



NWO Research Programme

Shifts in Governance: Problems of Legitimacy and Accountability

Revised edition (2004)

NWO

Programme *Shifts in Governance*

Laan van Nieuw Oost Indië 300

P.O. Box 93461

2509 AL The Hague

The Netherlands

Telephone + 31(0)70 3440906

Fax + 31(0)70 3832841

E-mail borsboom@nwo.nl

Website www.nwo.nl/governance

Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Research agenda	5
	Multilevel governance	5
	Urban governance	8
	Cultures of governance	11
	Private and public responsibilities	15
3	Implementation and Procedures	19
4	Programme Committee and Programme Office	24

1 Introduction

The goal of this brochure is to inform about the *Shifts in Governance* Research Programme. In 2002 there has been a first round. In 2004 a second round is scheduled. For this second round the text of this brochure is *not* changed. The research sub-themes are the same. In this (second) round applicants of **the historian, the economic and the western urban governance** (sub)disciplines are particularly invited to submit proposals.

One of the most significant developments in modern societies in the past decades has been the transformation of traditional state-based governing mechanisms and the advancement of new arrangements of governance. This has occurred in the private, the semi-private and the public sphere, and has involved governmental and non-governmental actors and agencies at various levels of organisation (local, regional, national, transnational and global). Typically, these new forms of governance rely less on the state as the institutional form and hierarchical centre of society.

Governance refers to the phenomenon that many public functions increasingly seem to be assumed and carried out by actors other than the classical government institutions of the nation-state (and its subdivisions). Public administration is thus increasingly becoming 'unbounded', involving various public, non-governmental and private actors in various ways in the process of decision making over public goods.

Shifts in governance can occur in two dimensions: vertically, across different levels of local, national and transnational government, and horizontally, from public to (semi-) private actors and agencies. 'Governance beyond the state' and 'governance without government' involve important questions concerning the location of power, the sharing of responsibility, the legitimacy of decisions and decision takers, and the accountability to citizens and organisations in different national, subnational and international settings. Such changes in the forms, mechanisms, location and cultures of governance have generated new and important *research agendas* for social scientists, concerned with different societal sectors and activities: law, social sciences, and the humanities. The increased interest in and use of the concept of governance has developed simultaneously, but disconnectedly in neighbouring disciplines. The *Shifts in Governance* research programme is meant to build bridges across disciplines and intra-disciplinary research agendas. It intends to stimulate fruitful comparisons between rather different phenomena and to inspire conceptual and empirical work through cross-fertilization and mutual learning in related disciplines.

2 Research agenda

Research supported by the programme Shifts in Governance will focus on four sub-themes:

- multilevel governance;
- urban governance;
- cultures of governance;
- private and public responsibilities.

Below, for each of these themes the *shifts in governance* that seem to be occurring, the current state of research, and possible research questions are briefly identified. Please note, these overviews and the questions raised are in no way meant to be exhaustive. Instead, they are intended to stimulate thinking and help researchers to formulate major research questions of their own. Also, interesting research questions may fall in between the four themes indicated below, or indeed combine several of them.

Multilevel governance

This theme focuses on the description, causes and effects of multilevel governance. 'Multilevel' refers to a variety of forms of (private or public) decision making, authority, policymaking, regulation, organisation, ruling, steering, et cetera, that are characterised by a complex interweaving of actors operating at different levels of formal jurisdictional or administrative authority, ranging from the local level, via the regional and national level, to the regional (e.g. European or South American) and international or global level. The central issue for research is that the rise of multilevel governance transforms the capacity, location and performance of the traditional (state-centered) mechanisms of power, responsibility, legitimacy and accountability.

Multilevel governance is a specific concept that attempts to capture the vertical shifts from government to governance: from national to international organisations or actors such as the WTO, European Union, OECD or United Nations; from national and international to subnational, regional levels, if only because international bodies generally rely on local agencies to implement and enforce their regulations; from national to international markets, through the

interdependencies created by trade, migration, finance or Internet; and from national to supranational law as in the case of the European Court of Justice, the International Court of Justice, or the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia.

State of the art

The notion of multilevel governance has two basic origins. In International Relations theory it constituted an attempt to modernise the earlier 'regime' concept, defined as the principles, norms, rules, and decision making procedures operating in an international environment of many actors, including non-governmental ones. 'Governance' in this context referred to the power relations resulting from such rules and to the substance of the policies thus defined and pursued. The term 'multilevel' attempted to grasp the fact that it embraced not only the different government levels (national, supra- and subnational), but also that it covered the activity of multifarious public and private actors at those various levels as well as their interrelationships. The other main source of thinking on multilevel governance as a distinct concept and field of study goes back to the efforts by some theorists working in the tradition of Comparative Public Policy Analysis, particularly those studying the EU Structural Funds. These theorists denied that nation-states were still the exclusive connection between domestic politics and intergovernmental bargaining in the European Union. Instead, they stressed the importance of policy networks that are organised across policy areas and government levels of the member states. In fact, the central point they tried to make was that the sovereignty of individual states is diluted in the European arena by collective decision making and by supranational institutions. Governance, it was argued, occurred in networks of both state and societal actors, particularly interest organisations, which form complex policy networks and arrive at decisions through multilevel negotiations rather than via hierarchical command. In addition, with the development of distinctively European and international bodies of law, and their complex interweaving with each other and with national systems, the legal system has also become a multilevel one, increasing greatly in complexity, and enabling more opportunities for individuals and collectivities to impose their will against their national governments.

The rise of multilevel governance is widely perceived as being recognisable in, among other phenomena, the declining importance of the nation-state and national legal systems as the central locus of public authority and in international relations, the declining role of hierarchy in public and private decision making, the rise of open methods and architectures of co-ordination and the use of 'soft law' in the European Union, the development of 'co-ordinated decentralisation' in the governance of firms and industrial relations systems, and, generally, the increasing significance of networks and complex negotiating systems involving public authorities, (semi-)private actors, non-governmental organisations (NGO's), social movements, multinational corporations, interest organisations, expert organisations.

Research topics and questions

With respect to multilevel governance, three central sets of issues for research occur:

- A first set of questions is *to what extent* the widely held beliefs about the shift to multilevel governance are actually corroborated by empirical evidence, and how unique or new such shifts are from a comparative and historical perspective. The need is for conceptual clarification and for a better road map of the ways in which the shifts in governance are rendered operational in practice. At the same time more rigorous empirical and historical analysis, and tests of observed or presumed trends need to be undertaken.
- A second important issue for research concerns the causes of the development towards multilevel governance and the varying degrees of intensity that may be observed in that process. There are many candidates, but three obvious ones are frequently mentioned in the literature: rapid developments in information and communication technology (ICT); globalisation and internationalisation, including not only free trade of goods, services, and capital, but also greater mobility of the population over the world, and instant exchange of information over the globe; and economic, social, political and legal integration, whether in Europe, Asia, South America, or Africa. How do such processes affect vertical shifts in governance and by what causal mechanisms do they create or alter the complex, multilayered

networks of public and private actors?

– The third research issue concerns the consequences of the rise of multilevel governance for the *governability* and *efficiency* of governing, for the institutions and processes of democracy (including, for instance, national and international constitutions and systems of representation), for the *accountability* arrangements that control the exercise of power and prevent its abuse or arbitrary application, and hence for its overall *legitimacy*. It is striking how much work still remains to be done in developing thinking on the ways in which issues of accountability, legitimacy and responsibility can be addressed in international or transnational governance, and how that might be operationalised in practice. Multilevel governance as a concept has been developed in reaction to, for instance, internationalisation producing different territorial levels of ‘state’ and ‘business’. Concerns have been raised about the freer flow of capital and the higher volatility of capital markets reducing the governing capacities of national governments, about national legal norms being undercut by regulatory competition, about a possible ‘race-to-the-bottom’ in environmental and labour standards, about fears over ‘social dumping’ and threats to welfare state programs and national cultures, about uncontrollable global migration flows, about rising social inequality, terrorism, and the undermining of civil liberties as a consequence of international police co-operation and in criminal law.

In sum, research might concentrate 1) on the effects of vertical shifts in governance on the governance capacity of societies, 2) on the effects of such changes in governing capacity on a wide variety of societal problems, and 3) on the effects of changing governance and problem-solving capacities on the relationship with citizens, through processes of legitimacy and accountability.

Urban governance

Urban developments are characterised by complexity, dynamism and diversity. In addition to the role of demographic change and migration, megatrends like economic globalisation, involving mobile capital investments and international institutions, increase

the complexity of urban government and competition between cities everywhere. We may distinguish between *inter-* and *intra-*urban issues. *Inter-urban* issues concern competitive relations between similar or different cities, within and across states, as well as the spatial development of cities through mergers or the emergence of new areas at the outskirts of existing cities. These can be planned areas, such as VINEX-locations in The Netherlands or new satellites of (mega)cities in southern countries, but also an unplanned and uncontrolled urban sprawl. Such developments call into question the governance of populations and sharing of physical resources. *Intra-urban* issues are related to the quality of life in urban areas, such as security or space, and access to utilities and services. Questions of social inclusion and social cohesion have become prominent in this connection, and can be related to the problems of power sharing, accountability and legitimacy in urban governance.

Inter-urban issues thus tend to refer to spatial conflicts; intra-urban issues to social conflicts. In either case, many actors, varying from national states and international organisations to city neighbourhoods, and including public bodies, private firms, NGO's or social movements, can be seen as stakeholders. The study of the complexity of urban governance through the potentially conflicting involvement of multifarious public and private actors in different arenas are at the centre of this research theme.

State of the art

Researchers and policymakers seem to be in agreement that hierarchical and control-based models of governance have become less effective in the management of such complex realities like urban development. The limited effectiveness of hierarchical government is especially apparent when the agendas of competitiveness and social cohesion have to be combined. In that case more and more different actors, agencies and interest groups must be motivated to participate and to collaborate. First and foremost this holds for the co-operation between central, municipal and sub-municipal levels of government. In the 1990s, by means of devolution of tasks, central governments tended to put a heavier burden on local governments. Secondly, there is a tendency to increase the involvement of the private sector through public-private partnerships or outright privatisation. Finally,

the voluntary and community sectors (such as neighbourhood organisations, trade unions, the church and other religion-based organisations) remain involved in the governance of urban issues. More partners in the governance process probably bring more knowledge, perhaps also greater (input) legitimacy, but there is also a greater likelihood of conflict with respect to the sharing of power and responsibility, and increased problems of accountability. This especially holds in situations in which the devolution of tasks takes place without an adequate devolution of decision making authority, competence and (budget-)power. The political viability of inter- and intra-urban governance may become problematic in such cases.

Research topics and questions

Within this theme one can think of the following problems and issues for research:

- The description and explanation of the emergence, character and development of governance mechanisms and practices related to (mega)cities, urban development, inter-urban conflicts or co-operation, and intra-urban sharing of resources.
- The effects of *urban sprawl* on the governance of physical environment in northern and southern (mega)cities. This may involve a comparative analysis of management of physical resources, and the consequences for urban welfare, equality, citizen's involvement, and local democracy.
- More specifically in southern countries, an interesting research issue relates to the effects of *shocks* on urban governance. These shocks can be natural and sudden (e.g. floods, earthquakes) or natural, man-made and gradual (e.g. global climate change, salination) or entirely man-made and catastrophic (e.g. huge migration waves caused by civil war). Under such circumstances no form of 'good governance' may be applicable, but what kind of governance is applied instead? What shifts in governance are observed or required in order to develop the necessary (minimum) administrative capacities to deal with such shocks or emergencies?
- With regard to intra-urban governance possible research questions address the quality of life within urban areas (megacities, districts, wards). Neighbourhoods in different countries and cities may be confronted, differently, with a sudden

or gradual degradation of the physical or social environment, e.g. an outflow of middle-class households, mounting social conflicts or racial tensions, increasing amounts of litter or waste, a depletion of physical resources, rising levels of unemployment, visible anti-social behaviour, deteriorating commercial and social services, et cetera. Because these problems find their causes in all kinds of political, demographic, physical, socio-cultural and economic developments operating on different levels and spatial scales (neighbourhood, city, region, country, global), they may be extremely hard to tackle. Can we identify (new) mechanisms of urban governance that adequately respond to these processes?

– Another question arises around the normative concept of *good governance*. This is a concept which is increasingly used in international policy discourse, for instance by the World Bank or the OECD. Does good governance, applied to urban problems, have a set of common properties? In addition, is it possible to identify a process of diffusion of best practices or a learning process across or within cities, urban communities, or states? Is 'good government' associated with a particular mode or mechanism of accountability? Is there a trade-off between legitimation by input (democratic process) and legitimation by output (quality of environment, welfare)?

Cultures of governance

Under this theme, the concepts of legitimacy and accountability play a central role. Definitions of such concepts differ, but they will always refer to a relation between forms of governance and the society they are applied to. Politics and administration do not operate in isolation, but are situated in concrete societies. Undoubtedly therefore, questions related to the legitimacy and accountability of forms of governance touch upon the social and cultural norms and expectations prevalent in any given society. Legitimacy is about the moral grounding of power and therefore involves social and cultural norms and expectations concerning proper behaviour of those that govern, the social relationship between rulers and ruled, the role of trust, reputation and force, and the balance between authority and obedience. Such norms and expectations vary across time and space. They can refer to the

output or input of policymaking, to the procedures or legality of decision making or to its content, to the performance or to the status of rulers, and to limited or ultimate criteria of justice. Accountability, and the neighbouring concepts of responsibility and responsiveness, involves the presence of checks and balances; the acceptance of rulers that they must somehow live up to expectations and justify their actions within given norms, and that the ruled have some sanctioning power. In short, legitimacy and accountability inevitably involve cultural definitions and patterns of power and governance.

State of the art

Political scientists have used the concept of culture in different ways. With some simplification, we may distinguish two approaches. In the first approach, they have tried to define an ideal or efficient type of democracy and governance, and then proceeded to analyse under what social, cultural or legal conditions such types might exist, develop or prosper, or, instead, discover the impediments or obstacles to democratic development. These obstacles have often been culturally explained or interpreted as, for instance, the result of deeply ingrained cultural patterns favouring authoritarian or clientelist political relations, or cultural attitudes and social relationships producing a lack of trust in politicians and government officials among citizens. The second approach has rejected the teleological implications of a political ideal type of democracy and 'good' governance, and abandoned the resulting focus on 'obstacles' or 'absences' in specific historical or cultural situations. This perspective does not assume a universal trajectory or desired outcome, but tries to analyse specific patterns of governance practice in different historical periods or in different parts of the world. It concentrates on path-dependent developments and tries to understand the importance of political culture and local traditions for variations in governance and particular forms of democratic accountability and legitimacy. Both perspectives share the emphasis on the cultural and historical specificities of political change. An important question is for instance, how cultures of governance, which often demonstrate surprising tenacity, are transmitted from one generation to the next through processes of socialisation, elite education, and political recruitment. Political developments like the transition

to democracy after one-party rule, dictatorship, or apartheid are also shaped by the knowledge of available examples of 'good government' elsewhere, or in one's own past, memories and perceptions of past experience, and processes of individual and social learning. Administrative traditions, memories of past events, imposition by powerful neighbours or international sponsors, learning behaviour, imitation of political 'fashions' concerning the relationship of the public and private domain and the acceptability of state intervention have shaped the political choices concerning privatisation and the cultures of bureaucrats and bureaucracies in various world regions.

Research topics and questions

The concepts of culture and history are essential for an analysis of shifting governance and the interplay between government and civil society. Two research perspectives are available in this field, which may generate complementary results:

- An 'institutional' perspective from within, starting from values, attitudes, mentalities and practices within governing agencies. The internal management of public agencies is subject to a wide range of cultural inputs, varying from the social and cultural background of administrators to the administrative styles developed by large and small bureaucracies. The relationship between superiors and subordinates, for example, depends upon general values concerning authority and its legitimacy. Weber's 'rational-legal' authority is a culturally and historically conditioned concept, which is not necessarily universally accepted. Many other cultural factors have a significant impact on administrative behaviour. Which values influence long-term organisational targets? What self-images of bureaucrats predominate? What kinds of 'ritual' govern their daily practices? Along which lines are administrative styles reproduced? How do governing agencies preserve (or change) the cultural norms they operate by? Do these norms enhance the accountability of public agencies, or do they insulate the agencies in a bureaucratic world of their own? In order to answer such questions it might be helpful to make use of concepts and perspectives developed by administrative scientists studying 'organisational culture', distinguishing between three layers of culture: 1) the artefacts, such as buildings, lay-outs, corridors (closed or open

doors), means of communication, and the like; 2) the espoused values, such as aims, mission statements, strategies, laid down in documents or otherwise known to employees; 3) shared tacit assumptions, i.e. norms, values, beliefs, which underlie administrative behaviour. New research could take these ideas as point of departure for comparative and historical research.

– A 'societal' perspective from without, starting from values, attitudes, practices, and behaviour prevalent among citizens, clients and organisations vis-à-vis governance arrangements. This perspective is close to the classical definition of political culture given by Almond and Verba as 'the subjective orientation to politics', which describes 'the system of beliefs and values which defines the situation in which political action takes place'. This could also be related to the current interest in questions of trust and distrust, social capital, party government versus technocratic forms of governance, and the importance of NGO's and civil society for democracy (for instance, in countries which make the 'transition' to democracy). The challenge of this perspective will be to find a way to incorporate societal reactions to governance without confining research solely to societal questions and leaving governance itself out of the picture. Another challenge relates to the study of the relationship between society and governance in transnational settings. Possible topics of research may include the patterns of conflict resolution and their historical development in a national or transnational context (e.g. negotiation arrangements in a context dominated by Islamic or other religious traditions); moments of social crisis provoked by irresponsible government action, by communication breakdown, or by overly bureaucratic conduct; the setting up of new governance structures and new relations between government and society after war or independence; the emergence of new forms of governance and control mechanisms between governments, NGO's, and private actors in national or international settings; the legitimacy of 'corporatist' government within parliamentary democracy, and the role of accountability mechanisms within NGO's or corporate actors. The emergence of new social movements in many parts of the world may also be mentioned here, since they have challenged the legitimacy and 'closed' culture of global governance and advocated alternatives for the direct and indirect involvement of citizens. This also raises

the issue of governance in a society which is in constant flux, and does no longer possess self-evident social formations or stable, permanent socio-political organisations, such as the former Dutch 'pillars' or the 'corporatist' order based on organised labour and capital.

Private and public responsibilities

In modern history, the responsibilities of the public and private sector have been changing substantially and vary considerably across countries and regions. In recent years, however, governments around the world have been exploring the possibility of privatising activities that had traditionally been part of the public sector. In making the transition, governments have to rely on alternative instruments than public ownership to correct market failures. These instruments include regulation, contracts, public-private partnerships, taxes and subsidies, and competition. By outsourcing production activities to the private sector, governments specialize in their core business: the identification of market failures and the correction of these through regulation and appropriate market design. In delegating decision power to the private sector, however, governments lose flexibility to adjust objectives and standards to new circumstances. More generally, as internationalisation proceeds and information in knowledge-intensive economies is increasingly in the hands of specialists, the ability of governments to internalise externalities and protect weak actors is reduced. In several areas, businesses seem to some extent to be willing to fill the gap left by governments as they are pursuing strategies of corporate social responsibility and are involved in self-regulation. Reputation may be a major correcting mechanism, as firms that do not meet the expectations of their various stakeholders (regarding working conditions, treatment of workers, product quality, activities generating pollution and other serious risks) may suffer adverse consequences. In particular, stakeholders may exercise not only their voice option but also their exit option on the various markets the firm operates on (the markets for labour, capital, other supplies, and output). How such reputational mechanisms can be strengthened, and the narrowing of accountability to one dominant shareholder can be prevented, is an important field of study. Modern information and communication technology (ICT)

and the involvement of non-governmental organisations may strengthen reputational forces by facilitating the gathering of information about the behaviour of firms and the dissemination of information within networks and to the public at large. International agencies like the United Nations, the ILO or the OECD may reinforce such pressures through guidelines, learning, peer pressure and shaming, and this in itself may constitute a new form of 'soft' multilevel governance. The 'open method of co-ordination' by which the European Union tries to achieve better performance and more private-public co-operation in the areas of economic and employment policy, social inclusion, education or pension provision is another area of interest.

State of the art

The theoretical literature on both the positive aspects (why are firms doing this? and how is their increased role legitimated) and normative aspects (should firms do this from a social perspective and if so, under which conditions of accountability?) of the increased public role of businesses is underdeveloped. This is one of the areas where empirical documentation seems to be outrunning theory. Little is known, for example, about the incentives for shareholder groups to report honestly and the risks of herd behaviour associated with false reporting. The same holds true for the motivations and preferences of stakeholders. Surveys and experiments can help identify how much consumers, workers, and investors are willing to pay for ethical sound practices of businesses. Experimental work is presently stimulating theoretical work building behavioural models deviating from the traditional rational choice model. This broader perspective on human choice, which acknowledges cognitive limitations and social norms in human choice, may help to shed light on the forces that stimulate firms to take on a larger social role.

The theoretical literature has had a hard time to identify the merits of governments contracting out production activities. Based on the transaction costs approach, the so-called property rights approach based on incomplete contracts has however recently identified some benefits of delegating power to the private sector but the application of the incomplete contracting paradigm to public policy still faces a large number of unresolved issues.

Research topics and questions

The developments described above raise a host of issues:

- The potentially larger social role of firms has important consequences for corporate governance. Whose interests count (most) if the interests of various stakeholders conflict? How can stakeholders obtain reliable, transparent information about the behaviour of businesses? What is the role of international organisations (such as the OECD and the ILO), national governments and various other stakeholders (including non-governmental organisations and civil society more generally) in this respect, for example in setting clear reporting standards and enhancing transparency more generally (by, for example, naming and shaming)? How effective are firms in communicating their efforts and how can these strategies be improved?
- The privatisation of public responsibilities also raises serious issues of legitimacy and accountability in a broad sense. Who sets the standards and objectives of private businesses? Is any link maintained with state actors? Who is responsible for monitoring? What is the legitimacy of various groups of stakeholders who try to affect the firms' behaviour (citizens united in non-governmental organisations, consumers, workers) and how can these stakeholders be disciplined not to incorrectly blemish the reputations of firms? How should incentives of monitoring parties be structured and how independent should this party be from both the polity and the sector concerned? What does responsibility mean in this context?
- In outsourcing activities to the private sector, the government faces the key question of the contractability of public interests. How can it ensure that private firms act in the public interest? Competition between businesses may also help. This raises the key issue of market design. Should contracts to private firms be awarded through auctions and, if so, which auction design should be used? More theoretical and empirical work on specific markets, paying sufficient attention to the institutional details of such a concrete case, would be welcome. The liberalisation and privatisation of network industries in the European Union, for example, raises many specific issues.
- The greater public responsibilities of business impact competition policy more generally. Should competition authorities allow co-operation between firms aimed at self-

regulation, for example through branch organisations? To illustrate, how should competition rules deal with voluntary agreements and joint alliances involving environmental protection, supply chain management (e.g. in agriculture) or social policy (e.g. collective labour agreements or agreements prohibiting cream skimming in health care or insurance markets)?

– Another key question is whether the voice option of citizens can be complemented by an exit option by providing citizens with the freedom to choose between various suppliers. What are for example the consequences of providing vouchers to consumers of education and health care on the quality of the services provided? Can ICT be helpful in strengthen the transparency of private provision? How can vulnerable groups be protected as firms engage in cream skimming and selection? And how can voice mechanisms be strengthened when exit possibilities are blocked or limited.

– More generally, the outsourcing of public services may have important consequences for income distribution. How can the government ensure that possible efficiency gains are fairly distributed and accrue to consumers rather than producers? How are such processes legitimated and can public or private accountability be improved? Case studies of particular markets (e.g. social insurance, pensions, health care, education) where European governments increasingly rely on private sector to provide services are called for here.

– Finally, delegation of public responsibilities to private firms, or interest organisations ('corporatism') involves some degree of public monitoring and sanctioning power. Who should be endowed with this task and what should the relation be with the traditional organs of control (e.g. parliament) in a given political system? How should the incentives of the monitoring agency be structured and how independent should this agency be from both the polity and the sector concerned? Is there a role for international organisations or multilevel governments, such as the European Union, in this particular area?

I Added value for the programme as a whole

- valuable contribution to the *Shifts in Governance* research programme

II Scientific quality

- scientific relevance
- definition of the problem and the theoretical framework
- innovation and originality in approach, methodology or domain
- research design, methodology and schedule
- international linkage
- scientific status and past performance of the applicant and the research group
- estimate of human and material resources
- expected scientific output

III Societal impact

- societal relevance and practical importance

Please note that the first five criteria (dots) have a higher weight and priority than the other, though important, criteria.

The Programme Committee will select the research proposals that fit to this criteria and will invite the applicants to elaborate their preliminary proposals into full proposals.

The Programme Committee can decide to invite an applicant of an preliminary proposal to elaborate it into a full proposal for reasons of *programme policy and overall strategic* in order to obtain a fully coherent research programme that fits to the programme goals.

Before July 1, 2004 all applicants of a preliminary proposal will be notified whether they are invited to elaborate the proposal or not.

Full proposals

The deadline for submission of full proposals is **September 1, 2004**. The full proposals will be reviewed by independent external experts. An independent assessment committee evaluates the evaluation reports of the external experts and ranks the proposals.

Then the proposals will be passed on to the Programme Committee with advise on funding. Applicants will be offered the opportunity to respond to the anonymous evaluation reports of the external experts.

Evaluation criteria full proposals

The full proposals will be evaluated with respect to three categories on the following criteria:

I Added value for the programme as a whole

- valuable contribution to the *Shifts in Governance* research programme

II Scientific quality

- scientific relevance
- definition of the problem and the theoretical framework
- innovation and originality in approach, methodology or domain
- research design, methodology and schedule
- international linkage
- scientific status and past performance of the applicant and the research group
- estimate of human and material resources
- expected scientific output

III Societal impact

- societal relevance and practical importance

Programmes will also be evaluated with respect to the following criteria:

- multidisciplinary co-operation
- coherence between the programme and its projects
- added value of the programme
- organization of the programme
- additional comments on the individual project within the programme

Please note that the first five criteria (dots) have a higher weight and priority than the other, though important, criteria.

The Programme Committee can decide to award a grant to a full

proposal for reasons of *programme policy and overall strategic* in order to obtain a fully coherent research programme that fits to the programme goals.

Replacement subsidy

The research programme *Shifts in Governance* offers the opportunity to fund replacement teaching costs (replacement subsidy). This research leave scheme funds replacement teaching costs for periods of research leave up to twelve months, so that an individual scholar may complete a significant research project. Please note, the purpose of the research leave scheme is to enable the researcher to complete a research project, i.e., *the research should be in its final version* and should result in an *(international) publication*.

Only professors and senior researchers associated with a Dutch research institution, in case recognized by NWO, can submit an application for research leave. Only a professor can submit an application for him/herself.

Applications will be reviewed by independent (inter)national experts. At least two evaluation reports will be obtained.

Applicants will be given the opportunity to respond to the – anonymous – evaluation reports. The Programme Committee will decide on funding.

There are two rounds of the research leave scheme per year.

Closing date for receipt of applications during the academic year 2003/2004 is: **March 3, 2004**. Closing dates for the academic year 2004/2005 are: **September 1, 2004** and (probably) **March 2, 2005**.

Transfer of Knowledge

In the Shifts Programme two full-day symposia are envisaged as general *transfer of knowledge* activities: one halfway through the planning period to review the projects, and one close to the conclusion to evaluate the programme.

Besides this general activities it will be possible for researchers to submit grants for *transfer of knowledge* projects. At this moment information about grants for Transfer of Knowledge projects is not yet available. At due time the Programme Committee will provide information on the website and in brochures.

4 Programme Committee and Programme Office

Programme Committee

prof.dr. C.J. van Kersbergen, chair (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, political science)

prof.dr. J.M. Baud (University of Amsterdam, Latin American Studies)

prof.dr. A.L. Bovenberg (Tilburg University, economics)

prof.dr. D.M. Curtin (Utrecht University, law of international organisations)

prof.dr. D.A. Hellema (Utrecht University, history of international relations)

prof.dr. R. van Kempen (Utrecht University, urban geography)

dr. N.G. Schulte Nordholt (University of Twente, development administration)

vacancy

Programme Office

drs. D.C.J. Borsboom, Social Science Research Council (MaGW), programme co-ordinator, telephone: 070 3440906, email: borsboom@nwo.nl

dr. M. J.H. Linssen, Council for the Humanities (GW), programme officer, telephone: 070 3440625, email: linssen@nwo.nl

dr. R.A. Strijp, Netherlands Foundation for the Advancement of Tropical Research (WOTRO), programme officer, telephone: 070 3440566, email: strijp@nwo.nl