

**INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT TO THE
SOUTHERN CONE**

89.

Institutional Support to the Southern Cone

IDRC INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT TO THE SOUTHERN CONE

A. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT GUIDELINES

It has been five years since the Board of Governors approved guidelines for institutional support grants in the Southern Cone countries of Latin America. Centre Management feels that some changes have taken place since then in the Southern Cone which merit modification of the existing guidelines.

The Social Sciences Division presented a paper to the IDRC Board of Governors in 1981 which pointed out the considerable difficulties being faced by social scientists in three countries (Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay) because of the hostile environment created by the military regimes in place at the time. Social science research in government supported institutions was being suppressed and a number of independent and non-profit research institutions had been set up to permit the continuation of social science research. As opposed to the more standard type of IDRC research project support that ties funds to specific research activities and does not cover general administrative costs, the division proposed that institutional support should be given to cover both the research programs and overhead costs of these independent institutions.

The Board approved the provision of institutional support to social science institutions in the Southern Cone subject to the following provisions:*

* Management Committee Document MC 81/10 adopted by the Board in March 1981.

1. "Recipient organizations should provide a comprehensive research and institutional plan for a 3-year period, with information about staffing, costing, budget and research issues. Such an indicative plan would give the Centre an idea of the nature of the organization, its aspirations and its research intentions as well as a measure, during the 3-year period, of the success of the mode of funding.
2. The recipient organization should also provide complete information about funding sources during the 3-year period. This information should be available at the commencement of the period of grant but it would be the obligation of the institution to inform the Centre of new project, program or institutional income. This guideline would not limit the capacity of the institution to search for more funds but rather would permit the assessment of the health of the organization on a continuing basis as well as permit the acquisition of increased knowledge about its sources of funds.
3. The Centre should limit the provision of program or institutional funds to a proportion of the recipient's estimated budget for the 3-year period. This limit would: (a) insure that no one agency dominated the activities of the research centre, (b) not discourage the independent centres from seeking other funding sources, (c) make maximum use of the limited resources at the disposal of the program division. A limit of 25-35% of total institutional expenditures is proposed as a general rule."

In addition, the Board stipulated that this support should not exceed 10% of the program division's annual project appropriation budget.

Nine institutions have been supported with institutional grants (see Annex 1). Some institutional support grants were given in the period 1977-1980 in advance of the Board's guidelines. IDRC support from 1977 to 1985 amounts to CAD 3.2 million for the nine institutions listed in Annex 2. This level is approximately 4% of divisional program appropriations for the period. The level of IDRC funding has varied among the institutions. Centre support to the institutions has stayed below 35% of their total budgets, as designated in the Board guidelines. Project support over the same period has amounted to an additional CAD 3.8 million (Annex 2).

If the guidelines were unchanged, the Social Sciences Division would anticipate providing an additional CAD 720,000 in institutional support in the next two financial years (Annex 3).

B. OUTCOMES

Since the passage of the Board resolution in 1981, there have been changes in the political conditions in the Southern Cone. Argentina and Uruguay now have democratic civilian governments, while Chile continues to be governed by the military.

Two evaluations have been undertaken of some of the institutions. The most recent review* in 1985 involved a consultant for the Social Sciences Division reviewing six institutions receiving support from the Centre.

The consultant's report indicates that, in conjunction with other funding organizations, IDRC's institutional support during the period of military governments has eased the financial insecurity of the institutions and achieved the objective of maintaining viable research institutions with a core research staff.

The report gave an indication of the size of the institutions concerned in three cases:

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| 1) CEDES (Argentina) | 20 researchers and 20 research assistants |
| 2) FLACSO (Chile) | 27 academic staff, 5 research assistants
and 12 administrative staff (plus visiting
scholars) |
| 3) CIESU (Uruguay) | 14 researchers and 14 visiting scholars. |

* Beatrice Avalos, Social Science and Social Policy Research in the Latin American Southern Cone - The Case for Institutional Support, 1985.

The report indicates that these institutions have been active in the training of young researchers, civil servants, school teachers and union leaders. Staff at the institutions have participated at international colloquia organized in Europe and North America. Some of the institutions have had an active publishing record. For example, FLACSO publishes 35 working papers and 4 books annually and PIIIE has published 7 volumes of its research.

The change in governments in Argentina and Uruguay has had a considerable effect on the role of social scientists in these two countries.

The consultant indicates that some of the institutions such as CEDES in Argentina and CIESU in Uruguay have provided an institutional framework for those social scientists returning from exile following the transition to non-military democratic governments. The economic research of CEDES has had a major input into the national economic policy of Argentina. CEDES is also collaborating with the Argentinian Congress in the design of communications policy and, with World Bank support, is developing a macro-economic model for the Argentinian economy.

The Centre's institutional support grants enabled the social science researchers to remain in their respective countries during a period of repression of social science research. With the transition to civilian rule, the staff of these institutions such as CEDES, CISEA and CEUR have been appointed to senior positions in the Government of Argentina. Oscar Ozlak, the former director of CEDES is now the Under Secretary for Public Office while another member of CEDES, Adolf Canitrot is now Secretary of Planning, and in charge of the Argentinian negotiations with the IMF. CISEA's former director, Dante Caputo, is now Argentina's Foreign Minister and his colleague, J. Sabato is Sub-Secretary in the Ministry of External Relations. Oscar Yujnovsky, the former director of CEUR is now Under Secretary of External Affairs in charge of International Cooperation. In

other cases, researchers have been invited back to the universities to organize departmental programs that had been abolished and to undertake the teaching of courses in these programs.

C. PROSPECTS

However some constraints continue to prevail. According to IDRC's LARO Regional Report, all three countries have large external debts (combined total of USD 71 billion); unemployment levels are high, and salary levels continue to decline in real terms.

According to the Social Sciences Division consultancy review, the present institutional and financial circumstances in Argentina, Uruguay, and Chile do not provide promising opportunities for the social science institutions funded by the Centre. However, some of the staff members of these institutions in Argentina and Uruguay have been appointed to the faculties of local universities. Thus, there is some evidence of improving relationships between the universities and some of the institutions funded by IDRC. While domestic sources for funding social science research in the short term are not generally promising, some funding is beginning to be available. The Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales (CLACSO) a regional organization in Latin America, has recently obtained funding support of USD 80,000 for its core budget from the Government of Argentina and the University of Buenos Aires. The Government of Argentina has also announced that they would follow with additional support to strengthen the CLACSO Secretariat.

With the current political conditions in Chile, there appears to be no possibility of a return to normal relations between the institutions and the university system. Institutions such as FLASCO and PIIIE will continue to depend on external sources for their financial viability.

D. POLICY RECOMMENDATION

The policy adopted in March 1981 was based on a need arising from the particular political circumstances prevailing in all Southern Cone countries at that time. The military governments in place at that time were not receptive to social science research and there was repression of social science researchers. This repressive atmosphere has now been lifted in Argentina and Uruguay, and the situation for social science research in these countries is no more severe than in other countries in the Third World where there are also financial constraints on social science research. Centre Management has reviewed this policy in light of the circumstances and is of the opinion that the special Board policy of institutional support to the Southern Cone is no longer necessary for Argentina and Uruguay. As Chile is the only remaining country left that the policy would affect, Centre Management feels that it would be inappropriate to retain the policy for only one country. Furthermore, Centre Management feels that regardless of the situation in Chile, the Centre has been able to demonstrate that it is in a position to support social science institutions in Chile via the research project mechanism (see Annex 2).

The termination of this policy would not mean that the Centre would not provide institutional support in the future. Centre Management is currently reviewing what other forms of funding support besides the project mode should be utilized. Once this review is completed, a paper outlining various options will be presented to the Board at a later date.

Other agencies such as SAREC and FORD, that have cooperated with IDRC in providing institutional support, have been consulted vis-à-vis their future funding intentions. SAREC will be approaching its Board with a proposal to phase out institutional support in the Southern Cone by 1988 and to confine future support to collaborative research, with SAREC funding only the Swedish institutions and researchers. The Centre is awaiting Ford Foundation's response.

Centre Management therefore recommends that the current policy of providing institutional support in the Southern Cone countries be rescinded. Suitable phase-out periods will be proposed at the end of current phases. The institutions concerned will continue to be eligible for regular project support and for any other mode that the Centre may subsequently decide as being globally applicable.

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

- 1) Beatrice Avalos Social Science and Social Policy Research in the Latin American Southern Cone - The Case for Institutional Support. IDRC Consultancy Visit to Argentina, Chile and Uruguay. 1985.
- 2) Elizabeth Fox Support for Social Science Research in the Southern Cone. Vol. 1. IDRC Social Sciences Division. 1980.
- 3) A.D. Tillett Social Science Research in the Southern Cone of Latin America: An Evaluation of Centre Supported Institutions. Vol. II. IDRC Social Sciences Division. 1980.

Figure 1

**Names of Institutions
1977/78 - 1985/86**

Institution

- Argentina :**
- 1) Centro de Estudios de Estado y Sociedad (CEDES)
 - 2) Centro de Investigaciones Sociales sobre el Estado la Administracion (CISEA)
 - 3) Centro de Estudios Urbanos y Regionales (CEUR)
- Chile :**
- 4) Corporacion de Investigaciones Economicas para America Latina (CIEPLAN)
 - 5) Programa Interdisciplinario de Investigacion en Educacion (PIIE)
 - 6) Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO)
 - 7) Academia de Humanismo Cristiano (AHC)
 - 8) Grupo de Investigaciones Agrarias (GIA)
- Uruguay :**
- 9) Centro de Informaciones y Estudios del Uruguay (CIESU)

Table 1

IDRC APPROPRIATIONS ALLOCATED TO INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT*
IN THE SOUTHERN CONE (1977-1986)

Fiscal Year			
Institution	1977/78 - 1979/80	1980/81 - 1985/86	Total
(CAD)			
<u>Argentina</u>			
CEDES	75,000	129,000	204,000
CISEA	-	555,000	555,000
CEUR	75,000	275,000	350,000
<u>Chile</u>			
CIEPLAN	75,000	-	75,000
PIIE	75,000	100,000	175,000
FLACSO	44,000	605,000	649,000
AHC	-	450,000	450,000
GIA	-	500,000	500,000
<u>Uruguay</u>			
CIESU	-	270,000	270,000
	<hr/> 344,000	<hr/> 2,884,000	<hr/> 3,228,000
% of SS Divisional Appropriations	1.8%	4.6%	4.0%

* Regular project support totalling CAD 3,810,920 has also been provided to some of these institutions in this period : CEDES - CAD 247,000, CISEA - CAD 78,300, CIEPLAN - CAD 1,343,000, PIIE - CAD 976,820, FLACSO - CAD 274,100, GIA - CAD 170,400, CIESU - CAD 360,050.

Table 2

Anticipated Level of Funds for Renewal of Grants
(1986 - 1988)

	1986-87	1987-88
	(CAD)	
<u>Argentina</u>		
CEDES	120,000 (36 mos.)	-
CEUR	100,000 (24 mos.)	-
<u>Chile</u>		
AHC	-	200,000 (24 mos.)
GIA	-	200,000 (24 mos.)
<u>Uruguay</u>		
CIESU	100,000 (24 mos.)	-
TOTAL	320,000	400,000