Final Report of the Expert Group Meeting

on

Creating an Inclusive Society:
Practical Strategies to Promote Social Integration

10 – 13 September
Paris

TABLE OF CONTENT

I. Recommendations

These recommendations are the outcome of the Expert Group meeting, organized by the UNDESA in collaboration with UNESCO and UN-HABITAT at the UNESCO HQs in Paris from 10 to 13 September 2007, which are to be considered as a first step towards a better conceptualization, analysis and operationalisation of "social inclusion". The recommendations are divided into: a) general recommendations; b) specific policy recommendations at national and sub-national levels; c) specific recommendations on measuring social inclusion; d) recommendations for fragile or post-conflict societies; and e) concrete recommendations for follow-up to this Expert Group Meeting.

I. General Recommendations

I-1. Essential elements necessary for creating an inclusive society:

The World Summit for Social Development (Copenhagen 1995) defines an inclusive society as a society for all, in which every individual, each with rights and responsibilities, has an active role to play. An inclusive society is based on the fundamental values of equity, equality, social justice, and human dignity and rights and freedoms, as well as on the principles of embracing diversity. A society for all is equipped with appropriate mechanisms that enable its citizens to participate in the decision-making processes that affect their lives, and ultimately shape their common future.

But what makes some societies more inclusive than others? What elements are considered as a key to effectively move towards a more inclusive society? The following elements were identified by the Expert Group Meeting (EGM) as critical for creating an inclusive society:

- Respect for the rule of law and the presence of strong legal infrastructure, including impartial and accountable judiciary;
- Respect for the rights, dignity and privileges of every individual of the society, espousing and ensuring their responsibilities;
- Inclusive policies, institutions and programmes that are pro-poor and gender sensitive, at national and sub-national levels;
- Equal opportunities for active participation in civic, social, cultural, economic, and political activities, especially inclusion of grassroots women's organizations;
- Presence of strong civil society (civil rights, civic responsibility, civic engagement, citizenship and mutual trust);
- Equal access to pubic information, public infrastructures and facilities;
- Free, compulsory, functional and qualitative 'basic' education to empower the marginalized and the excluded;
- Cultural pluralism, respect for and appreciation of diversity;
- Existence of (or creating of) open space and multiple opportunities for participation to build shared common goals/visions. There is a need for continuous dialogue on positive images of an inclusive society of the future in a participatory manner, which will be shared and understood by every individuals of the society;
- Good governance and representative leadership to achieve transparency and accountability;
- Equitable distribution of economic and social resources;
- Effective urban management through furthering the decentralization process to local and community levels, and involving communities and their members.

I-2. Dimension of inclusion

Social inclusion is multi-dimensional, and should be approached from various angles. The following five dimensions of inclusion may be considered as incremental steps to social inclusion. Each of these five categories can also be approached in terms of both "process" and "content". Starting from low to high, these 5 steps are as follows:

1. Visibility: to be noticed; to be recognized
2. Consideration: one's concerns and needs are taken into account by policy makers
3. Access to social interactions
4. Rights: rights to act and claim (including right to be different, "identity"), right to access quality and accessible social services (housing, education, transport, healthcare, etc.), right to work, right to participate in the cultural life
5. Resources to fully participate in society: social and financial resources are key; other important aspects also need to be taken into account in the possibility to fully participate, such as time, energy, spatial distance… (the reasons why people cannot participate in society need to be explored further)

Social inclusion is a process aimed at lowering economic, social and cultural boundaries, or making boundaries more permeable. It is a dynamic phenomenon, as its boundaries are changing over time, space, and in quality. Minimum requirements to enable participation in the past are different today owing to technological advance (ICTs, mass media, mass transportation, etc). Social participation may have different meanings from one society to another.

Structural dimensions of inclusion – its process, framework, and interaction aspects- need to be looked at carefully. In this context, the following elements are worth further examination.

> *Inequality* is something that is produced and can be changed. There is a difference between equality in opportunity/access and equality in results. Also, one needs to distinguish 'inequality' from being different. While we can be different, we all need to be provided with equal opportunity/access.
> *Cost of inclusion* is high, but cost of exclusion and missed/lost opportunity is even higher (i.e. social conflict, violence, divided societies, etc.).Cost of inclusion also includes social costs, and should not be approached only through economic costs. Inclusion is a key for sustainable development.
> *Identity:* to be different, desire to be the same, multiple identities, etc.
> *Insecurity* (jobs, health, children at school, fear of crime – lack of trust) and enculturation of insecurity (feelings, experiences, perspectives of insecurity). Sense of insecurity and fear generates more exclusion.
> *Fear* (fear of unknown, fear for uncertainty). How to lower threshold of fear is one of the most difficult questions. Process and reproduction of fear, deep historical trauma, should be looked at. It is not enough to empower the excluded to participate, but empowering the majority to reduce their threshold of fear is equally important.
> *Individual versus groups/community***:** Collectivities (not only individual rights). The relationship between individuals and groups needs to be approached with considerable amount of tact.
> *Sense of responsibility* (citizen's rights and responsibilities**)** is crucial in multicultural societies and changing one's lifestyles. What are the responsibilities of individual citizens, as members of a society, in increasing the participation of all members of their society?

Sense of community in bringing these people together
Culture of competition (where one wins and the others lose): there is a need to shift from win/lose competition to win/win logic.

I-3. Obstacles for social inclusion

Obstacles for social inclusion (including actual and perceived inequality, intergenerational poverty, physical and psychological insecurity…) often result from the inequitable distribution of socio-economic resources, unintended or intended exclusionary policies, lack of access to information and participation, natural or man-made disasters, including violent conflict, lack of inclusive democracy and good governance, etc.

Contrary to a widely shared view in the globalization discourse, economic constraints to redress inequality or social exclusion are not very robust. In fact, many countries that achieve relatively equal societies demonstrate stronger economic competitiveness. It is rather a political will to reduce barriers to social inclusion. If this is in fact the case, the cost for social inclusion should be seen as a long-term investment for sustainable development. The cost- benefit analysis for inequality/equality and exclusion/inclusion should be further examined, and the cost consciousness of the adversary effect of socio-economic exclusion be further advocated.

II. <u>Specific policy recommendations at national and sub-national level</u>

II-1. Actions to be taken to reduce obstacles for social inclusion

In order to reduce obstacles for social inclusion and promote respect for human dignity, the following actions were proposed:

- Set clear and targeted social inclusion, cohesion and well-being goals, with the appropriate strategies to achieve these goals, including the implementation of policies that will further social inclusion. Suggested policy goals include:
  - Promote social inclusion, social cohesion;
  - Promote gender equality;
  - Ensure equal opportunity for all, including on the labor market;
  - Promote equal access to basic quality social services (education, health, transport, shelter, etc.);
  - Ensure access for all to the resources (including land), rights and services, that are necessary for a true participation in society;
  - Prevent and address social exclusion, and eliminate all forms of discrimination;
  - Recognize the dignity and respect for each and every individual regardless of their background, as a moral and legal principle/instrument;
  - Overcome spatial components of exclusion (e.g. land policy);
  - Create safety and sense of security; and
  - Establish well-being of people as a policy objective.

  In order to achieve the above policy goals, there is a need to strengthen capacities and develop tools in the following areas:

  - Formulate social inclusion policies that are adequate, accessible, financially sustainable, adaptable and efficient;

- ○ Provide support to and strengthen capacities of institutions that are working on justice and social inclusion;
- ○ Enhance access to knowledge and information (including ICTs);
- ○ Empower people to participate in the design, implementation and monitoring of policies, as well as in the planning, budgeting, and resource mobilization (including civil society, the private sector, academia, various social groups);
- ○ Invest in social capital - building trust amongst people and between institutions;
- ○ Invest in and enhance capacities of key social welfare institutions that can create effective linkages between existing sectoral indicators and expertise with inclusive goals (For example, public health and public mental health infrastructures and their use of, and responses to, measures implicated in inclusion/exclusion such as well-being and social trust through population-level interventions);
- ○ Build effective partnerships, recognizing the complementary responsibilities of different sectors within society, within and between (sub-)national governments, as well as the need for an increased cooperation between United Nations entities and other international institutions;
- ○ Create an open space for dialogue to explore policy options, common values and identity, bringing communities together, and ensuring that the excluded and marginalized are heard;
- ○ Build capacity in good governance, accountability and transparency at national and sub-national levels;
- ○ Strengthen statistical capacity for data collection and better analysis and better use of data at national and sub-national levels; and
- ○ Mobilization and mobility.

II-2. Mechanisms or processes most productive in creating and sustaining an inclusive society

- Articulate the concept of social inclusion as a foundation for inclusive policies, which affect all citizens' lives, in particular those of the minority and vulnerable groups.

  - ○ Clearly state the right/opportunity to be different while also being included and actively participate in processes, spaces, and institutions.
  - ○ Differentiate the concept of "social inclusion" from merely "reducing disparity among people", which were common indicators in the past. Social inclusion is a much wider concept, incorporating distinctive and relevant dimensions such as: alienation; social mobility; access to space; sense of ownership; trust among people and institutions, being part of society; and well-being of individuals. Social inclusion indicators should go beyond traditional disparity indicators, and should not rely on a single indicator alone.
  - ○ As such, the following components should be further explored and considered to be an integral part of social inclusion:
    - – Social capital: linking the relationship between the state, government and public services, and citizens, focusing on the interface
    - – Overcome spatial components of exclusion (e.g. land policy)
    - – Social mobility: effective public transportation system, walk-ways to increase access for marginalized communities to social and economic life, including labor market
    - – Mobilization:

- Well-being: capture how people experience their lives (how people think and feel about their lives). Try to integrate a subjective and cognitive/affective component into the concept of social inclusion, which is currently absent. This will include the use of measures already developed in this area that can link with existing capacities such as community mental health networks.
- Open Space for everyone to engage in dialogues and exchanges (i.e., Porto Alegre, Observatory in the City Hall)

- Mainstream the objectives of social inclusion into existing polices and programmes in all areas, including regulatory framework, governance, economic planning, education, health, housing, employment, and urban planning, etc.

    o Demonstrate commitment to "inclusion-driven" policy-making measures, through prioritizing social inclusion dimension, better described as "Convivencia/ Interconnectedness/Ubuntu", or "sense and feeling of belonging", in rectifying existing economic and social disparities and policy priorities. This "Convivencia/ Interconnectedness/ Ubuntu" dimension is to be considered as an overarching goal for people's aspiration and, at the same time, it needs to be incorporated into all polices and programmes in other key areas. Specific actions to be taken include:
    - Formulate policies that promote a sense of belonging
    - Redefine collective pride and identity in an inclusive and participatory manner
    - Define a shared future with accommodating diversity
    - Create a mechanism for envisioning processes at local, regional and national levels.
    - Develop resilient and accessible dispute resolution mechanisms such as, facilitation, consultation, participatory dialogue, public hearing to enable reasonable accommodations of different views, values and cultures, etc.
    - Invest in measuring strategies that capture this dimension

    Such strategies should have actionable responses that prioritize the connections between the "Convivencia/Interconnectedness/Ubuntu" dimension and other disparities and policy priorities

- Identify indicators on inclusiveness of a society, and monitor the effectiveness of the inclusive policies and strategies. It is important to use a multi-method approach that uses qualitative approaches in addition to quantitative ones, to provide explanation for the findings.

- Advocate through effective use of the media, and effective partnerships with policy makers, civil societies, and the private sector to put into force the social inclusion agenda. Also support corporate bodies to meet their social responsibility goals.

III. <u>Specific recommendations on measuring social inclusion</u>

III-1. Possible approaches to capture, analyze and measure the multiple dimensions of social inclusion/cohesion

▪ A comprehensive review of existing methods used to explore social inclusion and cohesion is required (i.e. EU social indicators and open method of coordination). The same should be done for existing interventions aimed at creating a socially inclusive society. Based on such a

comprehensive research, a draft framework may be developed, tested, and revised, which will enhance our understanding of social inclusion/integration, and lead us to prioritize actions to be taken on the basis of solid, empirically confirmed knowledge. More effort should be made to explore what other countries have done to address social inclusion/cohesion/integration. (i.e., EU country's social inclusion strategies, UK Equalities Review).

- Social inclusion/integration discourses need to give greater consideration for how people think and feel (their experiences and perceptions), including the role that people's aspirations and goals have in shaping behavior and action. Well-being concepts and methodologies could inform such an approach.

- Because social inclusion/integration is a multi-dimensional concept/phenomenon, there is a need for a **multi-method approach** to understand it, and measure it. This requires a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods, drawing from a range of disciplines. Qualitative methods are important for unpacking the processes behind the figures/numbers. A multi-method approach would help overcome the universal/national/sub-national tension in exploring a complex phenomenon such as social inclusion/integration.

- Attempts to measure social inclusion need to capture both process and content. Indicators and measures are important and useful, but this should not replace in-depth research that is necessary to explain the results of measures. The Well-being in Developing Countries (WeD) methodology provides useful lessons of how to do this, particularly the importance of a multi-method approach (http://www.welldev.org.uk/).[1]

- The use of such measures in research can incorporate studies at national, regional, local and individual levels, and can encompass various methodological approaches, such as case studies, multiple comparative case studies, comparative surveys (at international, national, regional and local levels), in-depth interviews of individual citizens, and demonstration research...

- Well-being and functional mental health[2] measures and indicators could usefully be taken into account when exploring social inclusion/integration. Well-being measures and methods provide a way to measure and understand people's perceptions and experiences. Many can be implemented through extension of existing principles and capacities for community mental health work. Social inclusion/integration is people-centered; therefore there is a need to consult people on their values, beliefs, attitudes etc. A range of measures are already being used to explore how people think and feel, and how this affects people's functioning.

   For example, the Quality of Life Reporting System (QOLRS) developed by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities has been measuring, monitoring and reporting the quality of life in the municipalities regularly since 1999[3].
   The European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions has also commissioned an important work in this field. Its "EurLIFE" interactive database on quality

---

[1] For a thorough discussion on the type of tools and analysis which can help better assess the link between policies and expected resulting social outcomes, see: Marlier, Atkinson, Cantillon and Nolan, *The EU and social inclusion: Facing the challenges*, The Policy Press, Bristol: 2007.
[2] Functional mental health here means: the levels of mental health distress or disability that impairs function (i.e. meeting social roles, occupational performance, self care or care for others) rather than just a measure of symptoms or reports of anxiety, distress, or fear, etc.)
[3] **http://www.fcm.ca/english/qol/qol.html**

of life in Europe offers data drawn from the Foundation's own Quality of Life Surveys and from other published sources. The database provides information on the objective living conditions and subjective well-being of European citizens. It contains data from all 27 EU Member States as well as the EU candidate countries Croatia and Turkey[4].
The European Social Survey also provides useful information. It has included a rotating module on personal and social well-being to explore hedonic (feeling & evaluation) and eudaimonic wellbeing (capabilities & functioning[5]).

▪ The social inclusion indicators could attempt to measure inclusion by means of the five following dimensions: production, consumption, asset ownership, political and social activities, with indicators covering three broad categories: economic, political, and social. Items on each dimension are scored to create an index. Each index is then subjected to a factor analysis or Cronbach's alpha.

▪ Social inclusion indicators could be, instead of separately constructed or built, convergent with the existing valued institutions, and with an emphasis on the concept of "Ubuntu/ interconnectedness/Conviviencia". That would make social inclusion indicators more operational and actionable, as indicators would then fit in with the existing census process.

▪ Given all criteria necessary to consider and meet, it would be realistic to identify a small number of indicators. There are a few existing indicators that are concrete, actionable, and also bridge macro and micro level analysis. These include: well-being, social distance and trust and urban setting.

III-2. Process of developing social inclusion indicators

• Before identifying indicators, specifying the meaning of inclusion in different contexts may be necessary. In addition, in order to ensure consistency through key areas, it may be useful to identify common objectives, such as: promoting social cohesion, gender equality and equal opportunities for all; ensure the "inclusiveness" of policies through mainstreaming social inclusion objectives into all relevant public policies (including economic, budgetary and training policies). In this regard, the EU methodological framework for social indicators provides valuable experience and background which are already reflected in several of the recommendations made below (especially, the methodological framework for selecting comparative indicators).

• When selecting indicators, there is a need to balance contextual relevance and a degree of universalism, as universal indicators allow comparison, but are irrelevant for specific situations. It is important to take a participatory approach, involving relevant stakeholders.

• It is more useful and practical to identify a few key indicators in all the main dimensions of social inclusion (see below for suggested areas), as large numbers of indicators may obscure the development of meaningful measures. Each of these dimensions should:
    – Be comprehensive, cover all key dimensions of the common objectives;
    – Be balanced across the different dimensions; and

---

[4] http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/areas/qualityoflife/eurlife/index.php
[5] http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/

- Enable a synthetic and transparent assessment of a situation in relation to the common objectives.

- When selecting individual indicators to be used in a comparative context, the following aspects need to be considered. If indicators selected are:
  - Relevant (capture essence of problem);
  - Timely;
  - Accessible (simple to understand and easy to collect);
  - Measurable;
  - Robust and valid;
  - Reliable (built on regularly available and timely data);
  - Comparable across cultures and sensitive to cultural diversity;
  - Responsive to policy interventions; and
  - Have a clear and accepted normative interpretation.

- It is also important to build a high degree of local ownership of the measurement tools and results, from sub-national and national governments to the civil society and private sector, through participatory data collection processes. In some cases, this participatory process can be equally important in terms of promoting social inclusion.

- The indicators should help capture gaps and constraints in policy implementation; they also should contribute to identifying specific capacity-building needs, and formulating plans to change the situation.

- Suggested steps to guide the process of developing inclusion indicators are:
  - Allocate resources – effort driven by political will (local, regional, national and international levels);
  - Identify actors – through a process of consensus on who is involved in effort;
  - Create space where debate can take place;
  - Clarify meaning/definition of social inclusion both at the local/regional and national/global level
  - Establish criteria for monitoring and evaluation;
  - Build on existing indicators – establish guidelines to guide this effort;
  - Work with relevant stakeholders in participatory process – focus on local actors including civil society and vulnerable groups (ensures empowerment and local ownership);
  - Build on existing inclusion agendas;
  - Locate responsibility: UN agencies and partners; and
  - Develop guidelines, e.g., the Canadian booklet on "Coalition of Cities against Racism" could serve as guide to this effort.

III-3. Suggested Domains and Examples of Indicators:

FINANCIAL POVERTY (relative and absolute):
   To illustrate socio-economic disparity between have and have-nots
- Income (not only salary, but all kinds and forms of income where appropriate; aim at a measure of total household income)
- Consumption (food and non-food items)

- Other indicators of living standards (i.e., deprivation, lack of resources, enforced lack of durables[6], etc…)

SOCIAL MOBILITY:

To assess the degree of access for marginalized communities to social and economic life
- Effective public transportation system

SOCIAL CAPITAL:

To assess how society is functioning, level of confidence in authorities and interpersonal trust is important. Measure different dimensions of social capital (linking, bridging and bonding) When linked to security and human rights, one may be able to measure social capital deficit. Indicators:
- Interpersonal trust (social networks and support)
- Trust in institutions
- Corruption
- Cultural intolerance for violent behavior (number of violent deeds to vulnerable groups)
- Presence of condoned violence (Police/court/legal system not taking action)

HOUSING: (HABITAT, the World Bank)
- Homelessness (measure of people who have nothing at all)
- Access to quality and affordable housing
- Security of land tenure: ownership of land, ownership of property land title, protection from eviction from both land for residence and informal sector work

EDUCATION (UNESCO, UNICEF):
- Access to education – school enrolment and drop out rates
- Children below age 12 who are excluded. (Ethnicity, gender, religion: strive for multi-ethnic mix)
- Child and adult literacy and numeracy rates across different social divisions
- Access to informal and continuous education

HEALTH: (UNICEF, WHO, many good indicators exist)
- Specific needs of vulnerable groups
- Access to health care
- Mortality rates (infant mortality and premature mortality),
- Life expectancy, healthy life expectancy
- Nutrition (infant with low birth weight)

RIGHTS AND JUSTICE:
- Laws and regulations designed to promote inclusion
- Public safety and crime

LABOUR MARKET: (indicators need to be broken down for vulnerable groups)
- Unemployment, underemployment and joblessness
- Relation between formal and informal jobs / size of informal economy
- Labor market equity (respect for diversity, discrimination in the labor force)
- Gender integration in the workforce.

PARTICIPATION: covering social, economic and political dimensions
- Voter turnout
- Civic engagement
- Access to information

---

[6] These important well-being indicators are based on 2 questions. First, respondents are asked whether or not they possess or have access to a certain item. (i.e., a washing machine, a car for private use…). Then, if they respond negatively, they are asked whether it is because they cannot afford the item ("enforced lack") or whether it is by choice.

- Access to public services

ENVIRONMENT:
- Sustainable development policies
- Environmental protection measures
- Environmental inequality[7]

WELL-BEING AND MENTAL HEALTH MEASURES: need to capture people's experiences (and how they think and feel), including mixture of hedonic and eudemonic well-being measures (Satisfaction with life scale and functional mental health measures) For example, see the European Social Survey[8], and Canadian Index of Wellbeing (CIW)[9] . Wellbeing measures will also require qualitative methods.

Further analysis will be possible by cross examining the above with demographic and background information, such as:

DEMOGRAPHIC & BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- Socio-demographic profile (i.e., gender, age, religion, ethnicity, type of area <urban/ suburban/rural>, marital status, occupation, level of highest education, disability, etc.)
- Household & Family Composition
- Identity (i.e., foreign born, new immigrants, indigenous population, minorities)
- Language spoken at home

---

[7] http://www.sd-research.org.uk/researchreviews/documents/ESJ_final_report.pdf. Lucas, K. Walker, G. Eames, M. Fay, H. and Poustie, Justice: Rapid Research and Evidence Review. Environmental inequality refers to the unequal social distribution of environmental risks and hazards and access to environmental goods and services, and is closely related to the concept of environmental justice.

[8] http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org. ESS's measurement of well-being and quality of life links the work of sociologists, psychologists and political scientists to that of economists, epidemiologists, demographers and others. For instance, links have been shown between survey measures of life satisfaction and national economic indicators, between self-rated health and morbidity statistics, and between declining trust in government and falling electoral turnouts. Arriving at an appropriate and achievable long-list of new indicators will thus require extensive scrutiny as well as detailed discussions and consultations with and between a diverse range of appropriate specialists in each of these disciplines.

[9] www.atkinsonfoundation.ca. CIW attempts to measure wellbeing of citizens in seven areas. The Living Standards domain, for example, will measure incomes and jobs; the gap between rich and poor; food and livelihood security; and affordable housing. The Healthy Populations domain will assess the health status and health outcomes of different groups of Canadians, as well as risk factors and conditions that affect health and disease. The Community Vitality domain will assess social cohesion, personal security and safety, and people's sense of social and cultural belonging. Other domains will measure the quality of the environment, the educational attainment of the population, and the amount of free time that people can devote to social, family and cultural pursuits. Finally, the CIW will measure people's civic engagement, and how responsive governing bodies are to citizens' needs and views.

IV. Recommendations for fragile or post-conflict societies

IV-1. How does the concept of developing and sustaining social inclusion/cohesion apply in fragile or post-conflict societies and what special measure may be needed?

- Social integration/inclusion should be seen as an ultimate early prevention, by creating and maintaining peaceful social relations, and making societies more resilient for disintegration. It also lays a foundation to build an inclusive society in a post-conflict situation. As the social tensions arise, and societies start to become more polarized and fragmented, the window of opportunity for possible interventions is getting narrower and narrower. In this regard, social integration/inclusion should be seen as a condition to create long-term sustainable peace, and prevent societies from slipping into violent conflict. Therefore, the cost for social integration/inclusion could be described as an insurance fee or investment for the future.

- In addition to formulating new policies or strengthening institutions that promote social integration/inclusion, the concept of inclusion should be effectively mainstreamed into the existing policies and programmes in different sectors. This requires a comprehensive review to identify if there are any policies or its implementation mechanisms that are unintentionally non-inclusive, or intentionally exclusive. This could be also done through, for example, a 'situation analysis' or joint participatory dialogue.

- The concept of social integration/inclusion can be also incorporated in a range of general management and group process skills, such as active listening, meeting facilitation skills, confidence building, or more specific, targeted skills for collaborative, interest-based negotiations, participatory decision-making and leadership skills.

- It is also essential to build the capacities of government officials and civil society on "conflict-sensitive" or "inclusive" development, particularly for post-conflict or fragile states. Governments need to provide an enabling environment for civil society to recuperate and foster new leadership and flourish in post-conflict environments.

- Strategies for effective awareness-raising can be developed, in order to change mindsets of people. Such strategies could be targeted mass media campaigns, and carefully crafted media messages, a series of facilitated dialogue sessions, or popularization of social integration/inclusion in local/regional languages.

- An approach for building national capacity for social inclusion needs to be context specific, however, at its inception, it could, ideally, build a carefully balanced set of predominantly **process capacity-building skills**, and gradually shifting to more content, once trust and respect are installed, relationships are built, fears are brought to the surface and shared, and the content can be jointly addressed collaboratively.

V. Recommendations: A way forward – follow up actions to the Expert Group Meeting

The experts encouraged all parties to continue working in this area, and suggested the following activities to follow up the EGM.

1. Translate the concept of social integration/inclusion into practice, through formulating pilot studies in different regions, and highlight this issue in the programs of the related UN agencies and their collaboration scheme.

2. Advocacy on the importance of the concept of social inclusion/integration (popularize the concept in local/regional languages)

3. Mainstream "social inclusion" into other sectors – e.g., cross fertilization workshops to review the current approach.

4. Consolidate existing methodologies and indicators in such areas as social inclusion, social exclusion, social cohesion, wellbeing, mental health, community cohesion/solidarity, etc.

5. Conduct further research on existing work and good practices on social integration, social inclusion, social cohesion and social capital, and create a knowledge base to be shared widely.

6. Develop practical guidelines, for policy makers and practitioners, with a view to helping them to identify their own indicators, which emphasize citizen's perceptions and experience, through applying a **multi-method approach** (using qualitative and quantitative approach). Compile a manual on gathering data on social inclusion at the local/regional level (what and how to gather).

7. Put in place new modalities to strengthen dialogue between researchers, policy-makers and the civil society, including NGOs in the field of social inclusion.

8. Call upon a new collaboration to further the goal of social integration/inclusion. Create synergies and linkages with related networks, such as regional and urban planners, peace-building/conflict prevention networks, international coalition of cities against racism and discrimination, and UNESCO's Management of Social Transformations (MOST) Programme which is focusing on research-policy linkages, UN-HABITAT/UNESCO joint project on "Urban policies and the right to the city", and UN-HABITAT's work on "Inclusive cities", DESA's networks on youth, older persons, people with disabilities, family, indigenous peoples, etc.

9. Underscore the specificity of developing countries, particularly the role of structural institutions and institutional frameworks that allows actors in all spheres of society to engage harmoniously and to realize their respective potential, in realizing the objective of promoting inclusive cities.

10. Create an electronic resource based on theories and practices on social inclusion and related concepts.

11. Produce a high quality publication based on this Expert Group meeting, which is relevant and useful to policy makers, researchers and practitioners.

II.   Background

A. Introduction

The Division for Social Policy and Development (DSPD) of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), in collaboration with the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT), organized an Expert Group Meeting on "**Creating an Inclusive Society: Practical Strategies to Promote Social Integration**" at the UNESCO Headquarters in Paris, France from 10 to 13 September, 2007.

Within the broad objective of developing practical strategies to promote social integration through an inclusive and participatory process, the meeting was geared at exploring essential elements necessary to create an inclusive society, clarifying methodology of analysis of social inclusion, and exploring possible approaches to measure the cohesiveness of societies. This was done through examining case studies, existing methodologies and indicators to assess the impact of interventions to promote social inclusion at the local and community level. It also aimed to examine how these methodologies and indicators could be applied to real challenges that societies are facing, such as urban violence and insecurity, marginalization of certain groups, and, further, what role it could play in conflict prevention and peace-building efforts.

The meeting was part of ongoing efforts at UNDESA to clarify the meaning of social policy in a contemporary world, including the interconnection of inclusion, participation and justice in building socially integrated societies. Inclusion - in this context refers to policies and institutional arrangements designed to include all citizens - is closely connected to actions taken by policy makers.

This meeting of experts was conceived as a continuation of the work initiated at DESA/DSPD two years ago. It built upon a conceptual framework described in the recent publication entitled, "Participatory Dialogue: Towards a stable, safe and just society for all", together with E-dialogues organized by DSPD/DESA in 2005 and 2006, where the potential of participatory dialogue was explored as an important policy tool that can offer a range of practical means to promote social integration. The meeting's deliberations will be published as a contribution to the global debate, policy dialogue and evolution of practical strategies for social integration - thereby contributing to enhancing the social science- social policy nexus.

B. Context

The World Summit for Social Development (Copenhagen, 1995) established the notion of social integration in the intergovernmental discourse and national policy making. The Copenhagen Declaration and Programme of Action, a key outcome of the Summit, pledged to make the eradication of poverty, promoting full employment and fostering social integration overriding objectives of development. The Declaration contains a specific commitment to advance social integration to create "a society for all" through fostering inclusive societies that are stable, safe, just and tolerant and that respect diversity, equality of opportunity, and participation of all people, including disadvantaged and vulnerable groups and persons.

A "society for all" is one in which every individual, each with rights and responsibilities, has an active role to play. Such an inclusive society is promoted by social policies that seek to reduce inequality and that are trying to create flexible and tolerant societies that embrace all

people. Among other things, the Copenhagen Programme of Action called for creating social institutions and mechanism that are accessible to people and are responsive to their needs; ensuring opportunities for all people to participate in all spheres of public life; and strengthening participation and involvement of civil society in the formulation, implementation and evaluation of decisions. It gave special emphasis to measures to meet the needs and interests of those who face obstacles in participating fully in societies.

Achieving a "society for all" has proved elusive. The concepts and approaches are complex, making it difficult for most Governments to implement inclusive social policy or participatory planning. Some Governments embraced mainstreaming, but mainstreaming does not always guarantee participation. To achieve the kind of integration that is envisaged, Governments should promote active participation by various social groups – especially those historically excluded – in policy and planning processes. This requires measures to ensure that every group has an opportunity to express its views and become engaged in decision-making that affect their lives.

Making "a society for all" operational is crucial. In its efforts to follow-up on the commitments made at the Social Summit, the Division for Social Policy and Development of UNDESA has undertaken a series of activities, geared at promoting inclusive policy processes as well as exploring the potential of dialogue as a means to resolve conflicts non-violently and transform societies to be more inclusive and participatory, and, by extension, to further social cohesion.

There is a general consensus that a concept of "social integration", as a process for building and changing social relations, can play a central role in overcoming various social challenges, and has relevance for conflict transformation and peacebuilding. One of the recommendations arising from the discussions at the United Nations was to further explore ways to measure social integration, or the degree of social cohesion, to assess its impact; and to this end, discuss what types of indicators or proxy indicators, including complementary elements to existing indicators, could be looked at.

In a publication entitled, "Participatory Dialogue: Towards a stable, safe and just society for all" (February 2007) prepared by DSPD, measuring social integration was identified as one of the most important research and policy goals. It was suggested that developing some specific indicators or a composite index could be useful to further our understanding of social integration, as well as to measure progress in social integration. The question, however, was on how to make such index methodologically adequate - what components or weights could be used to make it truly representative.

Against this background, the Expert Group Meeting explored a variety of approaches to expand and enhance the inclusiveness of policies and policy making processes, as well as institutional mechanisms. It also highlighted participatory aspects of the decision-making processes, including information gathering methods at the local and community level. One of the aspects explored was the role of trust and social capital in finding collective solutions to various social challenges.

C. Objectives and expected outcomes

The principal objective of this Expert Group Meeting was to explore ways and means to promote social integration, in particular, to identify common approaches in mapping out, monitoring, and measuring the progress of interventions aimed at creating an inclusive society.

This was achieved through: 1) examining policies, case studies and existing approaches mainly at local and community levels; and 2) an E-dialogue organized from 23 May to 20 June 2007 with wider participants to stimulate new ideas and compile existing approaches and good practices. The meeting also discussed methodological issues pertinent to analysis of social integration and examined existing approaches to capture, analyze and measure multiple dimensions of social inclusion for further review and analysis.

The meeting specifically aimed to:

a) Review various dimensions of social integration/inclusion/cohesion and explore critical elements that are pre-requisites for creating an inclusive society;
b) Examine current initiatives and existing models in measuring the health of the societies (i.e., social inclusion/exclusion, citizen's participation, inclusive policy process, safety or security) and identify their strengths and weaknesses;
c) Identify the methodology(ies) and information gathering process which could be used for measuring social integration/inclusion/cohesion;
d) Explore a set of core indicators for measuring social integration/inclusion/cohesion;
e) Discuss if such an approach can also be applied at the national level, in particular, for conflict prevention and peace-building purposes;
f) Create a knowledge-base on good practices in this area; and
g) Explore options for the follow-up to the meeting.

III.   Organization of work

During the four days of the meeting, participants met in plenary session, round-table and working groups (see Annex II for the agenda of the meeting). In the first day's plenary, participants shared their perspectives on the concept of social inclusion as a major issue in contemporary societies, and explored what factors would make inclusive societies possible. Later, the participants made their observations on the barriers to social inclusion, and explored ways and means to overcome them. In the round-table discussions, the participants discussed concrete actions to create inclusive societies, including developing inclusive policies, institutional mechanisms, and effective use of participatory dialogue as a tool to promote social integration. On the second day, participants discussed on how to bring together communities of policy-makers, researchers and practitioners in order enhance social science and social policy nexus. Later in a round-table discussion, the participants exchanged their views on what are possible strategies to enhance national capacities for inclusive policy processes, as well as the role of local governments in promoting political, social and economic inclusion and participation. On the third day, the participants reviewed approaches and methods to measure social inclusion and cohesion. In the afternoon sessions, the participants divided into three working groups to elaborate recommendations for action. The work was concluded by sharing and integrating the reports of the working groups.

A. Attendance

Experts, researchers and practitioners from academia, research institutes, foundations, NGOs, local governments and the private sector, from the following 14 countries from Africa, Asia, the Americas and Europe participated in the meeting: Belgium, Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, India, Ireland, Israel, Netherlands, South Africa, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States, and Zambia. The areas of their expertise included: social policy, social science, social

integration/inclusion, social cohesion, co-existence, participation, diversity, fight against racism and discrimination, local governance, urban/environmental policy and safety, social indicators, community mobilization, public/mental health, wellbeing, integration of migrants, dialogue, coexistence, reconciliation, conflict prevention and peace-building.

Representatives of the following international and regional organizations also participated in the meeting: UNESCO, UN-HABITAT, European Forum for Urban Safety, and the United Nations Departments of Economic and Social Development (UNDESA).

B. Documentation

The documentation of the meeting included substantive papers on the concepts of social integration/inclusion/cohesion, review of existing approaches and methods in measuring social inclusion, as well as case studies of local-level experience with approaches to social integration/inclusion and participation. The papers were circulated ahead of time and are available on the website (see annex V for the list of documentation).

IV. Summary of sessions

A. Opening session

Mr. Wataru Iwamoto, in opening the meeting, welcomed the participants to the UNESCO HQs in Paris, France, and served as a moderator of the opening session. He introduced the representatives of three organizations, namely, Mr. Pierre Sané, Assistant Director-General, Social and Human Sciences Sector, UNESCO, Mr. Mohamed Halfani, Officer-in-charge, Urban Development Branch and Chief, Urban Governance Section, UN-HABITAT, and Mr. Sergei Zelenev, Chief of the Social Integration Branch, Division for Social Policy and Development, Untied Nations Department of Economic and social Affairs (UNDESA).

B. Working definitions

The Expert Group meeting used the following working definitions for social integration, social inclusion, social cohesion, and social exclusion.

Social Integration

The Social Summit approached social integration in terms of goals, principles, and process. The goal of social integration is to create "a more stable, safe, and just society for all", in which every individual, each with rights and responsibilities, has an active role to play. Such an inclusive society must be based on the principles of embracing – not coercing or forcing – diversity and using participatory processes that involve all stakeholders in the decision-making that affects their lives.

For this EGM, "Social integration" was defined as a dynamic and principled process in which societies engage in order to further human development. The successful social integration process encourages "coming together" while respecting differences, and consciously and explicitly putting great value on maintaining diversity. Social integration represents the attempt

not to make people adjust to society, but rather to ensure that society is accepting of all people. The main ingredients of social integration were: inclusion, participation and justice/social justice, which allow meaningful and effective engagement for a common future.

Processes of social integration are intended to overcome the obstacles to social integration and to re-balance the asymmetry of social exclusion. The role of the government in social integration may involve policies, service delivery, institutional capacity building, supporting interaction between groups, and often taking initiative in partnership with the civil society in promoting dialogues among stakeholders, leading to a better understanding and mutual accommodation.

Social Inclusion

"Social inclusion" was defined as the process by which efforts are made to ensure equal opportunities – that everyone, regardless of their background, can achieve their full potential in life. Such efforts include policies and actions that promote equal access to (public) services as well as enable citizen's participation in the decision-making processes that affect their lives.

Social Cohesion

"Social cohesion" is a related concept that parallels that of social integration in many respects. A socially cohesive society is one where all groups have a sense of belonging, participation, inclusion, recognition and legitimacy. Such societies are not necessarily demographically homogenous. Rather, by respecting diversity, they harness the potential residing in their societal diversity (in terms of ideas, opinions, skills, etc.). Therefore, they are less prone to slip into destructive patterns of tension and conflict when different interests collide.

Social Exclusion

"Social exclusion" is the opposite of social integration and can be defined as the process by which systematic neglect, oppression (i.e., social relations are unequal and inequitable) or discrimination against people, that exist in social institutions, whether government, organizations, communities and households.

C. Where are we today? Social inclusion as a major issue in contemporary societies

Moderator: Sergei Zelenev, DESA
Introductory remarks: Göran Therborn

Guiding Questions:

- What is social inclusion and why it is important?
- What factors make an inclusive society possible?
- What are the obstacles to social inclusion?
- What approaches could be used for promoting social inclusion at the national and local levels?
- How is the cultural diversity ensured in the course of the social inclusion?

Dimension of inclusion

Göran Therborn, Professor and Chair of Sociology, University of Cambridge, UK, opened his presentation by defining the term "inclusion", not completely agreeing with the UN's definition of "inclusive society", where every individual has an active role to play. He defined inclusion as "participation in social interaction", and not necessarily every citizen has to play an active social role.

He identified five dimensions of inclusion that could be used as a basis for developing social inclusion indicators. These dimensions are (from the lowest to highest): 1) visibility - to be noticed; 2) consideration – one's needs and concerns are taken into account by policy makers (Often the concerns and needs of the poor and other marginalized groups are not considered by policy makers.); 3) access to social interactions; 4) rights: rights to act and claim, including rights to be different, rights to access quality and accessible social services (housing, education, transportation, health care, etc.), and right to work, right to participate in the cultural life. Right to claim will regress if one is discriminated, (i.e., in the welfare state, people have right to claim social benefits): and 5) resources to fully participate in society (those who do not have access to rights, they are not able to participate fully in society, but even if some people have rights to access, without adequate resources, they cannot participate fully).

Fundamental Obstacles to Inclusion

Therborn identified three fundamental obstacles to inclusion as: 1) interdependence of inclusion/exclusion; 2) generation of inequality; and 3) interaction of insecurity, fear and exclusion.

Dialectics of inclusion/exclusion

According to Therborn, one of the important dimensions of obstacles to inclusion is the dialectics, or interdependence, of inclusion and exclusion. Inclusion usually means that something is inner of a boundary with an outer side of exclusion. In other words, inclusion is only possible by the existence of a boundary between those who are included and excluded. Being a member of something means there is a boundary between the members and the non-members. Collective identities are best produced by way of demarcating "us" from "them". If this is the case, efforts towards social inclusion is to lower these boundaries, or make boundaries more permeable.

Generators of inequality

He identified the following three elements as generators of inequality: 1) market-driven economies; 2) the family-school nexus of unequal social capacitation (more resources for privileged children in preparation: creates unequal social capacities); 3) ethno-national power relations.

He also argued that when tackling with inequality, one needs to understand that there are different types of inequality, and inter-generational inequality (reproduction of inequality), in particular, needs further studies. Unlike temporary inequality (i.e. temporary loss of job or income), inter-generationally-transmitted inequality is more systematic and most likely associated closely with exclusion.

<u>(Re) production of insecurity, fear and exclusion</u>

Another point raised was the interaction of insecurity, fear and exclusion. Most vicious forms of insecurity are connected to fear and exclusion:
- Inter-generational family reproduction of experiences of inclusion/exclusion: class, ethnicity, gender, reproduction of lack of self-confidence
- Cycles of privilege, resentment and rebellion, generates fear and exclusion, violence, leading to more fear, exclusion, and violence ….
- Migration creates new proximity to strangers that generates fear
- War or threat/fear of war (i.e. genocide: result of threats of war)
- State break-up or collapse

Three Major Tasks of Inclusion

Three major tasks of inclusion were suggested as: 1) reduction of boundary of inclusion/exclusion; 2) reduction of inequality; and 3) reduction of emotional or psychological insecurity.

Boundary reductions: Due to ongoing globalization and advancement of technologies, boundaries have already been lowered in some areas, such as information, knowledge and experience. Mass media facilitated the creation of capacity to take an interest in other cultures (cultural extension capacity) thus lowered the boundary in this area. Changeable lifestyles also eased possibilities of entering and exiting social milieu. However, more tact is necessary, especially in dealing with sensitive issues in multi-ethnic societies.

Conditions for and ways of reducing inequality: Contrary to a widely shared view in the globalization discourse, economic constraints to redress inequality or social exclusion are not very robust. In fact, many countries that achieve relatively equal societies demonstrate stronger economic competitiveness. It is rather a political will to reduce barriers to social inclusion. It is important to raise awareness for policy makers of the cost of inequality for the entire society, in particular, those who are privileged, and for a society as a whole.

The cost for social inclusion should be seen as a long-term investment for sustainable development. The cost- benefit analysis for inequality/equality and exclusion/inclusion should be further examined, and the cost consciousness of the adversary effect of socio-economic exclusion be further advocated.

Reduction of psychological insecurity: It is important to create and/or strengthen comprehensive socialization systems, which bring people together with diverse backgrounds (i.e., from different classes or different ethnic groups), and that will create horizontal and vertical social networks among citizens. At the same time, it is also important to create a strong political will as well as over-arching goals. Through interaction and dialogue with people with diverse backgrounds, each member/social group in a society will gradually learn and accept the standards and practices of another person or culture.

Final Outlook

Finally, Therborn gave an overall outlook of contemporary societies. Socio-cultural boundaries tend to be lowered, loosening the interdependence of inclusion and exclusion. Economic inequality within nations is generally rising, making societies less inclusive. Psychological and

emotional insecurity are increasing, generating more exclusion. At the same time, there is global de-legitimization of exclusion, existential inequality, racism and gender-based discrimination. Therborn concluded his presentation by stating, "Social change is possible, as always".

2. Discussion:

Definition of social inclusion

Some participants pointed out that Therborn's definition of inclusion, focusing on social interaction, is not sufficient enough, and proposed to look at a broader concept of social inclusion/ integration, which includes other components, and distinguish structural dimensions of inclusion from social interaction or social network. Structural aspects include basic socio-economic development at the household level (land, water, education, etc.). One participant suggested that social inclusion should not remain as an upstream umbrella concept, but should be tackled as a cross-sectoral concept, which needs to be mainstreamed into sectoral policies. Each of the sectoral policies then needs to be reviewed if they are inclusive, and if participatory measures are installed in the policy formulation, implementation and monitoring processes.

It is important to look at what holds a society together, and how the society can lower its boundary, so that everyone can feel they are a part of the society, and a part of the solution for the future of their society. This is a totally different approach from the existing one, which tends to aim towards integrating "others" into the mainstream society. In this sense, a sense of belonging, sense of community, or interconnectedness, may be a better word to describe an inclusive society.

During the discussion, there was a general consensus that the definition of social inclusion could be built around the sense of "change" in both individuals and their society. Addressing both informal (individual) and formal (society) level of engagements has significant importance, particularly when addressing the issue of exclusion, fear, historical trauma, or deep poverty.

Similarly, "citizen's responsibility" should be emphasized in the inclusion discourse. Whoever being included as a citizen and guaranteed their rights has also civic responsibility. Those in dominant position in the society have responsibilities to contribute to the betterment of their society. One of the barriers to inclusive societies is the resistance of the privileged to change, and their insecurity to bring unknown to their stable environment. Sense of responsibility is crucial in dealing with exclusion issues and changing one's emotion (fear, anger, hatred) links to alienation.

Issue of boundary and identity

Each person has multiple identities, such as gender, age, education level, economic status, ethnicity, religion, language, culture, historical background, origin of their parents, ideology, preference in food, etc. People identify themselves with one or multiple of their identities, depending on the situation. The height of the boundary is considered to correspond to the strengths of collective identity. For example, when a society excludes a certain group/people, based on collective identity, such as ethnicity, religion, or language, the boundary of exclusion/inclusion becomes high, as such exclusionary actions actually strengthen their collective identity. On the contrary, in an inclusive society, individual identity becomes more imperative. In other words, when we lower the boundary through various interventions, individual identify gains more importance compared to collective identity. Often in the conflict

situation, production of collective identity is facilitated by emphasizing the difference between us (civilized/good) and them (evil/uncivilized), thus building a fortress of boundaries.

One of the most difficult issues is how to deal with fears/deep historical traumas, in other words, how to lower the threshold of fear. It requires time to minimize a sense of fear among people, and this can only be achieved through bringing the historical perspectives. It is important, not just empowering the excluded to participate, but also empowering the majority to lower the level of their insecurity. If we agree with the notion that one's fear plays an important role for exclusionary behavior, more attention should be paid to explore how people think and feel (emotion) about social inclusion processes.

Another comment was made on culture and compatibility that gives culpability to culture. In the past, culture was something to be inherited and transmitted from one generation to another. However, culture is now seen as a process. People usually have multiple identities, and it is possible to create a new identity - more diverse and multi-cultural identity, that could eventually be adopted by all members of a society.

Cost of inclusion

The participants raised a question as to who would bear the high costs of inclusion and participation. They asked if this could be a part of corporate social responsibility. The cost of inclusion/exclusion is a very difficult task to tackle with, as those in financial power have vested interest in keeping status quo. One needs to look at factors that maintain social exclusion, such as skepticism of the privileged to change, and construction of "self-righteous", paternal assumption, etc. Creative solutions are necessary to overcome these obstacles.

It was pointed out that the cost should be looked at from both economic and social perspectives. If we only look at economic costs, they may look expensive; however, we must look at social costs at the same time. Not including a part of the society will eventually cost more in the long run, taking many different forms, such as, an increase in insecurity, high crime rates, brain drain, emigration, expansion of slums, instability, urban violence, and violent conflict, etc. Therefore, building awareness around costs of exclusionary policies and practice, from multiple perspectives, is crucial.

One participant pointed out what is missing here is an opportunity cost. In a business community, there is a cost consciousness of not only excluding some, but also lost opportunity by not including them. For example, in a globalized world, understanding people with different backgrounds, their culture, their customs and values, has added-value. We may be able to create cost-benefit consciousness around social inclusion.

Inequality, equity, and being different

It is necessary to distinguish inequality from being different. Unlike the latter, inequality is something that is produced and can be tackled with. Similarly, we need to tackle with individual rights differently from community rights. The difficult task is to address the relationship between individual and group's needs with considerable amount of tact. In this sense, it may be better to look at inequity rather than inequality, and we shift the paradigm further towards equity.

It was pointed out that today's competitive societies create more losers than winners, which tends to generate further exclusion and inequality. Many states attempt to prevent growing

inequality through compensation policies, which has not been successful so far, as fundamental problems remain unsolved. Developing a concept of inclusion is necessary, which can be brought deeper as to a concept of social integration in which people get together, are interconnected, and share sense of belonging as well as sense of responsibility.

It is important to note that all societies are changing. It's a dynamic process of bringing different members, new elements, transmitting traditional values, accommodating to new priorities, transforming themselves to adopt new environment. And those societies successful in adopting new environment will survive and flourishing. For example, some new societies that have sought to accommodate different languages and ethnicities have been relatively successful in integrating all people from different parts of the world. This is an example to indicate that some powerful mechanisms exist/existed at the national level in bringing these people together, which may be a sense of community.

D. Overcoming exclusion: promoting inclusive institutions and facilitating participation

> Moderator: Elisabeth Barot-Henault
> Introductory remarks: Sangeetha Purushotoman
> Brad Meyer and Hamid Senni

> *Guiding Questions:*

- Why social exclusion is so persistent? Why many social groups and individuals are unable to participate in a society in a meaningful way?
- What policies could be promoted to prevent disintegration and fragmentation of social fabric and a loss of social cohesion?
- How to promote participatory process and action for inclusion?
- Lessons learned from successful interventions
- What is the role of education to promote social inclusion?

> 1. *Presentation: Strategies, Barriers and Policies towards creating a more inclusive society*

Sangeetha Purushothaman, Director, Best Practices Foundation, Bangalore, India, presented an overview of her work on tackling with exclusion and efforts to engage extremely marginalized populations in economic and political empowerment programs in India. She stated that the ability to participate in economic, social and political development opportunities is severely curtailed by barriers experienced by certain segment of population, including religious and caste minorities, the poor, and, most acutely, poor women.

She emphasized that poverty is itself a tremendous barrier for participation, and without addressing endemic poverty in more integrated and coordinated way, development initiatives are doomed to fail. She offered a compelling critique and concrete examples of the failure of initiatives to coordinate, taking on ad hoc and unconnected series of agendas. Root causes have been ignored or not adequately addressed, making the impact weak at best.

She pointed to the need to root discussions of these projects in the larger context of poverty, exclusion and the democratic process. She focused on the intersections of these concerns, and suggested to increase awareness of enhancing participation as a convergence.

She noted that "development can take place with or without participation". She pointed to the Indian government's series of "five year plans" which outlined clear and important developmental goals and programs, but with very limited public participation in the goal-setting or implementation phases. This non-participatory approach to development actually appeared to diminish the beneficial effects of development efforts, since: a) project design may have been not well suited to particular sub-sets of society; and b) people felt alienated from the projects from the start.

Purushothaman then highlighted the importance of a rights-based approach to participation, particularly in the democratic process. She noted that the link to the development themes have to do with the historical weakness of support for realization of social and economic rights. A related challenge is the limits experienced by the poor and disenfranchised in simply becoming aware of certain rights, including those associated with health and education.

She turned to the question of *how* to address these challenges, especially amongst the poor. She noted the need to address both formal and informal levels of engagement, arguing that some issues must be addressed immediately. An example is that of deep poverty twined with intensely restrictive loan structures and indebtedness. These loan schemes develop and support extremely exploitive relationships. She cited examples of programming that addresses these problems through micro finance schemes, dealing with debt before attempting to move into more long-term development modes.

She also discussed the intersection of poverty and exclusion with caste and religious minority issues. This actually opens areas of cross-community sharing and creating common grounds. When work is done across caste lines, community mobilization is more comprehensive, creating a new environment.

Overall, she stressed the need to emphasize both a rights-based approach and high levels of participation of stakeholders in development efforts. In terms of ways forward, she emphasized on-the-ground community mobilization, through initiatives aimed at economic (for instance micro finance and livelihood initiatives), social (accessing services, advocacy, gender budgeting, etc.) and political (participatory local planning processes) empowerment efforts, in contrast to traditional development programming. A mode of intervention that supports this is the use of "collectives" or self-help groups, including the creation or capacity building of youth groups, farmers' groups, and women's groups, etc.

Concluding themes included the concept of "convergence", the closer interaction within government and also, critically, between government and civil society (especially CBOs) on these core issues. She also argued for the redefinition of participation as "the active involvement of all stakeholders at every stage in the development process, where the voices of the poor, of women and of marginalized groups are center staged.[10]"

---

[10] Purushothaman, Sangeetha, "Strategies, Barriers and Policies towards Creating a More Inclusive Society", prepared for the UNDESA Expert Group Meeting, 2007

2. *Presentation: Lessons learned from successful interventions*

Brad Meyer, Director, Collaboration Ltd. London, UK, and **Hamid Senni**, Director, Vision Enabler Ltd, London, UK, made a presentation on a case study of promoting inclusion and accommodating diversity, in the private sector in France. Their work focused on a process of "facilitated, consensus-based change", with a particular emphasis on identity, race, diversity, inclusion and related issues in the business community.

They began by noting that the recent riots in France started creating an awareness of deep and real problems and conflict regarding "identity" in the country. In the exploration of their intervention, this awareness opening also provided small but important opportunities for change processes to begin.

Senni gave a concrete example from his own experience that, "On paper, I am French, but in reality, people perceive me as 'French Plus'". He noted that discrimination starts with 'our names', 'our addresses', where 'our parents' come from, etc.

Their intervention started from an analysis of the riots in France as being rooted in a profound sense of long-term and endemic exclusion and discrimination experienced by youth of North African and Arab heritage in France. In particular, their analysis noted discriminatory practices (systemic, formal and informal) in education and in employment opportunities, and the work they have pursued targets the private sector as a site of discrimination and also an opportunity for social change and inclusion.

The question Senni and Meyer had struggled with in the framing stages of their intervention, immediately following violent rioting in France that primarily involved and impacted youth with North African and Arab origin, revolved around *how and where do we 'attack discrimination'?* On these issues, they argued that for the past two years (following the 2005 riots), "we have been in an analysis paralysis", with government and society struggling to come to terms with both the root causes of the violence and also appropriate, effective and sustainable responses.

They noted a difference between the UK and France. They suggested that in the UK, while communities do cluster and self-identify as distinct, there is a high degree of mixing and integration in the work environment. This contrasts with France, in which work places can often be seen as a "snow-white, male world".

They presented the work of their organization, "Vision Enabler", as it designed, developed and implemented a highly interactive, long-term and participatory process for private sector stakeholders. These participants were slowly brought into a process that encourages companies to look at their own practices as they relate to diversity and inclusion.

Among the challenging questions the process conveners had to engage with included:
- Why should we (the private sector participants) participate? Is there anything to be gained? Is this a waste of time and resources?
- What is the incentive? What are the expected outcomes?
- How and when should we convene?
- What if things go "wrong", or what if nothing significant is gained?

They described the multi-phased process of engaging with corporate participants, and the intensely reflective and people-centered approach they took in moving individuals through the

dialogic learning experiences. Their approach is to progressively peel away the layers of the mind sets of the people involved, to find out why they resist changes – and then address these reasons.

They illustrated the emotional reactions to changes provoked by so-called traditional "change initiatives". (Most change initiatives fail. Where they fail is on generating personal desire to participate in the change). The challenges behind a person's decision to not participate can be summarized in four responses; "It's not true", "So what?", "Do I care?", and "Who are you (to be approaching me this way)?" They demonstrated how the challenges to promoting inclusion are deeply rooted in one's personal beliefs, values and identities that have developed over the years.

They described the *"Vision Enabler Tool kit"*. This was a set of tools used during the process to gather data, analyze emerging themes, provide feedback to the project and build consensus with stakeholders. Some specific interventions for each challenge include:

- To address the "Not True!" response: leave a tangible reference trail of acknowledgement and respect for the beliefs of those involved (using individual surveys and collective reality graphs)
- To address the "So what?" response: expect and plan for a lot of networking and lateral thinking regarding (and on behalf of) stakeholder groups (using localised proverb cards and structured brainstorming templates)
- To address the "Do I care?" response: expect and plan for many personal interactions with target group members to better ensure positive participation (using values elicitation worksheets and personalised states of mind workbooks)
- To address the "Who are you?" response: find and create deeply shared contexts for a mutual sense of purpose and value for promoting positive, sustainable participation (using video to bring people "to life" remotely and with training and coaching regarding in-person rapport building and adaptive communication

3. Discussion

Role of a society in social mobilization

In India, community mobilization, initially started by the civil society, has active Government's involvement since 1980s. Its first intervention focuses on microfinance to support a large number of poor people getting out of their debt and exploitative relationship. Second step is to address the issue of gender, caste, ethnic and religious backgrounds, through organizing women's participation across religion and caste. Finally, interventions are made to address macro issues. The combination of targeted and cross-cutting interventions both at micro and macro levels is necessary to give them an overall sense of inclusion.

Participation and ownership

Participation and ownership of the people to manage their project is critical, particularly in sustaining project activities. But what forms of ownership facilitate participation, and what kind of participation is necessary? One participant gave an example of participatory budgeting. Another pointed out that participation should also be an important part of education and sensitization initiatives for excluded group and their communities. There are various dimensions that would make participation possible, i.e. five dimensions of inclusion discussed during the first

session (ability to be seen and taken into account, access to social interactions, to have access and rights, resources to fully participate).

It is also necessary to look at the relationship between local communities and the state, as a community is an indicative body in relation to the state. In order for the participatory process to function, state's capacity in responding to the needs of local communities in a timely and positive manner is essential. In the same way, local ownership should not be interpreted as being independent from the state, but rather, taking part of the shared responsibility. One participant pointed out that we need to distinguish inclusive governance from self-governance. Self-governance is not necessarily inclusive. In India, instead of waiting for the civil society to come to them, the government approaches communities to mobilize the poor. But this is done only in partnership with civil society organizations that are experienced in how to work with the most vulnerable and marginalized.

There is an increasing realization that the responsibility for improving local communities does not solely lie with governments. Identifying their own resources, strengthening their capacity to work together and bring things in together would also be the responsibility of local communities. In this sense, creating a new consciousness of "sense of responsibility within community" is important. Resources are not limited to financial, but also can be human resources, intellectual resources, and "social capital" – relationships between people and the synergies people create. With this sense of responsibility, communities are able to develop their own agenda of development, and explore alternative partnerships, for example, the private sector, in partnership with government.

Factors that might promote participatory approaches

Researchers examining factors that has stopped people from participating at the institutional level could focus on access to assets, types of information widely available, kinds of expectations tied to participation, as well as issues of security, i.e., if participation threatens their security/identity.

To the question how to entice people to reconnect to their desire to change, the presenter responded that the key is to address both informal and formal level of engagements. For this to happen, the core issue of deep poverty twined with loans and interest rate (personal level) has to be addressed within the broader framework of community mobilizations and interventions. One should be aware of the complexities of mobilizing communities, i.e. individual rights and communal rights, land rights issues, and plan for intersections between certain community mobilization activities, for example, cross-class and cross-caste, etc.

Value of inclusion

In France, one's identity often works as a barrier to inclusion, as the majority of discrimination starts with his/her name or address. As a number of mixed marriage increases, one's identity has become more complex, so does the dynamics of discrimination. It is necessary to look at the system more closely and identify where discrimination takes place and in what form (i.e., education system).

When there is a strong resistance to inclusion, it is useful to identify where this resistance comes from. Most likely, people are not resistant to a particular issue, but, resistant to a change that challenges the personal value each individual is brought up with. It is useful to find out what is important to them and start exploring where he/she could find a place for values of inclusion.

Another important point is to ensure the inclusiveness of legal institutions, as there would be no inclusive society, in the absence of appropriate legal instruments that create an enabling environment to empower individuals.

E. Participatory dialogue as a tool for creating an inclusive society

Moderator: Zachary Metz,
Introductory remarks: Minu Hemmati

Guiding Questions:

- How to ensure unity within diversity?
- What are the appropriate ways to strike a balance between specific interventions aimed at conflict prevention/peace building and a more general mainstreaming approach?
- What are the best ways to build effective partnerships: between governments and Civil Society Organizations; public and private sectors; international organizations and Civil Society Organizations and research institutions/academia, etc.
- Lessons learned

1. Presentation: Participatory dialogue as a tool for creating an inclusive society

This session was different from the others as the **Zachary Metz**, Director of Consensus' Peace Building practice and Faculty member of SIPA, Columbia University, and the presenter, **Minu Hemmati**, Independent Adviser, Germany, offered an experiential learning opportunity.

They chose one dialogue method, "Appreciative Inquiry"[11]. Appreciative inquiry is one of many tools used to help groups discover their strengths. This "strength-based approach" can be used, for example, for community change, helping them discover what is at the positive core of a community group. This dialogic method lays groundwork, through collective procedural analogy, for building future.

They explained that by using this approach, the meeting could explore some of the potential of dialogue as a method in understanding and promoting social integration/ inclusion. In specific, it starts with identifying what went well and what strengths the practitioner brought to the situation. It attempts to discover what has gone well in past practice and uses a story telling approach in which the practitioner is invited to tell their own story of the experience.

They then presented a session in which Hemmati was helped to examine a piece of work in which she had been involved, with Metz guiding her through the process, by asking relevant questions and reflecting back his impressions. The example was in relation to a meeting about environmental concerns. The key elements were that it dealt with a **specific time** when **one was part** of a **peak moment** of **success**. At the end, the presenter was invited to think of a metaphor or image which captures the moment and she chose a scarf with many colored threads woven together into a coherent pattern. The last part of the exercise was a collection of insights which

---

[11] see "Participatory Dialogue: Towards a Stable Safe and Just Society for All", UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, pages 91and 144 and http://appreciativeinquiry.case.edu/.

Hemmati could draw from the experience for her future practice and the whole group was invited to contribute to this part of the session.

The approach highlighted both specific learning points and also ideas which could then be explored farther. For example, it opened up the question of how far practitioners should raise contentious issues and how far it should be left to one of the participants to raises these problems as actually happened in her example. In the session there was not time to actually explore these issues but it demonstrated how they could emerge in a productive way.

With limited discussion, the participants were then divided up into small groups to also try out the method. Each group was made up of a facilitator to guide the process, a practitioner who was reflecting on an event in which he or she had been involved and an observer to comment on the process afterwards. After the appreciative inquiries in small groups, two of the groups shared their experiences with the larger group. The examples offered were very different, one being about the practitioner lifting the morale of a group when it discovered that funding was not available and the other a mediator being very direct and facing the protagonists in a dispute with the realities of the situation. All three participants in the exercise shared their impressions. In both cases the practitioner had been very direct and forceful at certain points but not necessarily directive and there was some time for discussion of this aspect of practice.

Finally, in the last few moments, the groups were asked to comment on the usefulness of an appreciative inquiry approach to social inclusion. It was suggested that it focused on process and not outcome and this is helpful because sometimes process is overlooked. Dialogue encourages people to react affectively. But the question was raised that it may not deal with power imbalances. People involved in politics are often suspicious of this type of affective process-oriented method of discussion, because it may affect the power relationships and they want to use their power to retain control of the process. Therefore, it may need to be introduced carefully. It may be that this specific method of dialogue used is more suitable as a learning tool to use within groups rather than as a tool to facilitate dialogue across groups. Finally the question of what is meant by social inclusion was again raised and how that question is answered determines the relevance of any method of dialogue.

The session itself provided a more affective way of exploring issues and provided a nice counterbalance to the more didactic sessions, and there was very active engagement from most participants.

F. Bringing together communities of policy-makers, researchers and practitioners: enhancing social science-social policy nexus

Moderator: Wataru Iwamoto, UNESCO
Introductory remarks: John Crowley, UNESCO
                   Gary Belkin

Guiding Questions:

- What kind of tools could be used to translate social research into policy action?
- What types of policy intervention are needed in countries at different stages of development?

- How the dialogue and exchange of good practices could be facilitated at the national and regional levels?

1. *Presentation: Building a nexus of research and practice*

The session was dedicated to enhancing the so-called social science – social policy nexus, in the sense of bringing together three communities of different professional cultures: researchers, practitioners and policy-makers. According to Professor Therborn, the basic tension between social scientists and social practitioners can be framed in the fundamental questions as to "what is and why" (social scientists) and "what can be done" (social practitioners).

John Crowley, Editor-in-Chief of the International Social Science Journal and Chief of the Section for Communication, Information and Publication in the Social and Human Sciences Sector of UNESCO, reminded us that the use made of social science knowledge by policy-makers is not inherently inclusive. Such use might be driven by the wish of social control, or by mere curiosity.

If the enhancement of social science knowledge is to enhance inclusiveness, we need a typical kind of knowledge: we need to think simultaneously about a better nexus; and a better inclusiveness. To achieve a better understanding of this, John Crowley eventually elucidated the three generic levels of producing knowledge, disseminating knowledge and using knowledge.

Knowledge production

When addressing the theme of knowledge production through the three afore-mentioned questions, John Crowley emphasized that social science research, as such, does not produce policy prescriptions. If the latter could be derived from mere scientific production, the exclusion of ordinary people would be inherent.

There is a need to translate social science knowledge into non-scientific terms, and from sophisticated specialist language into ordinary language. Crucial questions are on how to open up research to input from ordinary citizens; and how to harmonize time frames between policy-makers and researchers. This leads us to concerted efforts to design research programmes more sensitively. The rationale of involving practitioners needs to be stated more strongly, and relevant provisions for people knowing about policy implementation must be taken into account in the research process.

Knowledge dissemination

Knowledge dissemination must be improved. John Crawley pointed out that the international organization with a mandate of standardizing language, are now short of resources to fulfil the task. If we need to disseminate social science research, there is a need for resources to translate these into multiple languages, as many scientists lack linguistic sophistication to adequately read and write scientific work in non-native languages.

Knowledge use

Knowledge could be better used by policy-makers. It may be relevant to consider wider definition of policy-makers, including parliamentarians and local governments. At the same time,

there is a need for policy-makers to be more flexible, more issue-oriented, and more open to research findings as well as people's perspectives.

Finally, when facilitating the dialogue and exchange of good practices at national and regional level, consideration should be given to three levels, namely, knowledge production, knowledge diffusion, and knowledge use. Innovative research programming, such as multi-level research programming, is sought for, so as to harmonize parallel initiatives in neighbouring countries. Policy process can learn from both good practices and lessons learned. However, mere collection of various case studies do not provide added value, as the key issue is transferability of practices.

2. *Presentation: Building a nexus of facts, practices and knowledge through the lessons and capacities of public health*

Gary Belkin, Associate Professor, New York University School of Medicine and Deputy Director of Psychiatry, Bellevue Hospital Centre, USA, gave an account on "how to better operationalize the concept of social inclusion", on the basis of his work as a psychiatrist. He mentioned himself being impressed by the degree of psychological discourse prevailing in the discussions. He informed about the uses of community-based mental health strategies and demonstrated how suitable and operational these strategies can be for larger social policy objectives and a wide array of paradigmatic contexts.

A concrete example of knowledge in a macro-micro frame, bridging the levels of knowledge

When thinking of inclusion, he departs from a process/value-driven approach. He posed a question as to what inclusion is. When we talk about inclusion, are we taking about cultures, values, frameworks, or functional and material outcomes, or rather a process? He suggested that it might be useful to think of inclusion as core features of problem solving, rather than specific outcomes, and proposed to build a nexus of research and practice on the basis of the reference to well-being and collective efficacy as the unifying denominators. This would render the mental health institutions credible as carrying inclusive goals and values, inclusive process and practice.

The challenge for measuring social inclusion lies not only on finding measures themselves, and thus consensus as to the domains of inclusion of interest, but in incorporating such measures within an established policy practice, such as is argued here, within the work of public health. The complexity of social inclusion would benefit from strategies for complex models of **actionable indicators** (measures are tied to practical action) developed for community/public mental health.

For example, well validated scales of symptoms of distress, and daily ability to function in activities of living could, if applied across a population, provide a needed roadmap of mental health services and promotion intervention that is matched at an aggregate level with other-sector planning. Wellbeing and other mental health measures could uniquely both reflect community distress and draw connections between distress via actionable mental health/wellness markers, and other social, economic, public support, etc. conditions. It is possible to combine them with other reference, e.g., incident of violence, coordinating a range of policy and actions around self reports of wellbeing, distress, etc. gathered as part of public health work.

By making policies carry more actionable meanings and broader sites of legitimate public action, governance increases its credibility as a vehicle for social inclusion experienced and addressed at the micro level, to be connected to wider issues. Also, in this way, policy-makers can measure the impact of their policies, which allow them to generate real knowledge of actions that works on the ground. Mental health and wellbeing is not only an indicator of social inclusion, but social inclusion also should be viewed as cross-sectional at personal and social levels – inclusion as something experienced WITHIN a person impacted by social processes.

3. *Discussion*

Regarding the tension between social science, social practice and policy makers, there is a need to ease these tensions through interchange. At the same time, we need to recognize that each group has different objectives. Also, it is worth mentioning that these tensions are important in having the legitimate critique of social science and scholarly critique of policies.

Social science also has much to learn from public and mental health. Some of existing tools to measure how people feel and think should be incorporated in final report. At the same time, mental health issues can be linked to other issues, or other features of social life.

Getting people to take control over their lives, reducing depression, having a sense of control is vital to wellbeing. The process of inclusion needs to include how people feel and think. Mental health is measure of social exclusion and inclusion at personal level. Linking with other socio-economic information, this might be used to reflect the status of health of society as a whole.

G. The Right to the City: Citizenship Dimensions of Social Inclusion

Moderator: Elizabeth Johnston
Introductory remark: Paul Taylor, UN-HABITAT
                           Wataru Iwamoto, UNESCO

Guiding questions:

- How does the promotion of citizenship contribute to social integration in practice? Is citizenship an effective alternative approach to the legal enshrinement of rights, or just an adjunct to it?
- What are the challenges in exercising the Right to the City? How can it be promoted effectively? Who are the key actors?

1. *Presentation: The Right to the City: Citizenship dimensions of social inclusion*

Wataru Iwamoto, Director, Division of Social Sciences Research and Policy, made an introductory remark on UNESCO/UN-HABITAT joint project on "Urban Policies and the Right to the City" that focused on local democracy, urban governance and citizenship launched in Paris in 2005.

Actors such as Metropolis, the United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) and the Commonwealth Local Government Forum have been involved. Cities are now being involved in UN's research framework on the aspects related to urbanization, particularly with regard to the social segregation and the fragmentation of urban space. The question of capacity-building that enables local authorities to cope with the new challenges posed by the urbanization is also at the heart of the international debate.

Over the past 60 years, the human rights contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) have gradually become recognized and incorporated into the ordinary lives of individuals and social groups, thus expressing the needs, questions and claims of our times. However, there are many in the international community who have argued that certain rights need further elaboration at national and regional level on the basis of the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, such as the right to development, the right to safe drinking water, the right to a clean environment, which would contribute to the needs and rights of all city dwellers, regardless of their religion, age, gender, race, economic and social status, to fully enjoy urban life with all the services and advantages the city has to offer, as well as taking an active part in city management as part of their responsibilities.

The study on the different ways and modalities to include citizen participation to municipal decision-making processes constitute a specific focus of UNESCO/UN HABITAT joint project on "Urban policies and the right to the city". UNESCO contributes to this programme through the cooperation with UNESCO Committees established in different regions of the world, which are dealing with the issues, such as urban policies, citizenship, integration of migrants, etc.

The "Right to the City" is the right to "urban life, to renewed centrality, to places of encounter and exchange, to life rhythms and time uses, enabling the full and complete usage of moments and places. The importance of the notion of participation of all the dwellers has been increasing in today's policy making process. One should consider the cost of "not involving citizens" in the policy making process. The notion of ownership is also an important one.

In "Practical Approaches to Urban Governance," Edgar Pieterse and Jyri Juslén identify mainly four ways in which municipalities can deliver effective, efficient, relevant services to urban dwellers by: (1) developing city-wide decision-making frameworks so that different city stakeholders can "express their interests and vision for the city"; (2) mobilizing programs based on previously determined "flagship priorities"; (3) engaging in institutional reform, which entails a shift to a more demand-based orientation for municipal administration; and (4) monitoring projects and maintaining momentum, continually seeking to ameliorate existing programs and innovate new projects.

The discussion will be continued on the occasion of international meetings such as the World Conference on the Development of Cities to be held in Porto Alegre in February 2008, the WUF IV in Nanjing in October 2008 and the Shanghai EXPO 2010.

Paul Taylor, Director, UN-HABITAT Liaison Office to the European Union and Belgium, gave an introduction on the context of the "Right to the City". Under the rapid urbanization (this year more than 50% of the world population live in the urban environment), the question of urban poverty and exclusion is becoming a major concern. The urban landscape is characterized by the diversity in terms of income, religion and ethnicity. The approach to poverty alleviation has also changed: it is related not only to the lack of resources, but also to the

consequences of discrimination and exclusion. The traditional needs based approach towards urban policies is not strong enough in order to motivate decision-makers to take actions.

The rights-based approach could make a difference here. How the existing international instruments as well as national and local legal frameworks could be effectively translated into the political and social contracts. The right of the citizens/dwellers to be consulted on the matters which affect their lives is primordial. There are quite a few examples of actions that have been already taken by the local governments: e.g. European Charter for the Safeguarding of Human Rights in the City, Aberdeen Declaration, etc. The right to be consulted should be accompanied by the right to access to information, basic services, being different, but also the sense of civic responsibility.

The relationship between the State and the local communities/civil society, where possibly some kind of tensions may arise, was discussed.

Some participants pointed out that the implementation of the rights-based approach could be difficult in the political context where policy-makers need to prioritize various issues to be dealt with. One should think how to sell the concept to the politicians, and the argument of the cost effectiveness may be advanced for this purpose. Also, pointed out was that the notions of civic responsibilities should be further explored, while working on rights-based approach, as rights and responsibilities come hand in hand.

Instead of creating new legal instruments, the existing legal frameworks need to be reconsidered in creating a better understanding on each stakeholder's responsibility in implementing them. They should be implemented in a participatory manner.

Other points raised were: how to address the question of civic education in a more holistic manner, and how to strike the balance between economic competitiveness and social cohesion under the rapid urbanization. It would be useful to create a knowledge base on good practices and lessons learned to document various initiatives being carried out at the local level, for example, by CBOs, local authorities, NGOs, etc. in particular in the areas of participation, fulfillment of civic rights and responsibilities.

The Right to the City (RTTC) (a UN-HABITAT and UNESCO joint project) is a concept which argues how to facilitate citizens' participation in the decision-making process. Citizenship rights exclude who are not citizens, but the RTTC is more inclusive, as it is the rights of all the residents and commuters (which go beyond the current narrow definition of citizenship limited to the nationality). Local knowledge including the one of the most vulnerable people should be mobilized in the decision-making process.

H. Ways and means to develop national capacities for inclusive policy processes

Moderator: Aki Stavrou
Introductory remarks: Glenda Wildschut
                        Gay Rosenblum-Kumar, DESA

Guiding Questions:

- How to create an enabling environment for social inclusion?

- What roles different stakeholders can and should play? How different actions could be coordinated for efficient follow-up?
- What are possible strategies to enhance national capacities?
- How effective are these strategies and what are the criteria for effectiveness?
- What are the lessons from experiences of successful and unsuccessful practices?

1. *Presentation: Social Capital Formation as a Strategy to Promote Social Cohesion - Examples from post-apartheid South Africa*

Glenda Wildschut, Director, Leadership Support and Development Centre, Former Commissioner on the Truth and Reconciliation, South Africa, made a presentation on social capital formation as a strategy to promote social cohesion, in the context of post-apartheid South Africa.

The Institute for Justice and Reconciliation (IJR) was established to promote reconciliation, transitional justice and democratic nation-building in Africa by means of research, analysis and selective intervention. It had three main programs, namely, the Political Analysis Program, the Reconciliation and Social Reconstruction Program, and the Transitional Justice Program. The Political Analysis Program aimed to track reconciliation, transformation, and development. The Reconciliation and Social Reconstruction Program sought to promote processes of reconciliation in post-apartheid South Africa, and understood reconciliation as a fourfold process, which were: 1) acknowledgement and memory; 2) deepening of understanding; 3) forging partnerships; and 4) empowerment of individuals and communities.

With the above objectives, projects were organized, focusing on: education for reconciliation; memory, art and healing; development of tools and resources to teach history and life skills; and building an inclusive society. She presented the "South African Reconciliation Barometer", that is a survey-based tool aimed at providing an idea in quantitative terms of the state of national reconciliation, as an example of practical measures to promote and monitor social transformation. This qualitative survey was combined with the Economic Transformation Audit, which tracks transformation in the economic sphere, to provide the overall picture of the state of national reconciliation with a socio-economic context. The results of the survey have been published annually.

Wildschut presented another example of Western Cape Province's initiative to promote social cohesion. The vision they selected was "Home for All', and common vision for future is to transform the province into "a world class province which cares for all it's people, underpinned by a vibrant, growing and sustainable economy".

The concept of social cohesion, social inclusion, social compact, social integration, according to Wildchut, correlates to the South African concept of "ubuntu". "Ubuntu" represents the notion that one's won humanity and well-being is inextricably linked to that of the other. The focuses of this local government programme are: improved accessibility to government structure; safer communities (change from community policing forum which focused crime to broader focus on community safety); citizen's well-being (both physically and emotionally, psychologically; citizens that are civic minded; developing strong family structure (strengthen the communities as a whole).

She also pointed out that there was "negative" as well as "positive" social cohesion. For example, there is a high level of cohesion among gangs (drug-related problems, human trafficking, etc). When we discuss social cohesion/inclusion, we should also keep in mind that there negative bindings among/within communities as well.

2. *Presentation: Ways and means to develop national capacities for inclusive policy processes'*

Gay Rosenblum-Kumar started her presentation by saying that the theme of the session - ways and means to develop national capacities for inclusive policy processes- means accompanying national stakeholders to catalyze a process that develops locally-derived and owned, sustainable national capacities for increasing social inclusion.

The United Nation's approach in the area of conflict prevention and peace-building has evolved over the years, and has now become more inclusive not only in its rhetoric, but also in its practice, focusing on building capacities and processes that allow various stakeholders to address, identify and resolve root causes of divisions, disputes and conflicts, and transform their societies/relationships towards co-existence and social inclusion. Its content based approach has been balanced with a process based approach.

To that end, UN's approach has shifted radically in the past ten years from one that was segmented along sectoral lines to one that is multi-sectoral and integrated. The old perception of the UN taking a purely political approach involving preventive diplomacy, good offices, high level negotiations, and traditional positional negotiation has evolved.

So called conflict management capacity-building is based on the premise that it is not the ideal for the UN to intervene or mediate directly in the content of the conflict or exclusion or even helping groups to resolve a conflict. It is ideal that societies can transform themselves from inside, and UN's efforts would be imparting the capacity to local stakeholders.

She then described three projects that exemplify this approach:
* Strengthening Democratic Governance project in Ghana – initially the project aimed to address a protracted chieftaincy succession dispute in Northern Ghana. As a result of the project, the National Architecture for Peace is being developed, which included the establishment of peace committees at national, regional and local levels, where police, civil servants, and civil society have regular discussion on potential threats to human security.
* Social Cohesion Project in Guyana – supported the national government and its newly formed Ethnic Relations Commission to undertake inclusive policy consultations. Activities included training on confidence-building, facilitation of social dialogue, network building, negotiation and consensus-based problem-solving skills, and worked with political party youth leaders and local government officials. Collaborative negotiation started to win ground from competitive negotiation. This project was instrumental in creating an enabling environment for the first non-violent election in forty years.
* Conflict Transformation Skills Development programme in Zimbabwe – initially offered a workshop on "challenges". UN brought together a tense group of different stakeholders and talked about human needs, such as food, shelter, identity, respect other, etc., and also talked about cases in other countries. After three days of teambuilding, dialogue and conflict resolution skills development, stakeholders were ready and willing to engage with their content issues collaboratively and constructively. As a result of this project, a

strong group was built, waiting for windows of opportunity to open, with their capacity built, and enabling environment created.

Lessons learned: significant work was done on the "content" of inclusion and good governance, including strengthening the judiciary ad rule of law, developing minority protection legislation, establishing Human Rights Commissions, Ombudsman's offices, etc. However, what is lacking is "process" oriented approach - how it can be locally derived, locally owned, and fully absorbed. To that end, efforts should be geared towards developing a holistic, conflict-sensitive or inclusion-sensitive developmental approach to national capacity-building, which includes institutional capacity-building, individual capacity-development, and awareness-raising strategies for changing societal mindsets, and sharing good practices.

3. *Discussions*

Surveys are useful tools to both measure and promote social integration/inclusion, combining research and process. Publishing the results of surveys, especially periodic ones that allow comparison over time, generate focused debate and discussion in the public sphere and helps articulate and prioritize policies. The Barometer is showing a positive trend of increased interaction between those who never interacted before. Wildschut also pointed out that there are complicated issues, i.e., racial identity as the mixed race group feel they don't belong anywhere.

To the question if the "Reconciliation Barometer" survey has created tensions in the society, she responded that it is a question of how we level the playing field for both those who are disadvantaged and advantaged. It is true that the survey generated fears among the previously privileged, many of whom have uncertainty about their futures. However, she argued that it is better to have opportunity to debate/dialogue around difficult issues, than just pretend not seeing them. In South Africa, dialogue/ debate have proven to be viable, and public space for dialogue is widening.

The issue of inclusion/exclusion in the reconciliation process is a very complex one, but also a very important part of transformation, as inclusive processes are requirement for the social transformation. The process of reconciliation should not merely reverse the social order from the privileged to non-privileged, thus creating a sense of fear. But, it should be the process that will truly transform the society into a new, more inclusive one.

Another point raised was that the process needs to deliver. Trust in the deliberative, reconciliatory or inclusive processes, is a requirement for their functioning. If the processes do not deliver tangible results or clear milestones along the way, it is likely that those who were disappointed in the lack of clear victory or consensus solution, will run out of patience and further entrench their grievance, apathy or alienation. In this sense, the importance of promoting "**process competency**" was highlighted. In the peace-building field, there are two types of interventions: process oriented and content oriented ones. These two interventions rarely come together in synergy. The challenge is to bring these "process" and "content" oriented interventions together in more cohesive manner.

One participant suggested to carefully review "action chains" to see if there are any connections between success in one filed and failure in another (i.e., peaceful transition and high rate of crime and fear). Changes often generate fear, in particular for those who think they are losing their privileges. For real social integration to take place, the society as a whole must change its behaviours, power dynamics, value, and systems. This means that a sense of uncertainty and concern about one's future is unavoidable during the transition. One needs to

keep this in mind, when devising inclusion policies in post-conflict societies, in order to avoid resistance and backlashes.

One participant pointed out that negotiation and dialogue are very different. Unlike negotiation, dialogue values the process and not just the result. And the fact that the dialogue process includes all stakeholders from the beginning, and not at the end, it can create a common ground and a sense of ownership for all parties concerned.

I. Role of local governments in promoting political, social and economic inclusion and participation

Moderator: Edesio Fernandes
Introductory remarks: Cezar Busatto

Guiding questions:

- How can society ensure that the diverse interests of citizens are represented in the decision-making process that affects their lives?
- What specific roles can local governments play to promote social inclusion?
- How to ensure the participation of relevant stakeholders in policy design and implementation? How to balance policies targeting specific social groups and mainstreaming efforts?
- How to harmonize the economic development with social cohesion at local level?

1. *Introduction: Role of local governments in promoting political, social and economic inclusion and participation*

Edesio Fernandes, Lecturer, Development Planning Unit, University College London, UK, made a brief intervention in exploring the role of local government. Local governments are facing new challenges, namely, lack of fiscal resources and need for identifying alternative resources, including through better redistribution of responsibilities between local state and communities. Local administrations are a significant asset, which have been largely neglected so far. In fact, they have a fundamental role to play in tackling the issue of exclusion, in particular, through land policies, population land uses and development. Spatial dimension is a significant component of exclusion, and the responsibilities of spatial organization are intrinsically rest with local government.

Spatial administration has significant impact on generating financial benefits for the public as well as the private sectors/owners. As a result, urban planning (spatial urban planning) has been increasingly contributing to aggravating spatial exclusion. Local governments need to take a more active role in planning and organizing spatial and territorial activities and distributing better the costs and benefits of urban development, including monitoring activities implemented by private owners. The objective of social inclusion and inclusive policies should be well translated into spatial planning and administration. In this regard, Fernandes emphasized the importance of dialogue and participatory processes to create a new social contract.

When addressing issues at local level, "local" usually means at the municipality level. However, municipalities are not always the best boundaries to approach, when and where

metropolitan areas exist and more resources have become increasingly available at a metropolitan scale.

2. *Presentation: Local Solidarity Governance: The experience of Porto Alegre, Brazil*

César Busatto, Secretary of Political Coordination and Local Governance in Porto Alegre City, State of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil, made his intervention on "Local Solidarity Governance: The experience of Porto Alegre, Brazil".

Brazil is characterized by its successful decentralization system, which gives full autonomy to municipalities. Porto Alegre, in particular, has a historical tradition of "neighboring association", which was developed in the last 60-70 years. The neighboring association is the real base for the participatory budgeting and participatory democracies, and is the very reason why the experience of Porto Alegre is so sustainable.

Porto Alegre has now as long as 19 years of participatory budgeting experience, in spite of political changes at the local administration. This is a manifestation that Porto Alegre's experience is based on strong grass-roots participatory movements, called "Local Solidarity Governance". This is also linked to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and the citizens have developed a systemic revision of local governance to achieve the MDGs by the year 2015.

This revision was made in order to reflect the outcomes of an evaluation of participatory budgeting, and that is: "In order to advance participatory democracy, it is absolutely critical to move from "sectorial" approach to "integrated" approach of organizing government". This also means that they are moving towards more goal-oriented (focus on the end point, rather than means) approach through more integrated programmes.

The shift of their approach also affected their discussion on budgeting and indicators. The fundamental shift is that they recognized the need for developing a more integrated relationship between government and its society. Rather than placing local government at the top of a hierarchical pyramid, the society itself needs to be placed in the first place, working together with the government. The governance of the municipality should be participatory.

In Porto Alegre, the local government and the society have a strong systematic relationship through the "Local Government Management Committee", as a part of the "Local Solidarity Governance". There are 21 government programs in three Axes (social, environmental and economic), and 17 Regional Forums and six Thematic Assemblies for all cities (transportation, taxation, education, urban and economic development, culture, and health).

The objectives of the Local Solidarity Governance are to: implement universal public policies; deliver qualified services; meet populations in demand, and foster local development. This new concept brought new challenges to local authorities, as, in addition to offering universal public policies and services, it is also required to foster local development. It is not enough to implement public policies and deliver good services (public health system, good sanitation, and quality education) to achieve social inclusion, if there are people without work and income. And here, local development is crucial to achieve the long term goals.

The concept of local development is to create an enabling environment for development, and invest in social capitals, which will then turn to be an asset that guarantees an inclusive development, and inclusive society. This process requires the integration of three sectors, namely, public sectors, civil society organizations and citizens, and the private sectors.

In the wake of fiscal crisis of local governments, Busatto proposed to revisit the definition of resources and think of new types of budget for foster local development and social inclusion. Instead of looking only at government financial resources (tax revenue), they came up with the new concept of "society budget". It is simply unrealistic to promote local development only through government budget. Resources should be diversified, and expanded to new areas, such as citizen resources, university resources, third sector resources, private sector resources, community resources, etc. Everyone's contribution would be included in the budget. In this way, we can create a sense of responsibility, a sense of ownership for the development of their communities, and people feel included and empowered.

The evaluation of participatory budget highlighted the lack of access to information by citizens. Accessible information to every citizen is critical to promote their active participation in their society. Current challenge is to develop better methods of making resourceful information accessible to citizens.

As part of the efforts for providing better and more accessible information, and hearing voices from citizens, Observatory Hall has been established recently. The Hall plays an important role in empowering people, facilitating dialogue, and providing opportunities for their equal participation.

In order to replicate a successful experience in different societies, identifying concepts and values that make convergence possible in this area is perhaps more important than identifying methodologies or means of operation. Each society has different means to reach the goal. Therefore, our focus should be on what to achieve (in this case creating an inclusive society and better democracy) and leave the rest to each society.

Busatto then read the handouts he prepared. Main points in this note are: people need to be stimulated to feel that they really count, and they are an essential part of their community, and the future of the community depends on their attitudes and actions. What is lacking is social capital, confidence, connections of affection and emotion, cooperation, sense of community, solidarity in building prosperity for everyone and all human beings. The new concept of inclusive development is people-centered and based on human values and resources, including their capacities, creativity and intelligence, and social networks and cooperation among people. We must build peaceful relationships through dialogue for better understanding, as relationships matter.

3. *Discussions:*

Questions were raised as to how local government works with constituency/ people, and what role the state plays. Busatto responded that approximately 60 % of taxes are controlled by central government, 25 % is hand in, and 15% is collected by municipalities. Even so, Brazil is one of the most decentralized countries in the world, and local government has fiscal and political autonomy of self-administration.

One participant pointed out that spatial organization needs to be addressed, as space might be a reflection of social relations in society. The way space is configured has implications

for how to build social capital. The way one has access to space defines his/her participation. How much of the 15% of budget goes to people?

Taking an example of studies conducted in Columbia, where urban security is being monitored, and six indicator sets include social capital, violence, freedom of despair and fear, it is pointed out many indicators are in perception terms, and not directly related to any public policy/intervention, thus difficult to assess the impact of policy intervention. Being asked if Porto Alegre has developed a monitoring tool to assess the impact of participatory budget, he replied that in spite of many studies conducted, they still don't have a good monitoring process in terms of the impact. They have just completed some research on a multi-dimensional view of poverty, and Observatory will be responsible for monitoring.

To the question what the mechanism of ensuring wide and full representation is, he responded that based on computer based data search, Solidarity Governance can look at who do not participate, thus focusing on the excluded. The challenge is that the very poor do not participate, and they are trying to address this issue.

J. Review of approaches and methods to measure social inclusion and cohesion

Moderator: Mari Fitzduff
Introductory remarks: Eric Marlier
                              Julie Newton

Guiding Questions:

- How could we assess the levels of social inclusion within and across societies? (i.e., institutions, procedures and mechanisms)
- Which existing methodologies can be recommended to measure social inclusion and cohesion? What are their strengths and weaknesses?
- What are the existing indicators that could be used for this purpose?

1. Presentation: Review of approaches and methods to measure social inclusion and cohesion

Margaret Lombe, Assistant Professor, Boston College Graduate School of Social Work, Massachusetts, USA, provided an introductory overview of approaches and methods to measure social inclusion and cohesion, and pointed out the fact that work on social inclusion and its measurement is currently most developed in the European Union.

Historically, social exclusion/inclusion indicators were centered on social exclusion, measuring five dimensions, namely, production, consumption, asset ownership, and political and social activities. Some constrains of existing indicators are that they are numerically constrained and lack cultural sensitivity. According to her, the purpose of measuring social inclusion is to move beyond idealism and develop a solid theory in this area. Necessary next steps include further review of existing relevant work, develop draft framework, gather data to test them, revisit our thinking – and thus, enhance our understanding of and actions for social inclusion, based on solid, empirically confirmed knowledge.

There are a great variety of existing and possible methodological approaches, for example, case studies, multiple comparative case studies, comparative surveys at national/local levels, intensive surveys at individual level, cross-national comparative surveys, experiments of quasi-experiments, etc. She cited a number of institutions and organizations which have been working in this area, including the Centre for the Analysis of Social Exclusion, whose work she described in more detail. She also discussed limitations and strengths of existing approaches.

Some of the lessons learned from her research include: 1) universal indicators allow comparative analysis, but are not relevant in some places, therefore, there is a need to balance contextual relevance and a degree of universalism. It is also necessary to involve relevant stakeholders to develop indicators and index in any particular context; 2) large numbers of indicators may obscure the development of meaningful measures, identifying the key indicators may be more useful and practical over time; and 3) measures of inclusion tend to converge around key areas, such as education and health, etc.

Challenges for developing indicators for measuring social inclusion are, they need to be accessible, measurable, robust, grounded in theory, relevant, timely, amenable to adoption, reliable, comparable across cultures, and sensitive to cultural diversity.

2. *Presentation: EU social indicators as essential tools for EU cooperation in the field of social (inclusion) policy*

Eric Marlier, International Senior Advisor, CEPS/INSTEAD Research Institute, Luxembourg, made a presentation on "EU social indicators as essential tools for EU cooperation in the field of social (inclusion) policy, and provided brief background and overview of the work of the European Union (27 member states) on social inclusion. The Lisbon strategy was lunched in March 2000 by the EU heads of State and Government. The EU sets itself "a new strategic goal" for the next decade (2000-2010), "to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion. "Modernizing the European social model, investing in people and combating social exclusion" is a part of an overall strategy to achieve this goal. In this context, they agreed on a new open method of coordination (OMC) as the means of sharing and disseminating good practice to help Member States to progressively develop their own policies to achieve greater convergence towards the main EU objectives.

In 2001, the first set of common EU social statistical indicators on poverty and social exclusion - "Laeken indicators" were established as part of the Lisbon Strategy. In July 202, first action plans on social inclusion was submitted to European Commission. In 2001, OMC was extended to pensions and health care and long term care. In March 2006, EU streamlined Social Protection and Social Inclusion Process around twelve main objectives (three overarching, and three for each strand), common to all member states. EU Social Protection and Social Inclusion Process currently cover three strands, which are, social inclusion, pensions, and healthcare and long-term care. Member states are expected to produce national reports on strategies for social protection and social inclusion.

In order to make "a decisive impact on the eradication of poverty and social exclusion", three objectives were set under the social inclusion strand, that are: 1) access for all to the resources, rights and services needed for participation in society, preventing and addressing exclusion, and fighting all forms of discrimination leading to exclusion; 2) the active social inclusion of all, both by promoting participation in the labour market and by fighting poverty and exclusion; and 3) well-coordinated social inclusion policies, involving all levels of government

and relevant actors, and mainstreamed into relevant public policies, including economic, budgetary, education and training policies and structural fund.

He then described the typology of indicators and statistics used in the open method of coordination (OMC), because OMC, as a policy process, requires specific indicators, which meet methodological principles, such as: robust and statistically validated; relevant, clear and subjective; responsiveness to policy intervention without being subject to manipulation.

Indicators used need to be clear and accepted normative interpretation, in order to maintain its transparency. There are four types of indicators in the OMC: 1) commonly agreed EU indicators, allowing comparative assessment towards common objectives; 2) commonly agreed national indicators, allowing measure scale and nature of policy intervention; 3) commonly agreed context information, enabling to prove background information; and 4) national indicators and other statistics, enabling each country to have its own tool.

3. *Presentation: Wellbeing: Contributions towards practical strategies to promote social integration*

Julie Newton, Research Officer, Wellbeing in Developing Countries (WeD), ESRC Research Group, UK, made an intervention on the concept of "Wellbeing" and its approach. In order to understand the social and cultural construction of wellbeing in developing countries, ESRC Research Group conducted a conceptual and empirical research in four countries (Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Thailand and Peru). The research also aimed at improving our understanding of dynamics of poverty, and seeking policy relevance.

She also introduced a recent report produced by UK's Defra (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs), entitled "Securing the Future: UK's Sustainable Development Strategy" (2005), which intends to "bring together existing research to get a better understanding and focus on wellbeing, and explore how policies might change with an explicit wellbeing focus".

The concept of wellbeing is closely related to that of social inclusion. Before attempting to measure it, we must understand what wellbeing means. There are two dimensions in defining wellbeing: one is objective (i.e., materials, education, health, and poverty) and the other is subjective (how people think and feel). It is based on the belief, one's perceptions and experiences do matter. How people think and feel is important, when dealing with one's rights and responsibilities. Like social inclusion, it is people-centered, and requires consultation with people on their values, beliefs, attitudes, if they feel part of community, or feel alienated, or have a sense of control, etc.

As touched upon many times in the previous session, "process" is as important as "content", and wellbeing measure provides a framework for exploring the interaction between these two. Wellbeing measure uses multidisciplinary approach, combining quantitative and qualitative, in order to unpack the processes behind the numbers.

Under the subjective dimension, it may be useful to distinguish the difference between "hedonic" (what makes life pleasant/unpleasant, focuses on preferences and pleasures: life satisfaction, presence of positive mood and absence of negative mood), and "eudemonic" (human flourishing, realizing true potential, sense of purpose, meaning. This focuses on how people function in their society as having a sense of meaning and purpose of their lives and self-determination, which is usually based on autonomy, self-confidence and relatedness).

According to the WeD, wellbeing is defined as a state of being with others, where human needs are met, where one can act meaningfully to pursue one's goals, and where one enjoys a satisfactory quality of life in three dimensions: physical, social and mental.

Three building blocks of wellbeing are: 1) universal human needs (health, autonomy, security, psychological and relational needs, such as relatedness, sense of belonging) and social and cultural dimension; 2) socially meaningful goals (individuals have a sense of purpose and feel able to achieve goals and participate in society); and 3) satisfaction with life (good feeling, happiness, satisfaction with personally important goals in one's life). These are enhanced by conditions that include supportive personal relationships, strong inclusive communities, good health, financial and personal security, rewarding employment, and a healthy and attractive environment.

Since WeD has objective and subjective concepts, it rejects single measures or single method approaches. Indicators should look at both dimensions, in order to explain or facilitate understanding of underlying process. Existing indicators are predominantly objective measures, so, there is growing interest in subjective measures, such as: satisfaction with life scale (SWLS); psychological wellbeing scale (Ryff); Personal wellbeing index (Cummins); European Social Survey: third round (Huppert et al).

Defra's provisional Wellbeing Measures, Sustainable Development Indicators, uses a total of 68 indicators, consisting of 20 framework indicators and 48 other indicators (e.g., greenhouse gas emissions, fish stocks, employment, health, poverty, etc.).

What is missing so far in measuring people's wellbeing is how people think and feel. Only a multi-dimensional process will enable us to address and study how people think and feel, as well as what drives people to behave (values, goals). Finally, she emphasized that measures are important, but they should be accompanied by in-depth research and analysis essential for explaining and understanding social interactions.

4. *Presentation: Social integration in the Stockholm Region*

Martin Ängeby, Project Leader – Social Integration, Stockholm County Council, Sweden, made a presentation on "social integration in the Stockholm Region". He stated that Sweden has been dramatically transforming over the last decades. Sweden today accommodates people from all over the world, even though this is relatively a new phenomenon.

Stockholm has been working on regional planning project for more than 15 years, maximizing the capacity of its transportation system. This is a part of decentralization efforts, in which municipalities can spend 15 per cent of its budget according to their priority, and use 85 per cent in accordance with national plan, in terms of providing social services to citizens. In this context, it has become important to map out where the excluded people and their children live, to device the ways and means to serve people in different areas. To respond to the new needs, the concept of "Social System" emerged, which attaches an importance to space. Creating a common place in a city where everyone - people from different backgrounds - meet, can be only materialized through the advancement of the transportation system. This concept is closely related to that of social inclusion, and likewise, social inclusion/integration requires a common space where people can come together.

One of the main characteristics of metropolis is its highly diverse population, and tolerance is a required strategy for managing the city's plethora of ephemeral relationship. But more importantly, in order for the "Social System" to work effectively, we need to invest in social capital. But what is social capital? Social capital is the sum of the resources one has access to through social networks outside the family, which enables the individual to fulfill different needs, such as finding a job, housing, partner, baby sitter, etc. Similarly, social capital for society is the fabric of social relations that bond us together, such as: general trust in society's organizations; commonly accepted and predictable norms; well functioning, dense and dynamic interpersonal networks; etc.

There are three main types of social capital, namely: 1) bonding-capital – networks consisting of people similar to each other and tend to look inwards to the group (i.e., yacht clubs, immigrant organizations, rotary, and extended families/clans); 2) bridging-capital (outward looking networks consisting of people of different types); and 3) linking capital (the tie between people and public institutions). Bridging-capital is scarce and harder to build, but very necessary in a large and diverse society.

When we attempt to measure social integration/inclusion/cohesion, one area to look at is social capital, especially bridging-capital. For example, we first identify bridging institutions where human interaction take place, such as, work, educational institutions, political activities, civic activities, sports, culture center, transportation system, public space, virtual space. Secondly, we examine how these institutions are working; if they are excluding people; where the capital is generated; and how we can make these places work better.

Some of the lessons learned from the regional project are: performance indicators for bridging institutions can make a composite index for social capital development; survey instruments unveil social capital but are getting less reliable; integration facilitates economic development; civic engagement is enhanced by a well functioning social system; a tolerant and dynamic culture, and inclusive identity, is the oil that greases the social system; a dysfunctional (segregated) social system also makes municipalities unattractive; a combination of "soft" and "hard" measures will strengthen the social system.

5. *Presentation: Review of Approaches and Methods for Measuring Social Inclusion and Cohesion: UN-HABITAT's experience in developing and applying indicators*

Mohamed Halfani, Officer-in-charge, Urban Development Branch and Chief, Urban Governance Section UN-HABITAT presented UN-HABITAT's experience in developing and applying urban indicators.

Halfani started his presentation by stating his conclusions, which are: 1) instead of reinventing the tools for social inclusion and indicators, we need to review existing resources and adopt the most appropriate and useful ones; 2) in order to make harmonious social inclusion possible, we need to understand the structural and institutional framework, in particular, those in developing countries; 3) special focus on cities for each country, i.e., "Urban Inequity Survey"; and 4) there are challenges in identifying indicators and data collection (to be described below).

Within its broad mandate, UN-HABITAT has been focusing on improving the lives of urban poor. This major goal of alleviating urban poverty can be advanced within the broader

agenda of promoting the development of "inclusive cities". The definition of UN-HABITAT of an inclusive city is "a place where everyone, regardless of wealth, gender, age, race or religion, is enabled to participate productively and positively in the opportunities cities have to offer".

UN-HABITAT approached "inclusive cities" through the component and corresponding constituents of "sustainable urbanization", including: shelter, infrastructure and services, land, environment, local economic development, urban health and safety. The underlying premises of their approach, in particular in realizing inclusive cities, is that by developing a structural and institutional framework that allows actors in all spheres of society to engage harmoniously and to realize their respective potential – inclusiveness can be achieved. A related premise is that for these actors to be able to engage with each other and to make full use of the structural and institutional framework, they need to be mobilized and empowered.

He pointed out that there are already tools available to measure social integration and cohesion. These tools developed were of a macro-level mainly to monitor and evaluate the functioning and outcome of systemic processes and structures. However, in recent years, a more specific tool to looking into intra-city differences for selected variables has been developed, which is a combination of qualitative and quantitative tools, with measurable indicators of the following nature: **Urban Inequity Surveys** – Lake Victoria Region (Part of Urban Info); **Urban Governance Index; Legal and Institutional Environment Governing Security of Tenure; Urban Sector Profile Studies** (combining environment, gender, governance, slums, local economic development, basic urban services; & historic and cultural heritage); and **Safety Audits.**

UN-HABITAT is currently at the stage of building an infrastructure for data collection, building partnerships with other institutions and organizations, developing modalities for dissemination, and contemplating establishing awards in some areas.

Challenges were identified as: 1) identifying credible and robust indicators that are simple to understand and acceptable (easy to collect and apply); 2) balancing the need to reflect the specificity of institutional environment (national or local) – contextualization, with the ability to allow for a degree of universality and comparability of data; and 3) building in a high degree of local ownership of the tool and results through participatory process, including national and local governments, the civil society and private sector.

In addition, indicators need to help local authorities and governments to capture gaps and constraints in policy implementation, identifying specific capacity-building needs, and formulating change plans. Also, the emphasis should not be on the final number, bur rather the overall profile that finally forms the integer.

K. Discussions in the working groups

Three working groups were formed to discuss the following questions. Recommendations of each working groups were presented at the plenary, then, consolidated in the EGM recommendations (see Chapter I for recommendations)

Guiding Questions

- What types of mechanisms or processes could be most productive in creating and sustaining an inclusive society?
- What capacities are needed to develop and apply policies, and a concomitant legal framework, that would create an inclusive society?
- What types of methodology and indicators are most useful and appropriate in measuring social inclusion and social cohesion?
- How can effective systems of monitoring, evaluation and accountability be developed?
- How does the concept of developing and sustaining social inclusion/cohesion apply in fragile or post-conflict societies and what special measure may be needed?

Annex I   Aide-Memoire

I. Introduction

The Division for Social Policy and Development (DSPD) of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), in collaboration with the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT), is organizing an Expert Group Meeting on "**Creating an Inclusive Society: Practical Strategies to Promote Social Integration**" at the UNESCO Headquarters in Paris, France from 10 – 13 September, 2007.

Within the broad objective of developing practical strategies to promote social integration through an inclusive and participatory process, the meeting is geared at exploring essential elements necessary to create an inclusive society, clarifying methodology of analysis of social inclusion, and exploring possible approaches to measure the cohesiveness of societies. This will be done through examining case studies, existing methodologies and indicators to assess the impact of interventions to promote social inclusion at the local and community level. It also aims to examine how these methodologies and indicators can be applied to real challenges that societies are facing, such as urban violence and insecurity, marginalization of certain groups, and, further, what role it could play in conflict prevention and peace-building efforts.

The meeting is part of ongoing efforts at UNDESA to clarify the meaning of social policy in a contemporary world, including the interconnection of inclusion, participation and justice in building socially integrated societies. Inclusion - in this context refers to policies and institutional arrangements designed to include all citizens - is closely connected to actions taken by policy makers.

This meeting of experts is conceived as a continuation of the work initiated at DESA/DSPD two years ago. It builds upon a conceptual framework described in the recent publication entitled, "Participatory Dialogue: Towards a stable, safe and just society for all", together with E-dialogues organized by DSPD/DESA in 2005 and 2006, where the potential of participatory dialogue was explored as an important policy tool that can offer a range of practical means to promote social integration. The meeting's deliberations will be published as a contribution to the global debate, policy dialogue and evolution of practical strategies for social integration - thereby contributing to enhance the social science- social policy nexus.

II. Background

The World Summit for Social Development (Copenhagen, 1995) established the notion of social integration in the intergovernmental discourse and national policy making. The Copenhagen Declaration and Programme of Action, a key outcome of the Summit, pledged to make the eradication of poverty, promoting full employment and fostering social integration overriding objectives of development. The Declaration contains a specific commitment to advance social integration to create "a society for all" through fostering inclusive societies that are stable, safe, just and tolerant and that respect diversity, equality of opportunity, and participation of all people, including disadvantaged and vulnerable groups and persons.

A "society for all" is one in which every individual, each with rights and responsibilities, has an active role to play. Such an inclusive society is promoted by social policies that seek to reduce inequality and that are trying to create flexible and tolerant societies that embrace all

people. Among other things, the Copenhagen Programme of Action called for creating social institutions and mechanism that are accessible to people and are responsive to their needs; ensuring opportunities for all people to participate in all spheres of public life; and strengthening participation and involvement of civil society in the formulation, implementation and evaluation of decisions. It gave special emphasis to measures to meet the needs and interests of those who face obstacles in participating fully in societies.

Achieving a "society for all" has proved elusive. The concepts and approaches are complex, making it difficult for most Governments to implement inclusive social policy or participatory planning. Some Governments embraced mainstreaming, but mainstreaming does not always guarantee participation. To achieve the kind of integration that is envisaged, Governments should promote active participation by various social groups – especially those historically excluded – in policy and planning processes. This requires measures to ensure that every group has an opportunity to express its views and become engaged in decision-making that affect their lives.

Making "a society for all" operational is crucial. In its efforts to follow-up on the commitments made at the Social Summit, the Division for Social Policy and Development of UNDESA has undertaken a series of activities, geared at promoting inclusive policy processes as well as exploring the potential of dialogue as a means to resolve conflicts non-violently and transform societies to be more inclusive and participatory, and, by extension, to further social cohesion.

There is a general consensus that a concept of "social integration", as a process for building and changing social relations, can play a central role in overcoming various social challenges, and has relevance for conflict transformation and peace-building. One of the recommendations arising from the discussions at the United Nations is to further explore ways to measure social integration, or the degree of social cohesion, to assess its impact; and to this end, discuss what types of indicators or proxy indicators, including complementary elements to existing indicators, could be looked at.

In a publication entitled, "Participatory Dialogue: Towards a stable, safe and just society for all" (February 2007) prepared by DSPD, measuring social integration is identified as one of the most important research and policy goals. It has been suggested that developing some specific indicators or a composite index could be useful to further our understanding of social integration, as well as to measure progress in social integration. The question, however, is how to make such index methodologically adequate - what components or weights could be used to make it truly representative.

Against this background, the forthcoming Expert Group Meeting will explore a variety of approaches to expand and enhance the inclusiveness of policies and policy making processes, as well as institutional mechanisms. It will also highlight participatory aspects of the decision-making processes, including information gathering methods at the local and community level. One of the aspects to be explored may be the role of trust and social capital in finding collective solutions to various social challenges.

III. Context

There is broad-based agreement that societies should be founded on the principles of social justice. These principles are the foundation of the United Nations, and are salient in the declarations and policy statements emerging from the major international conferences held in the

late 1990s, notably the World Summit for Social Development. Social inclusion is seen in this context as a crucial policy goal. Most recent developments, however, give substantial reasons for concern.

As a result of rapid socio-economic transitions brought on by globalization, people in many parts of the world face some degree of social and cultural dislocations, creating tensions among/between communities, social groups, or generations. These trends, which have been particularly prevalent in recent years, provide fertile grounds for creating negative social conditions, such as widening disparities and inequalities, and the marginalization of certain groups or communities. Left without any effective and early interventions, these trends may lead to societal polarization and fragmentation.

Some societies are experiencing increased incidents of urban crime and community or inter-community violence, including conflicts between mainstream society and socially marginalized groups, among others, the poor, indigenous peoples, immigrants, migrant workers, ethnic/religious minorities. Others are facing increasing intergenerational tensions between citizens with traditional values and those with new values, such as younger generations. Some are coping with the diversity of the members of their communities with different ethnic, religious, or cultural backgrounds. A large number of immigrants or migrant workers pose another challenge to culturally homogeneous societies.

The direct impact of these tensions is especially felt at the local level. Under the rapid processes of globalization and urbanization, cities have become arenas of accelerated social transformations. Societies are becoming more and more diverse due to migration flows, and, therefore, need to integrate dwellers of different origins. Confrontations stemming from cultural, ethnic, religious and other differences sometimes give rise to irrational fears, prejudices, and encourage the development of ideologies such as racism and practices of discrimination geared at excluding "others". In many countries, particularly in developing countries, an unprecedented percentage of the population[12], seeking for better living standards and job opportunities, is migrating from rural areas to one or two urban cities, thus creating mega cities. The influx of the new population has resulted in expanded urban slums, a large number of unemployed citizens, especially youth, and deteriorating security. This rapid urbanization is of a particular concern for policy makers in developing countries. The question of how to ensure these cities and communities adapt to, and include their culturally diverse citizens is a major challenge for today's world.

In order to assist the policy makers at the national and local levels in strengthening their social integration policies, UNESCO's Social and Human Sciences Programme, among other activities, commits itself to the efforts to counter discrimination and exclusion with the following three focuses: 1) the fight against racism and discrimination at the municipal level; 2) the fight against exclusion of children; and 3) the fight against HIV and AIDS related stigma and discrimination. The International Coalition of Cities Against Racism was launched by UNESCO in 2004 to mobilize the municipalities around a common guiding principle, called "Ten-Point

---

[12] According to the third World Urban Forum (Vancouver, June 2006), most of the population growth is happening in cities, and the majority of them are in the poorest countries. It is projected that the number of people living in urban areas will, for the first time in history, outnumber those living in rural areas. In 1976, one-third of the world's inhabitants lived in cities. Thirty years later in 2006, cities are home to half the world's population, and data suggests this proportion will continue to grow to two-thirds of the world's population - or six billion people - by 2050.

Plan of Action", covering the areas of competence where the municipalities could play a major role, such as employment, health, education, housing as well as cultural and sports activities. This network of solidarity aims at providing the committed municipalities with a space for dialogue and exchange to share good practices for furthering their policies for social integration and participation of everyone. Regional coalitions are being created in Africa, Arab region, Asia-Pacific, Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean.

In a realization that cities today are expected to fulfill a social function, assuring all inhabitants fundamental liberties, collective well-being and equitable opportunities to participate in all spheres of urban life, UN-HABITAT supports efforts towards building an inclusive society at the local level, as part of its mandate to realize sustainable human settlements development, set out by the Habitat Agenda. The UN-HABITAT's approach to inclusive cities is multi-faceted: 1) inclusive urban planning, through which spatial reality of the city reflects social integration, cohesion and equity in access to services and livelihoods; 2) promotion of urban safety and crime prevention, through capacity building of local authorities, civil society actors, and other partners; 3) social integration in post-crisis recovery, as a process of social transformation for improved governance, conflict prevention, peace building and disaster resilience; and 4) facilitation of inclusive urban governance, ensuring participation of marginalized groups in local decision-making and implementation. The Agency's activities have contributed to the current momentum towards assisting in a framework for social integration and cohesion, including: the creation of a joint UNESCO/UN-HABITAT Working Group on Urban Policies and the Right to the City; continuing dialogue at the World Urban Forum III in 2006 under the theme of Social Inclusion and Cohesion.

While it is clear that there is a strong need to develop practical strategies and evidence-based social policies aimed at creating a stable, safe, just and inclusive society, it is less clear how to achieve this. Including all citizens with diverse backgrounds and promoting their participation are ever more important now, not only for the reason of ethical or social responsibilities, but also for practical needs to cope with rapidly changing demography and values. A specific tool is required to map out the areas for improvement, in order to formulate or amend existing policies to make them more inclusive and maintain safety and stabilities of societies at local, regional and national levels. For this reason, there is a need to closely examine various indicators that have already been developed at the municipal level in a participatory manner, with particular attention to best practices.

Various organizations of the United Nations system play an active role in advocating the importance of and promoting strategies for creating more inclusive societies. In this context, DESA, UNESCO, and UN-HABITAT, in their respective activities, focus on strengthening the local capacity in maintaining healthy social relations, transforming conflicts in a non-violent manner, and enhancing social cohesion thorough inclusive and participatory processes. By identifying critical elements for creating a society for all, the forthcoming Expert Group Meeting will help to outline measures that prevent societies from slipping into social fragmentation, and polarization.

IV.   Objectives and Methodology

The principal objective of this Expert Group Meeting is to explore ways and means to promote social integration, in particular, to identify common approaches in mapping out, monitoring, and measuring the progress of interventions aimed at creating an inclusive society.

This will be achieved through: 1) examining policies, case studies and existing approaches mainly at local and community levels; and 2) an E-dialogue planned to be organized prior to the meeting with wider participants to stimulate new ideas and compile existing approaches and good practices. The meeting will also discuss methodological issues pertinent to analysis of social integration and will examine the feasibility of the potential Social Integration Index for further review and analysis. It will examine the usefulness of such indicators when they are applied in specific situations, particularly in the context of conflict prevention and peace-building.

The meeting specifically aims to:

- Review various dimensions of social integration/inclusion/cohesion and explore critical elements that are pre-requisites for creating an inclusive society;
- Examine current initiatives and existing models in measuring the health of the societies (i.e., social inclusion/exclusion, citizen's participation, inclusive policy process, safety or security) and identify their strengths and weaknesses;
- Identify the methodology(ies) and information gathering process which could be used for measuring social integration/inclusion/cohesion;
- Explore a set of core indicators for measuring social integration/inclusion/cohesion;
- Discuss if such an approach can also be applied at the national level, in particular, for conflict prevention and peace-building purposes;
- Create a knowledge-base on good practices in this area; and
- Explore options for the follow-up to the meeting.

V. Expected outputs

The meeting will produce the following outputs:

- A concept paper to be revised upon receipt of expert inputs
- 10 – 15 page paper prepared and presented by each expert
- A suggested set of feasible indicators for measuring social integration/inclusion/cohesion will be identified;
- Methodology for applying such indicators will be proposed;
- Policy recommendations at international, national and local levels will be adopted;
- Further directions, good practices and potential partners will be identified.

The results of the meeting will be incorporated in the final report, which will be used as a basis of a future publication to be prepared by DSPD. Policy recommendations may be presented during the forty-sixth session of the Commission on Social Development scheduled to take place in February 2008. A concept paper on social integration and cohesion will be jointly drafted by UNDESA, UNESCO and UN-HABITAT. The paper will serve as a background document to the EGM, identifying critical elements of and current initiatives for greater social integration and cohesion. Upon receiving expert inputs at the EGM, the concept paper will be finalized as a collective policy paper on this issue.

VI. Organizational and administrative matters

The Expert Group meeting will be organized by the Division for Social Policy and Development, in collaboration with UNESCO and HABITAT. The meeting will be conducted at the UNESCO Headquarters in Paris, France, and is scheduled to take place from 10 – 13 September 2007.

The number of participants will be approximately 25, including 15 experts, who will be identified and invited by the Division for Social Policy and Development. In addition, the following will participate:

1. UNDESA/DSPD as an organizer to provide substantive and administrative support;
2. Representatives of UNESCO and HABITAT
3. Discussants who will be identified by DPSD;
4. Representatives from selected NGOs (both international and regional);
5. Facilitators;
6. Representatives from international organizations, UN Departments and agencies.

The participants will meet in plenary as well as in working groups. In an opening plenary, participants' presentations will create a conceptual framework for the discussion. The plenary will be followed by short presentations and in-depth discussions on specific issues both in plenary and working groups. At the conclusion of the meeting, participants will outlines the major conclusions and recommendations of the meeting. A final report will be produced after the meeting.

VII.   Documentation and the Language of the meeting

The documentation of the meeting will comprise of the background paper titled, "Participatory Dialogue: Towards a stable, safe and just society for all", 5 – 10 page contributions from the expert participants, and relevant United Nations documents that will be provided at the meeting site. Expert participants will be invited to provide their contributions in advance (to be submitted by **22 August 2007**), and to make brief presentations in the plenary.

The working language of the meeting will be English. Documentation for the meeting will be provided in English.

VIII. Passports and Visas

Participants will be expected to make necessary arrangements with regard to passports, visa and health certificates for travel. An information note will be sent out to participants to assist them with travel arrangements.

All relevant correspondence should be addressed to:

> Makiko Tagashira
> Social Integration Branch
> Division for Social Policy and Development
> Department of Economic and Social Affairs
> United Nations
> E-mail: tagashira@un.org

Annex II   Annotated Agenda

10 September 2007

8:30-9:00	**Registration**

9:00-9:45   **Opening session**

Welcome and Opening Remarks:

Mr. Pierre Sané, Assistant Director-General
Social and Human Sciences Sector, UNESCO

Mr. Mohamed Halfani, Officer In-charge
Urban Development Branch & Chief, Urban Governance Section
UN-Habitat

Mr. Sergei Zelenev, Chief
Social Integration Branch, Division for Social Policy and Development
United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs

Moderator: Mr. Wataru Iwamoto, Director
Division of Social Sciences Research and Policy, UNESCO

9:45 – 10:15   **Introductory Session: objectives and expected outcomes of the meeting and introductions of the participants**

10:15-10:30   **Break**

10:30-12:30   **Session I: Where are we today? Social inclusion as a major issue in contemporary societies**

Moderator: Sergei Zelenev, DESA

Introductory remarks: Göran Therborn[13].

Questions for discussion:

- What is social inclusion and why it is important?
- What factors make an inclusive society possible?
- What are the obstacles to social inclusion?
- What approaches could be used for promoting social inclusion at the national and local levels?
- How is the cultural diversity ensured in the course of the social inclusion?

 Roundtable discussion

---

[13] For experts' title, affiliated institution, please see "**list of participants**".

| 12:30-14:00 | **Lunch break** |

| 14:00–15:30 | **Session II: Overcoming exclusion: promoting inclusive institutions and facilitating participation** |

<u>Moderator</u>:   Elisabeth Barot

<u>Introductory remarks</u>:   Sangeetha Purushotoman
                                       Brad Meyer and Hamid Senni

Questions for discussion:

- Why social exclusion is so persistent? Why many social groups and individuals are unable to participate in a society in a meaningful way?
- What policies could be promoted to prevent disintegration and fragmentation of social fabric and a loss of social cohesion? How to promote participatory process and action for inclusion?
- Lessons learned from successful interventions
- What is the role of education to promote social inclusion?

Roundtable discussion

| 15:30-16:00 | **Break** |

| 16:00-17:45 | **Session III: Participatory dialogue as a tool for creating an inclusive society** |

<u>Moderator</u>:   Zachary Metz

<u>Introductory remarks</u>:   Minu Hemmati

Questions for discussion

- How to ensure unity within diversity?
- What are the appropriate ways to strike a balance between specific interventions aimed at conflict prevention/peace building and a more general mainstreaming approach?
- What are the best ways to build effective partnerships: between governments and Civil Society Organizations; public and private sectors; international organizations and Civil Society Organizations and research institutions/academia, etc.
- Lessons learned

Discussion

| 17:45-17:55 | *Wrap-up by the Rapporteurs of Day 1 discussions* |

11 September 2007

9.00-10.30	**Session IV: Bringing together communities of policy-makers, researchers and practitioners:** e**nhancing social science-social policy nexus**

Moderator: Wataru Iwamoto, UNESCO

Introductory remarks: John Crowley. UNESCO
                        Gary Belkin

Questions for discussion:

- What kind of tools could be used to translate social research into policy action?
- What types of policy intervention are needed in countries at different stages of development?
- How the dialogue and exchange of good practices could be facilitated at the national and regional levels?

Presentation of national case studies and discussion

10.30-10.45	**Break**

10.45-12.30	**Session V: The Right to the City: Citizenship Dimensions of Social Inclusion**

Moderator: Elizabeth Johnston

Introductory remark: Paul Taylor, UN-HABITAT
                        Wataru Iwamoto, UNESCO

Questions for discussion:

- How does the promotion of citizenship contribute to social integration in practice? Is citizenship an effective alternative approach to the legal enshrinement of rights, or just an adjunct to it?
- What are the challenges in exercising the Right to the City? How can it be promoted effectively? Who are the key actors?

12.30- 14.00	**Lunch break**

14.00-15.30	**Session VI: Ways and means to develop national capacities for inclusive policy processes**

Moderator: Aki Stavrou

Introductory remarks: Glenda Wildschut
                         Gay Rosenblum-Kumar, DESA

Questions for discussion:

- How to create an enabling environment for social inclusion?
- What roles different stakeholders can and should play? How different actions could be coordinated for efficient follow-up?
- What are possible strategies to enhance national capacities?
- How effective are these strategies and what are the criteria for effectiveness?
- What are the lessons from experiences of successful and unsuccessful practices?

15.30-16.00   **Break**

16.00-17.45   **Session VII: Role of local governments in promoting political, social and economic inclusion and participation**

         Moderator: Edesio Fernandes

         Introductory remarks: Cezar Busatto

         Questions for discussion:

- How can society ensure that the diverse interests of citizens are represented in the decision-making process that affects their lives?
- What specific roles can local governments play to promote social inclusion?
- How to ensure the participation of relevant stakeholders in policy design and implementation? How to balance policies targeting specific social groups and mainstreaming efforts?
- How to harmonize the economic development with social cohesion at local level?

         Discussion

17.45-18.00   W*rap-up by the Rapporteurs of Day 2 discussions*

12 September 2007

09.00-10.30   **Session VIII: Review of approaches and methods to measure social inclusion and cohesion**

         Moderator: Mari Fitzduff

         Introductory Remarks: Eric Marlier (EU social indicators as essential tools for cooperation in the field of social (inclusion) policy")

                            Julie Newton

         Questions for discussion:

- How could we assess the levels of social inclusion within and across societies? (i.e., institutions, procedures and mechanisms)
- Which existing methodologies can be recommended to measure social inclusion and cohesion? What are their strengths and weaknesses?
- What are the existing indicators that could be used for this purpose?

Discussion

| 10.30-10.45 | **Break** |

10:45–12:00 **Session VIII: Review of approaches and methods to measure social inclusion and cohesion (Continued)**

Moderator: Mari Fitzduff

Introductory remarks: Margaret Lombe
Martin Ängeby
Mohamed Halfani (UN-HABITAT's experience in developing and applying indicators)

Questions for discussion:

Policy goals and monitoring requirements in the area of social inclusion

- What mechanism or process would be useful in identifying national priorities in the area of social cohesion?
- How to reconcile what is needed and what is feasible?
- What lessons could be drawn from experiences of local government?
- What are the experience of UN-HABITAT and UNESCO in promoting inclusive practices and measuring inclusion?
- What are feasible options for monitoring the progress in this area?

12.00 – 14.00 **Lunch break**

14 00- 15.30 **Session IX: Discussions in the working groups:**

- What types of mechanisms or processes could be most productive in creating and sustaining an inclusive society?
- What capacities are needed to develop and apply policies, and a concomitant legal framework, that would create an inclusive society?
- What types of methodology and indicators are most useful and appropriate in measuring social inclusion and social cohesion?
- How can effective systems of monitoring, evaluation and accountability be developed?
- How does the concept of developing and sustaining social inclusion/cohesion apply in fragile or post-conflict societies and what special measure may be needed?

Preparation of draft recommendations

A: Working group

B: Working group

C: Working group

15.30-15.45	**Break**
15.45-17.45	**Session IX: Continuation of working group discussions**
17:45-18:00	*Wrap-up by the Working groups Rapporteurs of Day 3 discussions*

13 September 2007

9.00-10.30   **Session X: Policy recommendations: what should be done at the national, regional and international levels**

Moderator: Sergei Zelenev, DESA

Presentations of the working groups

Discussion

10.30-10.45	**Break**
10.45-12.30	**Continuation of session X**
12:30-13:00	**Discussion on follow-up: A way forward**

Moderator: Makiko Tagashira, DESA

13:00-14:00	**Lunch**
14:00-14:30	**Finalization and adoption of recommendations**
14:30-15:00	**Conclusion and closing**
15.30	**Bon voyage!!**

Annex III   List of Participants

ÄNGEBY, Martin, Mr.
Project Leader – Social Integration
Stockholm County Council
Stockholm, Sweden
E-mail: Martin.Angeby@rtk.sll.se

BAROT-HENAULT, Elisabeth, Dr.
National Commission of Canada to UNESCO,
Canadian municipalities against Racism and
Discrimination
Canada
E-mail: elisabeth.barot@unesco.ca

BELKIN, Gary, S., MD, PhD,
Associate Professor, New York University School
of Medicine,
Deputy Director of Psychiatry, Bellevue Hospital
Center, USA
E-mail: gary.belkin@bellevue.nychhc.org

BUSATTO, César, Mr.
Secretary of Political Coordination and Local
Governance in Porto Alegre City, State of Rio
Grande do Sul, Brazil
E-mail: cezarbusatto@smgl.prefpoa.com.br
daniely@smgl.prefpoa.com.br

FERNANDES, Edesio, Dr.
Development Planning Unit
University College London
London, UK
E-mail: edesiofernandes@compuserve.com

FITZDUFF, Mari, Prof.
Chair, Coexistence Programme Advisory Board
Director, MA Programme in Coexistence and
Conflict, Brandeis University
Massachusetts, USA
E-mail: mfitzd@brandeis.edu

HEMMATI, Minu, Dr.
Independent Adviser
Germany
E-mail: minu@minuhemmati.net

LOMBE, Margaret, Dr.
Assistant Professor
Boston College Graduate School of Social Work
Massachusetts, USA
Email: lombe@bc.edu

MARLIER, Eric, Mr.
International Senior Advisor
CEPS/INSTEAD Research Institute
Luxembourg
E-mail: eric.marlier@ceps.lu

METZ, Zachary, Dr.
Director of Consensus' Peace Building practice,
Faculty member of SIPA, Columbia University,
New York, USA
E-mail: zmetz@consensusgroup.com

Newton, Julie, Dr.
Research Officer
Wellbeing in Developing Countries (WeD)
ESRC Research Group
University of Bath, UK
Email: julieajnewton@yahoo.com

PURUSOTHAMAN, Sangeetha, Dr.
Director, Best Practices Foundation
Bangalore, India
E-mail: bpfound@bgl.vsnl.net.in

STAVROU, Aki, Dr.
Director, Integrating Ireland
Ireland
E-mail: aki@integratingireland.ie,
astavrou@eircom.net

THERBORN, Göran, Prof.
Professor and Chair of Sociology
University of Cambridge, UK
E-mail: gt274@cam.ac.uk

WILDSCHUT, Glenda, Ms.
Director, Leadership Support and Development
 Centre,
Former Commissioner on the Truth &
 Reconciliation
Cape Town, South Africa
E-mail: glendawi@telkomsa.net

DISCUSSANTS

ABU-RASS Thabet, Dr.
Co-Director of New Horizon,
  Arab-Jewish Institute for shared Society, and
Lecturer, Department of Geography and
Environmental Development
Ben Gurion University of the Negev
Email: Thabet@bgu.ac.il,

Be'eri-Sulitzeanu, Amnon, Mr.
Executive Director
The Abraham Fund Initiatives, Israel
E-mail: amnon@abrahamfund.org.il

CARROLL, Sean Mr.
Program Director
Club of Madrid
Madrid, Spain
E-mail: scarroll@clubmadrid.org

DEGANI, Zeev, Dr.
Co-Director of New Horizon,
  Arab-Jewish Institute for shared Society.
E-mail: deganizeev@yahoo.com

JOHNSTON, Elizabeth, Ms.
Deputy Director
European Forum for Urban Safety
E-mail: johnston@urbansecurity.org

McCARTNEY, Clem Mr.
Program Consultant
Club of Madrid
E-mail: clemmccartney@hotmail.com

MEYER, Brad, Mr.
Director, Collaboration Ltd
United Kingdom
E-mail: BradMeyer@collaboration.co.uk

SCHEPER, Elisabeth, E. Dr.
International Consultant
Fellow, Weatherhead Center for International
  Affairs, Harvard University, and
Program Advisor to the World Conference of
  Religions for Peace
E-mail: bettyscheper@hotmail.com
SENNI, Hamid, Mr.
Director, Vision Enabler Ltd

United Kingdom
E-mail: h.senni@visionenabler.com

SILVER, Sarah, Ms.
Executive Director
Alan B. Slifka Foundation
New York
E-mail: ssilver@halcyonllc.com

UNITED NATIONS

UNESCO

Mr. Pierre Sané
Assistant Director-General
Social and Human Sciences
E-mail: p.sane@unesco.org

Mr. Wataru Iwamoto
Director
Division of Social Sciences Research and Policy
E-mail: w.iwamoto@unesco.org

Mrs. Christina von Furstenberg
Chief of Section
Policy and Cooperation in Social Sciences
E-mail: c.von-furstenberg@unesco.org

Mr. Kenneth Eklindh
Chief of Section,
Section for Inclusion and Quality Learning E-
Enhancement
E-mail: k.eklindh@unesco.org

Mr. John Crowley
Chief of Section, Communication, Information
and Publications Unit
Editor, International Social Science Journal
E-mail: j.crowley@unesco.org

Ms. Brigitte Colin
Programme Specialist
Division of Social Sciences Research and Policy
E-mail: b.colin@unesco.org

Ms. Cecilie Golden
Programme Specialist
Policy and Cooperation in Social Sciences
E-mail: c.golden@unesco.org

Mr. German Solinis
Programme Specialist
Policy and Cooperation in Social Sciences
E-mail: g.solinis@unesco.org

Ms. Jun Morohashi
Assistant Programme Specialist
Struggle against Discrimination and Racism
E-mail: j.morohashi@unesco.org

UN-HABITAT

Mr. Mohamed Halfani
Officer In-charge, Urban Development Branch
& Chief, Urban Governance Section
UN-Habitat
E-mail: Mohamed.Halfani@unhabitat.org

Mr. Paul Taylor
Director
UN-HABITAT Liaison Office to the European
Union and Belgium
E-mail: paul.taylor@unhabitat.be

UNDESA

Mr. Sergei Zelenev
Chief, Social Integration Branch
Division for Social Policy and Development
E-mail: zelenev@un.org

Ms. Gay Rosenblum-Kumar
Senior Public Administration Officer
Governance and Public Administration Branch
Division for Public Administration and
Development Management
E-mail: rosenblum-kumar@un.org

Ms. Makiko Tagashira
Social Affairs Officer
Social Integration Branch
Division for Social Policy and Development
E-mail: tagashira@un.org

Annex IV   Expert Group Meeting Background Papers

Author	Paper/Presentation
BUSATTO, César	Solidarity Governance for Creating Inclusive Societies
BAROT-HENAULT, Elisabeth	No title
BELKIN, Gary S.	Measuring and Using Social Inclusion – Building a nexus of facts, practices and knowledge through the lessons and capacities of public health
WILDSCHUT, Glenda	Social Capital Formation as a Strategy to Promote Social Cohesion – Examples of Post apartheid South Africa
THERBORN, Göran	Issues of Social Inclusion
NEWTON, Julie	Wellbeing: Contribution towards practical strategies to promote social integration
LOMBE, Margaret	Review of Approaches and Methods to Measure Inclusion and Cohesion
FITZDUFF, Mari	Measuring Social Inclusion and Cohesion – the Challenges
ÄNGEBY, Martin	Social Integration in the Stockholm Region
HEMMAT, Minu	Participatory Dialogue as a Tool for Creating an Inclusive Society
HALFANI, Mohamed	Review of Approaches and Methods for Measuring Social Inclusion and Cohesion –UN-HABITAT's Experience in Developing and Applying Indicators
PURUSOTHAMAN, Sangeetha	Strategies, Barriers, and Policies towards Creating a More Inclusive Society
IWAMOTO Wataru	Session V: The right to the city: Citizenship social dimensions of social inclusion – Intervention of Wataru Iwamoto
METZ, Zachary	New Narratives through Dialogue: Two Cases Studies from a Practitioner Perspective
MEYER, Brad and SENNI, Hamid	Overcoming Exclusion: Promoting inclusive institutions and facilitating participation lessons learned from successful interventions (Case Study)
ABU RAS, Thabet and DEGANI, Zeev	Cooperating at Work: A study in a Bi-National Factory (Case Study)