved in Indonesia, China and Malaysia, and the lack of resources to bring in additional countries such as Cambodia and Vietnam.

In the year 2000, policy implications will be drawn from the comparative analysis. The co-operation between the project leader and the MOST monitor is fluent. The general annual output is reported by the co-ordinating group. Continuous contacts exist with the contributing donors. At this moment two edited volumes are published; there are plans for three more volumes. Four working papers and four newsletters are internally circulating.

Box 2

The Economic and Social Transformations Connected with Drug Trafficking.

The project leaders are based at the CNRS and ORSTOM in Paris. Five French, four Brazilian, four Mexican, two Indian, two German and one Chinese research institute, are participating in the project. After its approval by the SSC in 1996, United Nations Drug Control Programme (UNDCP) approved in 1997 a trust fund of \$255.000 for the period 1998/99. The MOST label, even more than the seed money, proved to be important during the negotiations with UNDCP, a process that took a year, and a proposal is current being considered for additional funding by the European Union.

The objectives of the project are explicitly policy-oriented: (1) the generation of fresh knowledge; (2) a better theoretical understanding; (3) production of comparative analyses; (4) the creation of an international network; and (5) analytical tools to provide assistance in public decision making. In November 1999 a concluding seminar is foreseen for the project. The involvement of the MOST programme officer in the project is strong. Until 1998, the output has been a direct publication of the research data in the World Drug Report, and the publication of an edited volume by Karthala (Paris). Several research papers and MOST-publications are published as an additional result.

- 3.1.8 In the majority of projects, the involvement of MOST project officers appears to be a very active and committed one. Individual MOST project officers are allotted MOST budget funds to honour the contribution agreed for each project. The contributions are specified in contracts between MOST and the project leader. MOST project officers are as a rule well informed about the state of affairs in the projects they accompany. In some cases, project officers have been active in stimulating the formulation of projects.
- 3.1.9 In a number of cases, MOST projects have produced a valuable institutional impact since) new research centres, inspired by MOST projects, have been set up in Australia (CAPSTRANS, see Box 1 above) and Argentina (a Social Development Observatory, financed by the World Bank). Turkey recently declared its intention to create a MOST centre on Social Integration and Migration.
- 3.1.10 In a number of projects fruitful co-operation between MOST and natural science research programmes is on-going (like with the IHP and CSI for a network of Historic Coastal City Centres; the Cities, Social Transformations and the Environment Project; and the Northern Circumpolar Regions Project).
- 3.1.11 There exists a Clearing House which provides on-line publications, a discussion platform, and information on the programme and its projects.
- 3.1.12 The mission observed that an international MOST Ph.D. prize has recently been

created as part of the programme's capacity building objective, which, because of its recent establishment, could not be evaluated.

3.2 *Flaws*

Content:

- 3.2.1 Given the bottom-up approach through which it was constituted, the project portfolio displays considerable heterogeneity within the themes. Difficulties in the field of programme level funding (to be reviewed in the next chapter), led to a situation in which MOST accepted, or even sought, an increasing number of so-called MOST-related 'pro-active projects'. These projects are seen as responding to direct needs of local organizations, governments or groups, or arise in some cases out of requests from other parts of the UNESCO or UN system. Their main attractiveness to MOST was that they could be more easily linked to (sometimes) substantial external co-financing. These projects are in fact conventional development interventions, with perhaps some external policy relevance, but insufficiently anchored in research.
- 3.2.2 As a result, the project portfolio does not always reflect strategic priorities defined by MOST, thereby precluding the constitution of a clear 'niche' for the programme. However, as noted before, this has in part been consciously accepted during the starting phase, to ensure the programme's "take off" in terms of size and visibility. At present, however, it is clearly important to become more selective with regard to the composition of the project portfolio.
- 3.2.3 Although in a majority of cases the quantity of academic output as listed by project leaders and MOST officials appears to be fair or good (see Table 1 above), little can be inferred about the quality of academic status. Projects that show published output through renowned academic publishers or international peer reviewed journals are still limited.
- 3.2.4 In certain projects, the comparative dimension of the research design is insufficiently developed, suggesting that replicability and cross-fertilisation of project findings is difficult.

Impact:

- 3.2.5 Academic impact is varying, measured from the quantity and nature of published output and meetings. Much published output is in the 'grey' circuit with uncertain distribution or audience. In a number of cases the project is still in an initial or data-gathering stage, so that no published output can currently be assessed.
- 3.2.6 At this mid-term stage, the policy impact is hard to gauge. A number of projects lack a systematic component of policy linkage. Policy-makers sometimes participate in project formulation or attend meetings, sometimes receive training or publications, but the impact of the project results on relevant decision making levels is as yet unclear.

- 3.2.7 This leads to the following question: in what ways and on what levels must the policy linkage of research projects be conceptualised and operationalised? There seems to be a need for a clear strategy and specific criteria for this dimension. This has been declared to be a priority objective for the 1999-2002 period, and relates to our recommendation 2.3.2.

Network sustainability:

- 3.2.8 A number of networks appear to have originated through different approaches a) *ad hoc*, in order to capture MOST funding or the MOST label; b) as a result of pre-existing contacts within the UNESCO orbit (membership on or contacts with national committees); c) as a result of initiatives by specific national donor countries; d) as a result of pro-active operations initiated from the MOST secretariat.
- 3.2.9 The sustainability of a number of the project partnerships is unclear, particularly if MOST funding ends or no additional funding is forthcoming, since it has been made clear that MOST financial support has been instrumental for the functioning of a number of networks as such.

Project Funding:

- 3.2.10 Many projects show inadequate funding, especially in view of the sometimes high funding requirements embedded in the project design, and despite the attraction of outside funding by a number of projects. Expected funding is either not forthcoming, irregular or late. Many projects combine high fund-raising ambitions with the inflexibility to comply with potential donor priorities. In many cases, project leaders are unable to assess the funding possibilities in each of the countries from which researchers participate in the project. In one third of the cases, inadequate funding has caused considerable down-sizing of the initial project design. A number of projects have been conceived independently of donor priorities which weakens their possibility to subsequently obtain additional funding. Other reasons given for the difficulty to attract adequate funding were insufficient contacts by project leaders or MOST project officers.

It must be made clear, however, that this mission has no claim to exhaustive insight in the financial status of all the projects. In part this reflects the lack of systematic monitoring that links project progress to overall programme performance. Table A2, annexed to this chapter, is hence meant to provide an illustration of the size of the projects in budgetary terms, both with respect to MOST funds and additional (outside) funding.

- 3.2.11 It was also repeatedly stated, that obtaining MOST seed money was no guarantee for receiving adequate additional funding. In a few cases, MOST seed money has been the only funding available. Such projects appear to linger on or whither away because of the lack of additional financing.

Selection, labelling, monitoring:

- 3.2.12 MOST selection criteria are designed for a project-funding approach. Demonstrable policy impact and funding feasibility have been insufficiently employed as selection/labelling preconditions, even if the SSC had introduced, as of 1996, a requirement of "project feasibility".
- 3.2.13 An independent SSC has been an asset for MOST and instrumental in establishing its scientific credibility. However, the tasks of the SSC, defined earlier on in relation to the bottom-up approach to project building, lost focus over time. While the SSC has screened all the MOST research projects, it has not assessed a majority of the MOST-associated, action-oriented projects. The SSC was informed of their existence and progress. Submission guidelines were prepared by the MOST secretariat and completed and approved by the SSC, but such guidelines were not appropriate for certain types of projects which later came into the orbit of MOST. There appears to be a need for greater clarity on the criteria of selection, especially with regard to the quality of the networks, the academic and policy targets and funding.

Recently, the MOST SSC has been renewed. It is to meet in February 1999 and to contribute to programme development in the next phase of MOST.

- 3.2.14 Despite the project knowledge that exists with the project officers, no systematic monitoring practice for project progress and performance exists. The mission had to invest considerable time and energy in collecting the basic project profile information. The quality and validity of available project information depend on the diligence of individual project leaders and MOST programme officers.
- 3.2.15 The contribution of the MOST NLCs to project formulation and funding appears to be minimal - with a few exceptions. The functioning of the NLCs is widely varying. In the majority of cases they seem to lack local support to play the desired stimulating and co-ordinating role in generating feasible MOST projects.

Clearing House:

- 3.2.16 The notion that the Clearing House is an important vehicle for achieving the policy impact of MOST projects and activities is questionable. Such policy impact can be achieved mainly if policy concerns are an integral part of MOST project design and if they are communicated to relevant policy makers, through a strategy that should from the outset be part of the project.

3.3 Recommendations

- 3.3.1 Review and systematically apply the selection/labelling criteria for MOST projects and networks in the light of:

- MOST objectives and core business
 - quality and relevance of research component
 - international and comparative design and implementation
 - demonstrability of policy linkage and impact of research efforts
 - funding feasibility
 - robustness and sustainability of networks and partnerships
 - projected results, output and publications, also in terms of aims, dissemination strategy and audience
 - adequacy of monitoring and reporting provisions
- 3.3.2 MOST projects should only be approved and supported if the feasibility of adequate co-funding on the project level has been demonstrated.
- 3.3.3 Development-oriented projects should be supported if, and only if, they have a strong research component.
- 3.3.4 Projects must continue to attract the active involvement of prominent, internationally recognized academic scholars and policy-makers, and particularly seek participation of scholars and policy-makers in developing countries.
- 3.3.5 MOST should utilise the academic resources available through the regional social science networks (FLACSO/ CLACSO, CODESRIA, AASSREC).
- 3.3.6 The involvement of MOST NLCs in project formulation and funding should be intensified and guided by the MOST secretariat.
- 3.3.7 The MOST secretariat should design and use criteria, mechanisms and procedures for project monitoring, also to enable MOST to carry out programme level monitoring and strategic planning and adjustment (see also chapter 5). A system should be designed at the programme and project level that fits also with UNESCO's results-based monitoring and evaluation system.
- 3.3.8 It is recommended that the central purpose of the Clearing House is to be a support service to the programme for dissemination of its activities and results. Its main features should be to:
- a) provide up- to-date information on ongoing MOST projects;
 - b) make relevant on-line publications available;
 - c) stimulate communication and exchange of findings and insights between MOST research networks.

Section 4

Funding

4.1 Outline and merits

- 4.1.1 Funding for the MOST programme can be derived from four main sources: the regular budget, provided through the bi-annual budget of UNESCO (the so-called C/5), part of which is decentralized; UNESCO's Participation Programme (requests introduced by Member States); extra-budgetary programme funding, e.g. funds supplied by other UN agencies such as UNDP or deposited by other donors at UNESCO earmarked for allocation to the programme ('funds-in-trust', 'special accounts'); direct co-funding of individual MOST projects by a wide variety of funding and donor agencies, public, non-governmental, and private. From its inception, the importance of adequate funding for the programme has been repeatedly stressed: in the Feasibility Study, during the sessions of the IGC and the SSC, and during the interviews the mission conducted as part of the evaluation. It has been acknowledged, from the outset, that the regular budgetary funding would not be sufficient to achieve the long-term objectives of the programme.
- 4.1.2 Over the past 4 years, the regular MOST budget expanded from approximately \$600,000 for its first 2 years (1994-95) to over \$2.6 million for the 1998-99 budget (of which some 30% were 'decentralized'). Its regular budget is now of the same order of magnitude as that of the large natural science programmes in ecology, oceanography, hydrology and geology (which range from \$2.3 to \$3.6 million). In addition, over \$500,000 has been allocated to the MOST action oriented related project on Cities: management of social transformation and the environment for the current 98/99 budget⁴. In budgetary terms, MOST appears to be consolidated within UNESCO's Major Programme II (Sciences in the service of development).
- 4.1.3 The evaluation mission sees a good potential for attracting substantial additional extra-budgetary funding for MOST at the programme level. Representatives of the member states of the IGC have been expressing their commitment to MOST and to the desirability of strengthening the funding base of the programme. It should be feasible to interest other potential sponsors on the basis of the mandate and the objectives of the MOST programme, provided direct fund-raising strategies are pursued.

4.2 Flaws

- 4.2.1 The funds earmarked for MOST appear to be subject to cuts and re-allocation which creates difficulties for programme and project development.

⁴ See UNESCO, *Approved Programme and Budget for 1998-1999* (29 C/5). Paris, 1997; pp. 36,61-64, 220-221, 223.

- 4.2.2 There are also problems with respect to the decentralised part of the regular MOST budget. Such problems appear to be related to the decentralization process in which the programme co-operation between HQ and the Field is such that decentralized MOST activities are not always implemented in conformity with the established MOST priorities.
- 4.2.3 The lack of clarity with respect to the 'real' versus the 'estimated' extra-budgetary funding that is allocated to the MOST programme (see the 29 C/5, p. 223, which estimated a total of \$ 3.5 million for the 1998/1999 biennium) presents another difficulty for programme and project development. Extra-budgetary funds are handled by the Bureau of Extra-budgetary Resources (BER) of UNESCO. It seems to the mission that social sciences are not considered as a priority when UNESCO negotiates with donors. The MOST secretariat should be more incisive and direct in dealing with BER and enlist their co-operation for providing extra funding, either at the programme or project level.

The mission does not claim to have fully grasped the complex intricacies of this problem. It seems clear, however, that greater transparency and control, as well as a more synergetic orientation across UNESCO, with respect to these matters is a vital precondition for actions that seek to increase the amount of extra-budgetary funding earmarked for the MOST programme.

- 4.2.4 Direct efforts made by the MOST management or by the SHS to attract programme-level extra-budgetary funding or funds-in-trust that are allocated to MOST could be increased. The increase of extra-budgetary funding would allow MOST to support larger and more robust research & policy networks, occasionally offering more than seed money, and making MOST-sponsored projects more attractive for co-financing by other funders.
- 4.2.5 As already outlined in the previous chapter, a system and practice of monitoring project-level funding in relation to the overall performance of the programme (especially its budget/external fund raising ratio) is missing (see also relevant recommendations in sections 3 and 5).

4.3 Recommendations

- 4.3.1 To have a real impact on building meaningful research and policy networks and projects, MOST should be able to offer more than seed money. To make this possible, the MOST management should assure:
- (1) An adequate regular budget, that is protected from the current instability. This should be claimed and supported by the members of the IGC
 - (2) Long term extra-budgetary commitments to the programme as such, provided by a core group of supporting bilateral donor country governments, scientific councils, foundations, and NGO-conglomerates, and clearly allocated to the MOST programme.

- 4.3.2 To achieve this, the programme management should reserve staff time, expertise and regular budget. It is advisable to develop direct contacts with potential sponsors through visits and meetings, in order to form a core group of supportive funding agencies that can identify with MOST and its activities.
- 4.3.3 Efforts to organise systematic availability of funding for MOST-labelled projects by national public donor agencies, national scientific funding organisations, private funding entities, or multilateral organisations should clearly be intensified.
- 4.3.4 The mission recommends that UNESCO organise on the basis of this evaluation a MOST information/donors meeting for Ministries of Education and Science, Research, Development Co-operation, national research councils, private foundations and multi-lateral agencies.
- 4.3.5 A more constructive mode of co-operation between MOST and other relevant units, such as BER, and the Co-operation for Development Unit within SHS, is strongly advisable.
- 4.3.6 BER and other relevant units should be enlisted to support such efforts by the MOST management.
- 4.3.7 IGC member states should be actively committed to raising extra-budgetary funding for MOST (similar to the situation in e.g. the IHP and IOC programmes). Member states are advised to follow up on their dedication to MOST with active commitment in helping to organise funding from national or international sources.

Section 5

Staff and Management of the MOST Programme, Institutional and Organisational Context

5.1. Outline and merits

5.1.1 UNESCO has a unique position and mandate to support multilateral efforts in the field of scientific research and to act as an umbrella and catalyst for international research efforts and networks dealing with international core problems. However, as all larger organizations, UNESCO has a complex and sometimes contradictory bureaucracy, as confirmed by all interviewed persons and institutional representatives.

However, it is important to stress that UNESCO has provided the MOST programme its legitimacy and initial infrastructure and funding to give it a fresh start. Under the UNESCO umbrella, the MOST programme has been developed by a competent secretariat structure and an adequate governance. It is generally felt that UNESCO lends status and presence to the programme.

5.1.2 The MOST programme has been established as an intergovernmental programme that enjoys substantial baseline support among its constituency of Member States, reflected through its IGC.

5.1.3 The IGC has and should continue to have substantial social scientific expertise and commitment among its Delegates.

5.1.4 The SSC, composed of internationally renowned social scientists, monitors and guides MOST from a scientific perspective.

5.1.5 The fundamental importance and legitimacy of MOST is acknowledged and supported within UNESCO as a whole.

5.1.6 Counterpart research programmes in the natural sciences emphasize the importance of MOST and the usefulness of joint activities.

5.1.7 The mission recognises the dedication and competence within the Secretariat as an important factor in overall consolidation of the Programme.

5.2. Flaws

5.2.1 Currently no project officer is assigned exclusively to MOST tasks. Of the more than ten professionals, only five devote the bulk of their time to MOST. Staffing of the Secretariat does not follow sufficiently programme requirements.

5.2.2 With some clear exceptions, there seems to be no uniform high-level social science

research expertise and affinity among the (nominal) MOST project officers. The mission is of the opinion that maintaining the academic level and alertness of the MOST officers and monitors is a fundamental pre-requisite for the adequate support and monitoring of MOST programme activities.

- 5.2.3 The mission noted the weakness of programme level monitoring, documentation, file building and financial reporting, in short: the lack of prima facie accountability, transparency and institutional memory.
- 5.2.4 There are reasons for concern with respect to the profile and visibility of the MOST programme. Much effort is absorbed by inward-looking reporting such as the newsletter, policy papers, occasional papers, leaflets, flyers. Audience and impact of these media are unclear. The MOST Web-site - although fairly organised and accessible - cannot remedy this very much.
- 5.2.5 The MOST programme lacks systematic and durable liaisons to regional social science organizations (FLACSO, CLACSO, CODESRIA, AASSREC).

5.3. Recommendations

- 5.3.1 We strongly recommend that the organisational structure for the implementation of the MOST programme be streamlined in such a way as to clearly identify the Secretariat and the staff for managing the core activities of the MOST Programme.
- 5.3.2 We recommend that the recruitment of the members of the MOST team be based on criteria of professional and scientific competence, that officers have a Ph.D. degree, with an explicit research track record.
- 5.3.3 The mission is of the opinion that maintaining a high academic and professional level and alertness of the MOST officers is a fundamental pre-requisite for the adequate support and monitoring of MOST programme activities. Therefore, MOST project officers should be given the opportunity to upgrade their capabilities for the MOST programme and to publish regularly.
- 5.3.4 The IGC should be more effective in strengthening institutional and financial support within and across the member states for MOST projects and MOST networks.
- 5.3.5 We recommend that the MOST secretariat design explicit mechanisms for progress monitoring on the programme level.
- 5.3.6 We recommend that the MOST secretariat design explicit mechanisms for budget monitoring on the programme level.
- 5.3.7 We recommend that the MOST secretariat designs a coherent and systematic practice of annual scientific and financial reporting to improve the visibility and transparency of the programme.

- 5.3.8 We recommend that the MOST secretariat designs a coherent and systematic strategy to enhance the professional visibility of the MOST programme, and in general, to professionalize its public relations.
- 5.3.9 We recommend strongly that the MOST secretariat pursues an assertive strategy of qualified publications, insisting on and sponsoring qualified academic publication, and limit internal publications that have no guaranteed or measurable audience and impact.
- 5.3.10 The IGC should provide strategic policy guidance to the Programme. It should ensure the integrity of MOST: the budget (within UNESCO), management, monitoring and reporting procedures of the Programme.
- 5.3.11 The IGC should be encouraged to represent the MOST programme to potential funding agencies and national and international scientific councils: public bodies, bilateral sponsors, private foundations, multilateral institutions (banks and the UN family).
- 5.3.12 The SSC should be encouraged to define the scientific priorities for the research agenda, and the crucial link between research and policy, in the next phase of the MOST programme. The SSC should feed the Programme with strategic scientific thinking and thematic development.
- 5.3.13 The SSC should be encouraged to stimulate the creation of an international book series (with a professional editorial committee) that suits most of the professional MOST publications. The foundation of an international MOST journal should be considered (or alternatively, a regular section in the *International Social Science Journal*). Generally, key publications should be submitted to peer review.
- 5.3.14 The SSC should also be given the mission to encourage UNESCO's regional social science networks (FLACSO, CLACSO, CODESRIA, AASSREC) to join forces.
- 5.3.15 In general, the NLCs should be stimulated to play a central role to link national research communities, research funders, and policy-concerns to network in the orbit of the MOST programme. The MOST secretariat should design a more forceful strategy to this effect. The possibility of fortifying this area through the good offices of the IGC member states and their delegations should be considered.

Section 6

General Conclusions and Final Recommendation

The mission wishes to emphasize that the establishment of MOST as an intergovernmental policy research programme is an important achievement for UNESCO. This has enabled strengthening the role of the social sciences within the organization, contributing toward bringing them on a par with the sister programmes in the natural sciences. Further, it has reinforced institutional links with social science institutions world-wide and the scholarly community. Given these achievements, the programme has now created the necessary conditions for its further strengthening and consolidation during the next phase.

This exercise will have to address the following 7 issues, already outlined and argued in the report, but summarised below:

Box 3
Summary points

1. Strengthen the profile and visibility of the Programme both within UNESCO and towards the outside research and policy community.
2. Stimulate reflection on the thematic priorities and coherence of the programme in the longer term.
3. Streamline the organisation and staffing of the core MOST Secretariat.
4. Enhance the Programme's management practice and performance.
5. Adopt more rigorous and consistent procedures relating to the MOST project portfolio so that it is in line with the core MOST programme objectives.
6. Design and implement additional programme level funding strategies.
7. Improve the publication policy within the programme.

Box 4
Final Recommendation

The mission strongly recommends that a strategic vision be developed that incorporates these issues. Subsequently, this should result in a concrete Plan of Action to be prepared by the MOST Secretariat, in consultation with the SSC and the Bureau of the IGC, to be presented to the Director General for approval and subsequent implementation. This Plan of Action should be concluded by the end of this calendar year (1999).

Appendix 1

**Table A1
Summary Table of Recommendations**

Secretariat	SSC	IGC	General
2.3.4	2.3.5		2.3.1 2.3.2 2.3.3
3.3.1 3.3.2 3.3.3 3.3.5 3.3.6 3.3.7 3.3.8	3.3.1 3.3.4		
4.3.2		4.3.1 4.3.7	4.3.3 4.3.4 4.3.5 4.3.6
5.3.3 5.3.5 5.3.6 5.3.7 5.3.8 5.3.9	5.3.12 5.3.13 5.3.14	5.3.4 5.3.10 5.3.11	5.3.1 5.3.2 5.3.16

Appendix 2

Table A2
MOST Projects (including funding and additional funding)
(in US dollars, unless stated otherwise)

Funding as reported by project leaders and MOST Secretariat.

TITLE OF PROJECT	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	subtotal
Multicultural and multi-ethnic societies						
1. New migrations and Growing Ethno-cultural diversity in the Asia-Pacific region (APMRN)		15.000	40.000	15.000	30.000	100.000
<i>Additional funding</i>		10.500	19.400	20.000	234.000	288.900
2. Ethno-net Africa			20.000	18.500	10.000	48.500
<i>Additional funding</i>						
3. Democratic governance in a multi-cultural and multi-ethnic society						
<i>Additional funding</i>					190.000	190.000
4. Multicultural policies and modes of citizenship in European cities (MPSC)					20.000	20.000
<i>Additional funding</i>						100.000 ⁵
5. Multicultural and multi-ethnic societies	15.000					15.000
<i>Additional funding</i>						
6. Managing cultural, ethnic and religious diversities on local, state and international levels in Central and Eastern Europe				15.000		15.000
<i>Additional funding</i>						
7. Monitoring of ethnicity, conflicts and cohesion			15.000	5.000	15.000	35.000
<i>Additional funding</i>						Aprox 100.000 ⁶
8. Migration networks in Africa, Central & Eastern Europe, Latin America & the Caribbean						
<i>Additional funding</i>						
9. Negotiation of Peace Pacts in Arab Countries				5.000		
<i>Additional funding</i>					75.000	⁷
Cities						
10. City words	15.000		31.500			46.500
<i>Additional funding</i>	235.000		183.500			418.500
11. Growing up in cities (GUIC)			30.000			30.000

⁵ Project leader reports each country had its own funding. 100.000 for Participation Programme.

⁶ Funding provided by Carnegie Foundation (New York).

⁷ Funding obtained from FORD Foundation.

⁸ Project leader reports each country had its own funding.

<i>Additional funding</i>						8
12. Socially sustainable cities: building a knowledge base for urban management in the twenty-first century		10.000	23.000			33.000
<i>Additional funding</i>					40.000	40.000
13. Cities, the environment and social relations between men and women			25.000 CHF	20.000		25.000 CHF & \$ 20.000
<i>Additional funding</i>			46.848 CHF	29.000 CHF		75.848 CHF
14. City project (MOST-MAB) ⁹				100.000		100.000 ¹⁰
<i>Additional funding</i>						11
Global - Local						
15. The economic and social transformations connected with drug trafficking			10.000	25.000		35.000
<i>Additional funding</i>				255.000		255.000
16. History and observation of social transformations (HOST)	16.300	35.000				51.300
<i>Additional funding</i>						12
17. Industrial decentralisation and urban development in India						30.000
<i>Additional funding</i>						
18. Globalisation and structural adjustment and transformations in Arab Mediterranean countries		15.000		15.000		30.000
<i>Additional funding</i>		35.000				35.000
19. MERCOSUR: A space for interaction		7.500	15.000	25.000		47.500
<i>Additional funding</i>						13
20. Institutional modernization of social policies in Latin America		7.500	15.000			22.500
<i>Additional funding</i>						
21. Coping locally and regionally with economic, technological and environmental transformations (CCPP)		15.000		15.000		30.000
<i>Additional funding</i>		100.000 DK	160.000 DK & 1.75 million NK	200.000 NOK		1.95 mill NK 260.000 DK
22. Personal and institutional strategies for management of transformation risks in Central and Eastern Europa			21.000	23.000		44.000
<i>Additional funding</i>			25.600	26.500		52.100
23. Sustainability & sustainable development policies						
<i>Additional funding</i>						

⁹ MOST-MAB projects in six cities: Yeumbeul, Port au Prince, Sao Roque, Santo Domingo, Djenné, Bogotá.

¹⁰ An additional 100.000 decentralized.

¹¹ No data. Other donors participate at the country level.

¹² Idem.

¹³ Funding for related projects: Rockefeller Foundation (249.000) and the Argentinian government (24.000).

Research, Action & Capacity Building						
24. Workshop on Globalization and Mega-City Development in Pacific Asia						
<i>Additional funding</i>						
25. UNESCO Chairs						
UNESCO-ITESO, Mexico						10.000 ¹⁴
ETVÖS University, Hungary						
26. Children's Recommendations on improving a squatter camp environment, South Africa						25.000
<i>Additional funding</i>						35.000
27. Community development in Burkina Faso						50.000
<i>Additional funding</i>						731.000
28. Training and enablement of Bantwane women from Moutsem Mpumalanga						
<i>Additional funding</i>					20.000	20.000
29. Coastal historic centers						
Essaouri		50.000	100.000	150.000		300.000
Mahdia				40.000		40.000
Saida				50.000		50.000
30. Clearing House						
Discussion Forums on Social Transformations and on Multicultural and Multi-ethnic Societies						
Electronic Journal on Multi Religious Societies						
31. PhD Prize						

¹⁴ An additional 10.000 decentralized.

ANNEX II

MEETING OF THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COUNCIL OF THE MOST PROGRAMME

Recommendation on the mid-term evaluation of the MOST programme

The Council of the MOST programme,

Appreciating the mid-term evaluation of the MOST programme, takes note of its results with satisfaction,

Taking note of the Scientific Steering Committee's deliberations on the mid-term evaluation, and *welcoming* their recommendations on the report,

Noting with satisfaction that the report considers the programme's achievements in terms of its networks and results and concludes that its rate of success is commendable for the first phase of the programme,

Recalling that the programme's strengths lie in its capacity to provide impulse to a new way of thinking, doing and using research through relevant programmes and activities, such as cooperative and comparative research, sustainable networks, dissemination of knowledge and well reviewed best practices - which altogether further the link between scientific research and social management,

Bearing in mind the crucial importance of time, continuity and sustainability in the relevance and success of scientific ambitions of that magnitude,

Invites the Director General to ensure

Development of a strategy for the second phase of the MOST programme, in partnership with the Intergovernmental Council, the Scientific Steering Committee and National Liaison Committees, that also addresses the issues of sustainability of its networking activities and the quality of its academic output - combined with the criteria of relevance, timeliness, efficiency, and impact - as key components for attaining the programme's operational overarching goals;

That the SSC consider all current and future activities in the MOST programme, monitor the suggested redeployment of efforts in favour of a better integrated core programme, and apply systematic rules and principles for the selection and monitoring of projects;

That budgetary information, both at the programme and project level be included in the report of the Secretariat to the Council;

That the Secretariat has a key responsibility for building, from the outputs of the networks, a scientific and operational framework enabling relevant stakeholders to develop new patterns of thought, action and problem-solving;

That the Secretariat make an effort to develop means of assessing the impact of the programme and its activities both from a scientific and a policy-making perspective;

That the report of the mid-term evaluation be transmitted to the Executive Board and to the General Conference at its 30th session, together with the recommendations of IGC;

The Council further recommends that the programme

Increase its focus on youth, both by developing policy oriented research activities on youth problems and by involving youth in its activities;

Pay special attention to women and indigenous people in its activities to ensure further equitableness and inclusiveness;

Emphasize activities related to understanding and eliminating poverty (155 EX/Decision 4.1, para. 49), in relation to the core MOST themes and in close connection with all other attempts within and outside UNESCO to tackle this important issue, with a view to giving the MOST programme significant outcome in this field;

Ensure the continued quality and scientific rigour of the programme by maintaining the highest levels of competence amongst all partners of MOST.