RESEARCH AND POLICY

An INCORE consultative review of research
processes, research priorities and the usefulness
of research to policy-makers at the United Nations
and other international agencies.

Sue Williams and Gillian Robinson

Abstract:

Staff at the United Nations and other international agencies responsible for policy with respect to situations of conflict rarely read or take into account academic research in making policy decisions. INCORE interviews with more than 40 policy makers in Geneva and New York confirm this, while also uncovering a few instances where research has been influential. Factors behind this include the different time-frames and conceptual frameworks of policy and research, the lack of congruity between policy needs and research topics, and the perceived narrowness of academic research as compared with the breadth of option-generation called for in policy decisions. A key area cited was dissemination: research would be more influential if presented to policy-makers concisely, with suggestions of possible policy alternatives, and with face-to-face meetings and discussions as well as print formats.

CONTENTS　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　**Page**

INTRODUCTION

Why INCORE chose to do this study

INCORE (the Initiative on Conflict Resolution and Ethnicity) was set up in 1993 as a joint initiative of the United Nations University and the University of Ulster to address the management and resolution of ethnic conflict. It does this through a combination of research, training and other activities.

For some time INCORE had been considering the need for an evaluation of the impact of research and practice on policy-makers and within organisations commissioning and using research. The establishment of INCORE's new Policy and Evaluation Unit in the autumn of 1998 made this an appropriate time to conduct such an assessment.

Primarily INCORE needed to do such a study for two reasons (a) to ensure that the research priorities of INCORE matched that of these agencies whom it sees as its target group and (b) to understand the processes within such agencies so that INCORE could facilitate the dissemination of research results (not only those produced by INCORE) within agencies. Underlying these reasons, though, was the appreciation that much research was not leading to policy-oriented outputs and, more importantly, that even policy-oriented research was not being used in policy-making. In addition, this process might have other indirect uses, for instance in assisting policy makers to protect themselves from criticism, to legitimise established practices, to maintain expected levels of research expenditure and so on.

> *The research institutes tend to exist in a world of their own, largely removed from the work and concerns of the United Nations.*
> *Kofi Annan, UN Secretary General*

How can this lack of impact on policy-making be explained? As Finch[1] notes there are two main kinds of explanation. First, there are those which concentrate upon the differences between researchers and policy-makers and between the worlds in which they operate. This was clearly brought home to us as one interview we conducted was interrupted by a telephone call which needed an urgent decision on a particular situation in an African country. In the world of research, decisions concern what to investigate and how, with a long time-frame and a focus determined by the researcher. For policy-makers, world events determine the focus, and the time frame is urgently the present. Another kind of gap concerns the relative status of the researcher and the policy maker – in relation to central government policy, researchers are likely to be relatively low status in relation to those whom they hope to influence. In other words, as we found in the course of our interviews, it is not simply the nature of the research findings, but also whose name is attached to them, which is likely to have some bearing upon whether they are taken up.

---

[1] Finch, Janet, Research and Policy, The Falmer Press, Social Research and Educational Studies series;2, 1986.

Second, there are those explanations that concentrate upon the intrinsic character of the research process and research findings. The 'two communities' thesis holds that policy-makers and social scientists live in different worlds conceptually as well as spatially and cannot communicate with each other easily.

There are dozens of major conflict situations in the world today, and hundreds of incipient conflict with the potential to intensify. These situations are the everyday working environment of the United Nations and its agencies, of international assistance, of inter-governmental organisations, and of regional, national, and local NGOs. Policy-makers and practitioners in all these organisations ask similar questions: How can we best deal with what confronts us? How can we understand the situation better, learn from current research and best practice, develop effective strategies, and implement our plans with maximum effectiveness and minimum risk?

Methodology

In this study we were concerned to address :

>Research Processes
>Research Priorities
>Policy Processes
>Links between Practice and Policy and Research

A qualitative approach was decided upon whereby INCORE staff would interview key individuals within the target group. This approach was adopted because of an awareness that a quantitative approach would have had little or no success. Whatever chance we had of gaining a brief interview with the key personnel and discussing the issues with them, there was no possibility of getting a questionnaire onto the desk of the right person and that person having the time or interest to complete such a form. In addition, an interview offers the opportunity to explore key areas that we might not have been aware of beforehand.

Identifying the key people was also a challenge. Suggestions of appropriate names were sought from a small number of personal contacts within the institutions in Geneva. A master list of possible people was compiled and a lengthy process of setting up meetings began. A range of interviews were set up for the second week in December, and once in Geneva, more meetings were confirmed and yet others set up. The New York trip was somewhat easier to arrange as the Geneva trip had resulted in some significant contact suggestions, as had the Director's recent visit to the UNU in Tokyo. Most importantly, the UNU office in New York facilitated the visit and, working from our provisional list of those we wanted to contact, arranged all the New York interviews. This was a tremendous facility, and one we are most grateful for. The Washington interviews were arranged independently.

A preliminary interview was conducted in Northern Ireland to test the format and see how the interview with two interviewers would work. Table 1 shows the numbers of meetings, organisations and individuals involved in the study.

Table 1: Summary of Meetings

Place	Number of Organisations	Number of Meetings	Number of Individuals
Northern Ireland	1	1	1
Geneva	8	10	20
New York & Washington	11	13	21
TOTAL	**20**	**24**	**42**

The majority of interviews were conducted jointly by Sue Williams and Gillian Robinson; Sue Williams conducted 4 interviews on her own. Both took written notes during the interviews and these were transcribed as soon as possible after the interviews. The notes were manually analysed for the purposes of informing this report.

All interviewees were assured that they would not be individually identified and nor would any statements be attributed to them personally.

Appendix 1 shows the letter of introduction used to gain access to individuals and Appendix 2 gives a further breakdown on interviews.

The background: too little time

For policy-makers, as for most of us doing research in this field, the questions we were asking embodied a crucial dilemma: people are too busy, the problems they deal with in conflict situations are too urgent, for them to be able to learn adequately what is coming out of research and practice, and incorporate it into policy.

This can be parodied, as a statement that one hasn't enough time to do something well. Yet it is a reality for many people in policy positions, and one which must be taken into account by those of us who want them to take advantage of learning from research and practice. They often do not have time to commission research into key questions, to read what other people are finding, or even to reflect on their own experience. Our search, then, must be to see emerging issues early, to have answers ready by the time they articulate the question, and to present the answers in a concise, timely, credible, and easily-assimilated fashion.

The background: shifting roles

Another reality for policy people in international agencies is that these are times of great change in terms of existing and changing responsibilities.   The United Nations seems to see peace-keeping as its base activity, its key role, supplemented by long, formal negotiation processes, and big international conferences on grand themes. Development agencies find themselves working mostly in situations of conflict, and are more engaged in emergency relief and humanitarian intervention (often with armed guards) than in what used to be called development. Human rights organisations find themselves drawn into work on the ground, before, during, and after violent conflict. They monitor and report on atrocities committed by governments that may not have the capacity or the will to live up to conventions, and by non-state armed groups to whom the conventions do not apply.

Even as the nature of intervention is changing, so is our understanding of the stages or phases that require intervention. There is a fairly clear emergency stage, but a lot of uncertainty as to what to do when one can see the cataclysm approaching, as well as when the emergency seems to have become chronic, or when it improves somewhat without being "normal." When stages are blurred or shifting, boundary disputes between agencies, or between departments within agencies, reveal that policy often becomes *ad hoc*, competitive, expansionist. In addition to key questions like: who are we?, what do we do?, we must now add: Where/when are we?

Windows of Opportunity

These times of changing roles and shifting stages can also open spaces for something new. Because things are unclear, people and organisations may be more receptive to new concepts, actively seeking new skills and tools, and willing to experiment a bit[2]. New paradigms may be identified, new structures invented to suit new realities. Over time, these will become familiar, be incorporated into bureaucracies, become *démodé*, and no longer offer space for creativity. There is a little window of opportunity when each new way of understanding enables people to see things differently, to question the frame, and to see new possibilities.

Research results, similarly, offer insights that are relevant and provocative only at certain moments and for certain audiences. As an ESRC workshop on research and users concluded:
> "The potential for using research depended on the existence of specific situations or 'windows' in which the capacities and interests of users temporarily aligned with the capacities and interests of researchers and in which research became momentarily relevant. (…) As a result, relevance, rather than being a quality of the research itself, is better seen as a property of potential contexts of use."[3]

THE VIEW FROM GENEVA AND NEW YORK

Our interviews with policy-level people, principally in the United Nations and its agencies, but also with people at international agencies in Geneva and New York produced consistently the general situation described above. Yet, on the level of understanding the making of particular policies in particular agencies, how research does or could influence policy, and which formats and forms of dissemination are most likely to be effective, there was considerable variety.

We will, therefore, set out in more detail the range of responses to the key areas of questioning. At the same time, as noted above, the interviews included a commitment not to attribute any comment to any individual or organisation, and that will be respected here.

Research needs and processes

Throughout this report we draw attention to the fact that for many people we interviewed, research was taken to be either the evaluation of field programmes or a survey of an area prior to beginning an operation in the field. Every department and agency we spoke to, almost without exception, conducted their own field surveys, occasionally drawing on information from other departments. Many departments did see themselves as having a research role, and in these various processes were adopted. Commonly, in-house officers conducted the research, drawing together whatever evidence they could from a wide variety of sources, including the often referred to institutional memory. Typically within the UN, this type of research led to position papers that were fed up through the hierarchy and might result in policy

---

[2]   At the same time, of course, others will become more closed and rigid, less willing to listen to new ideas or try out new options, more dependent on familiar strategies.

[3]   Elizabeth Shove, "Researchers, Users, and Window Frames." Report of the first workshop on researchers and users as mediators and translators, Economic & Social Research Council, 9-10 December, 1996. P.2.

changes. By and large, UN departments only work on what the Security Council, Secretary General, General Assembly, and national governments have mandated. However they try to keep a close eye on the media to see emerging themes so that they can be prepared to address them.

Research was often needed to confirm prior preconceptions. Results which did not do this or which generated negative conclusions might not be useful or given any attention. As we noted earlier, the timescales were difficult and it was difficult to see a way around this given the urgency of the issues. All were agreed that not enough time was given to "lessons learned" although some commented that there was no time and no audience interested anyway. [4]

On occasion consultants from outside were used. The credibility of the researchers was critical, and agencies tended to draw on contacts from their own personal pool. For research to be credible in most agencies, it needs to be clearly based on field research, and done by someone with credibility, preferably in terms of field experience as well as academic credentials.

Research Priorities (as identified by participants)

Bearing in mind the perceptions of research noted above, it may be of interest to note what the people we spoke to identified as current and forthcoming research priorities for them. Table 2 lists all those mentioned, and we can see a range of topics from the very general and somewhat vague 'more conceptual studies' through to the specific content focus of 'the role of civilian police in peace keeping'. The particular priorities may, of course, have taken the form of whatever happened to be on their minds at the time, but the kinds of topics are interesting to note.

Several people commented on the over reliance on International Relations frameworks and on relationships between governments, and others on the over-reliance on Law particularly in the area of refugee studies. Sources reported a relative dearth of material on conflicts from the viewpoint of economic and social policy. Multi-disciplinary research, longitudinal studies, and new conceptual frameworks were advocated but rarely seemed to be available.

Table 2: Research priorities

Longer term longitudinal studies
Lessons learned
Ethnic Groups in South Georgia
Role of Civilian Police in PKO
Database Similar to QUB States of Emergency Database
Role of the UN in developing countries
Poverty eradication
Prevention
Education of Refugees
Refugees not from Law perspective
Historical studies

---

[4] Unfortunately, we did not manage to meet anyone from the Lessons Learned Unit within the UN.

Small arms – disarmament and development
Register of conventional weapons
Tools to reconcile a society
Leadership and capacity building
Best long term efforts in dealing with trauma
Real thinking about tricky situations such as borders and regional powers
Management of divided societies
Conceptual frameworks
Good practice
Enhancement of African peace keeping capacity

How does research influence policy?

It is important to reiterate that many of those interviewed used the term research primarily to refer to programme evaluation or to field analysis. When asked to focus more on what academics mean by research, their responses were grouped along the following lines:

◊ Research is influential if it is generalisable: if it crosses geographical lines, disciplines, types of situations. (This may mean that the research itself is comparative, or that broad conclusions are drawn from it.)
◊ Long-term research is important in showing the consequences over time/space of policy and practice.
◊ Research is influential if it is done and presented by a known and credible person.
◊ Influential research treats real problems which agencies experience.
◊ If it is presented in a way that is provocative, focused, concise, and timely. (For more on this theme, see the section on dissemination of research results.)
◊ The best research looks at the same issue from different perspectives.
◊ When research can raise the level of policy debate by introducing new concepts and frameworks, then it has an impact on policy.
◊ Research is most influential when it supports the ideas policy-makers already hold, or challenges them with a new paradigm.
◊ There must be strong field research behind it, rigorous analysis, and a range of policy options presented.

Examples of research which has influenced policy:

◊ War-Torn Societies Project, in which research was itself a way of intervening in a situation of conflict to facilitate dialogue among stake-holders in the situation, has also influenced how international agencies and donors view their own activities.
◊ UNIDIR's books on small arms (Robin Poulton and Ibrahim ag Youssouf: A Peace of Timbuktu, 1998, dealing with the small arms moratorium in Mali, and Virginia Gamba's various publications on small arms, e.g., Managing Arms in Peace Processes, 1998) because they opened new conceptual areas.

◊ Weiss and Minnear's publications from the Humanitarianism and War project, because they dealt with problems agencies really experience, and codified their results in a usable form. [5]

How could research influence policy?

Beyond the characteristics listed as making research influential, are there other ways in which it could have more impact on policy?

◊ It could involve policy-makers during the research process, thus getting their questions as well as their ownership of the results.
◊ Research people could convene discussions among policy people of similar levels, to discuss policy issues that are important to them but not operational.
◊ Research could help by offering conceptual frameworks, alternatives, options.
◊ Policy-makers would like to look to research to provide tools and training for dealing with a variety of situations.

In addition, there is a key area where expectations of policy and research people are different. Several policy-makers reported that academic researchers seemed to expect to present only their current research results, and did not expect to bring into discussions their broader knowledge, results of other people's research, or any practical experience. Rather to the surprise of policy-makers, researchers did not seem to expect to theorise beyond the narrow confines of the current project. Researchers at the ESRC workshop mirrored this with their surprise that, when they dealt with policy people, "it seemed to be the researchers' experience which was of real value, not only, or not simply, the results of a specific project."[6]

It seems that researchers operate in environments where they are discouraged from drawing conclusions beyond the scope of the demonstrable results of the current project. Policy people, conversely, operate in an environment in which contexts and questions change constantly. The policy-makers themselves cannot control the variables or limit the arena of action, and they are accustomed to having to take the best decision possible with insufficient information, relying often on applying their own broad experience to the problem at hand. They may also be accustomed to working with consultants, who readily draw on experience, analysis, and option-generation as the currency in which they trade. Researchers will need to understand that, if they are themselves cautious about drawing policy alternatives from research results, then consultants will probably continue to be used as mediators who present such alternatives in their stead.

Which ways of disseminating research results are most effective?

---

[5] Interestingly, Do No Harm (the Local Capacities for Peace Project) which would probably be cited by international humanitarian and development NGOs and by funders as having had a major impact on policy, was not mentioned by UN agencies. This simply may not have occurred to those interviewed, or it may be an indication that policy people have to be targeted specifically within these different domains.

[6] Shove cited , p.6.

The overall conclusion was that the most effective strategy is to know the appropriate people and direct specific research results at them. Failing that, results should be disseminated in several forms: in print, in 1-page summaries or abstracts as well as "tomes", and in person, through seminars, workshops, conferences, talks, and book-launches. There should be a dissemination strategy, which includes frequent release of interim results during the course of the research, and following up publication with more directed targeting of selected policy people.

The ESRC publication Researchers, Users and Window Frames[7] asserts that if users are policy-makers, then they want '(i) clear summaries of findings…(ii) findings which are free of methodological caveats, and (iii) unambiguous conclusions'. The policy people offered similiar responses:

➢ The most influential format is quick, digestible, readable, with impact indicators (ie built-in evaluation.) Overly academic language is a real barrier.
➢ The specific format most often cited was that of Oxford Analytica: 3 paragraphs and a conclusion, concise and to the point.
➢ Less formal format and presentations are often more effective in opening up new thinking, and may enable people to attend in a non-official capacity.
➢ Formats that pose problems in such a way as to open up new options have more influence.
➢ Talks are often effective, such as a lunchtime series, when experts present their results or ideas to a broad group of invitees.
➢ Major UN summits such as Beijing and Rio, despite all negative commentary, really do force governments to examine policy and sometimes change it. Within national governments, a lone voice for policy change may rely on official communiques and summit reports to raise awareness and make innovation seem acceptable.
➢ Offering policy options, even if they are contradictory.
➢ Conference proceedings are not useful!

One area of disagreement was Internet formats. Some policy people are avid users of the Internet, and described real policy change resulting from ideas mentioned in discussion groups or websites. However, more are only indirectly influenced by the Internet (if an assistant or colleague brings them something from it.) The majority are primarily influenced by people, by conversations, seminars, meetings, and other direct exchanges. Nearly all expressed the wish to have more time to "keep up with research," but few expect ever to have it.

How do policy-makers try to influence policy?

The policy-level people interviewed are not only users of research. They are people who themselves learn from their own and their organisations' practice and research, and use the resulting insights to change other people's policies. The following are some of the methods they described using:

⇒ *Official seminars addressed by practitioners or experts* so that representatives of member states can be made more aware of the issues, and in order to launch a dialogue between practitioners and policy-makers on both policy and operational issues, and get resources allocated earlier in the process.

---

[7] Ibid, p.26

⇒ *Huge international conferences* with both official and non-official representation, to raise issues across levels from heads of state to grass roots, which has a slow impact at a distance, but does have an impact, particularly important to smaller countries where people push for issues to be seen as important.

⇒ *Long, formal processes of negotiation* between official representatives, in order to raise the level of debate, inform less expert members, show powerful countries what others think

[*examples: Nuclear Test-ban treaty, Land mines, Biological weapons conventions,* which all involved see as necessary but certainly not sufficient]

⇒ *Less formal, parallel processes* involving official representatives as well as experts, NGOs, practitioners, in order to open up new possibilities, raise the level of debate, give people room to speculate.

It is interesting to note that all of these processes are experienced in the real world (that is, exchanges between people in the same room rather than in writing, by telephone, over the Internet.) Some involve relatively small groups, meeting in a single room to exchange ideas, while others are enormous, with speeches plus a "shadow structure" of chance meetings and conversations over coffee-breaks.

Research can feed into any of these processes, though it is likely to be less prominent in the enormous conferences and designated years (Year of the Child, and so on.) Learning from practice probably features more prominently in the first and last processes. Often, research and practice may both contribute to attempts to inform or influence policy-makers. Interestingly, when policy people try to inform or influence other policy people, they seem to organise events and then give the floor to people speaking from research and practice rather than from policy experience.

Another approach is to influence people who are, as it were, <u>above</u> the policy-makers. The UN, for example, is hierarchical, therefore, as one interviewee commented, assent at the top produces acceptance at other levels. For this reason, policy people within the UN who want change may seek, directly or indirectly, to present new ideas to the Secretary General or other key people. This may be by sending them research, inviting particular experts to meetings, or otherwise arranging for particular viewpoints to be presented to them. Another example is changing the ideas of funders and donors, so that they in turn understand these new frameworks, and seek them or support them in their interactions with agencies.

Yet another strategy is to engage public support to apply pressure for policy change. The campaign to ban land-mines was a clear example of this, involving public pressure within countries, as well as parallel pressure from smaller countries, to get major powers to support the new policy. Some of this lobbying came from, or was supported by, international and intergovernmental agencies who are policy-makers in their own right.

CONCLUSION

Re-stating the problem

This consultative review was undertaken for two kinds of reasons. On one level, there is a general sense that research is not widely utilised by people engaged in practice or policy. At one time, we may have

thought this was because there was not enough research, or that it was too simplistic. However, as Ray Rist points out, the problem has not improved with time.

> "Increased personnel, greater allocation of resources, and growing sophistication of methods have not had the anticipated or demonstrated effect of greater clarity and understanding of the policy issues before the country. Rather, current efforts have led to a more complex, complicated, and partial view of the issues and their solution.[8]"

Our conclusion is that this can be improved primarily through careful attention to the expectations each party has of the other. Researchers should pay attention to policy questions and disseminate their results in the most useful ways, while policy-makers should appreciate researchers' need for rigour and make broad connections and policy applications themselves.

On another level, we entered this process because our own institution and its research results seem to be invisible to some of its intended targets. UN Secretary General Kofi Annan spoke bluntly about the situation in proposing reform of the United Nations and its institutions.

> "In spite of the useful research findings of some of the institutes and the valuable capacity-building projects of others, the overall contribution and potential of the research institutes remains largely under utilized by the United Nations community. The research institutes tend to exist in a world of their own, largely removed from the work and concerns of the United Nations. The need for such bodies to pursue their research and other activities with a degree of autonomy and intellectual rigour partly explains this remoteness. The United Nations institutes have an obligation to make their work both relevant and accessible to the larger United Nations community.[9]"

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

It appears that new institutions such as INCORE which straddle the researcher-user divide or which combine commercial and academic interests are gaining ground, as are temporary, project-specific research alliances between agencies and universities and between universities with different expertise.

We ourselves now have a somewhat clearer idea of how policy is made in the various departments and agencies of the UN, and therefore can see more clearly some possibilities of being useful in that process. Some possible ways forward involve:

1. Designing research with the changing needs of policy-makers in mind from the beginning. This may involve day to day interaction, concentrating as much on the process of doing research as on the final research findings.

2. Seminars, fora, and conferences which bring policy and research people together. This increases the likelihood of their making connections between their conceptual worlds, and working together to address problems.

---

[8]   Ray Rist, "Influencing the Policy Process with Qualitative Research", in Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y, Handbook of Qualitative Research, Sage, Thousand Oaks California, 1994. p.545

[9]   Report of the Secretary-General, "Renewing the United Nations: A Programme for Reform", A/5/950 of 14 July 1997, paragraph 62.

3. Learning more about processes of policy-making, including offering opportunities for policy people to take sabbaticals with institutions like INCORE, reflecting on their experiences, our analytical frameworks, and research which might be relevant to them.

4. Expanding our repertoire of dissemination strategies by collaborating more with training agencies and other research institutes. We need also to be aware of the different forms of written communication from research: media reports; official reports; and academic papers. INCORE needs to assess its priorities in this area.

5. Networking. No written communication can guarantee that the ideas/findings will find a receptive hearing or influence policy. Good networks will provide a better chance that we can foresee the specific conditions and circumstances in which potential users will use research.

In addition to taking on board the findings of this process, there is a need for much more research, documentation, and understanding of the interplay of research, practice, and policy. One area would be the compilation of case studies of good practice, situations where research and policy strengthened each other. Another would be analytical documentation of policy-making as a process, clarifying the role of factors such as organisational culture, disciplinary focus, methodology, and fieldwork orientation, as well as the interplay of internal and external forces and interests in policy development. A key area, clearly, is the interface between research and policy, both within institutions and between them. In this last area, an interesting question would be whether research is more influential if it is conceptualised and presented as a more broadly-based collaboration between several institutions or projects, rather than with each project devising and presenting its results separately.

Appendix 1: Letter of Introduction

INCORE Assessment of Research Processes, Priorities and Impact

INCORE (the Initiative on Conflict Resolution and Ethnicity) was set up in 1993 as a joint initiative of the United Nations University and the University of Ulster to address the management and resolution of ethnic conflict. It does this through a combination of research, training and other activities.

For some time now INCORE has been considering the need for an evaluation of the impact of research and practice on policy-makers and within organisations commissioning and using research. The establishment of INCORE's new Policy and Evaluation Unit this Autumn makes this an appropriate time to conduct such an assessment.

INCORE's Research Director and Policy and Evaluation Director would like to arrange a brief meeting with you to discuss some of the following issues
- If your organisation is operational, how does it incorporate what field staff learn in their work? How is this disseminated within the organisation, and outside?
- How does your organisation keep up with results from other practitioners in your field of work?
- What issues are coming up out of practice/field work which might
  * generate hypotheses about working in situations of conflict?
  * influence policy with respect to conflict?
  * serve to initiate future research?
- Does your organisation commission research? If so, what prompts such commissions? Do you react to proposals put to you or is there a committee or group within your organisation who identify research needs? Do you have a regular research programme or is it *adhoc*? Do you have a list of organisations that you use? Who is on that list? What are your major research priorities? What do you foresee as being major areas of concern in the short-term/long-term?
- What does your organisation do with research reports it commissions? Are they acted upon? Do they influence/inform policy? What about research you did not sponsor: How does that feed in, if at all, to your policy-making processes?

Results of this process will be available to you, if you would like them.

Gillian Robinson, Research Director
Sue Williams, Director, Policy and Evaluation Unit

INCORE
Aberfoyle House, Northland Road, Derry BT48 7JA Northern Ireland
Tel. +44 1504 375500   Fax +44 1504 375510
email: swilliams@incore.ulst.ac.uk
        gillian@incore.ulst.ac.uk

Appendix 2: Organisations and Departments who participated in the research

Northern Ireland (November 1998)
Central Community Relations Unit

Geneva (December 1998)
United Nations
UNIDIR
UNHCHR
UNHCR
UNRISD-WSP
ILO
UNDP
UNV

ICRC

New York & Washington (January 1999)
United Nations
UNUONA
DPKO
DPA
UNDP
UNDA
Strategic Planning Unit
Staff Development
DESA

World Bank

USAID

Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation