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LE TEMPS
Genève internationale vendredi 05 décembre 2014

Genève accueille un sommet des laboratoires d’idées

Par Simon Petite

Quelque 60 think tanks du monde entier sont réunis jusqu’à samedi à Genève. La Suisse se profile pour attirer davantage de ces groupes de réflexion
Plus de 60 groupes de réflexion parmi les influents du monde sont réunis à Genève jusqu’à samedi. C’est la première fois que la Suisse accueille le Global Think Tanks Summit. Ces institutions sont légion dans les pays anglo-saxons mais beaucoup plus rares en Suisse.

Le laboratoire d’idées helvétique le plus connu est Avenir Suisse, fondation créée en 1999 par les plus grandes entreprises multinationales du pays. Le Foraus, forum de politique étrangère, est lui plus jeune de dix ans. Le groupe fait d’ailleurs partie des organisateurs du sommet genevois, tout comme la Confédération, l’Institut universitaire des hautes études internationales et du développement (IHEID) ou la Fondation pour Genève, qui vise à promouvoir la Genève internationale.


«Avec mes étudiants, nous nous intéressons à ces nouvelles formes de gouvernance. Etre à Genève, c’est comme être dans un laboratoire», avance le professeur à l’IHEID Thomas Biersteker.

Quelle légitimité?

Spécialiste de ces entités, le professeur James McGann, de l’Université de Pennsylvanie, estime qu’il en existe 8000 à travers le monde. Elles ont en commun de vouloir faire en sorte que les autorités politiques ou économiques prennent les décisions les plus informées possibles. Pour le reste, on trouve de tout. Certaines sont indépendantes, d’autres sont de simples extensions des gouvernements. «Elles doivent maintenir un équilibre difficile entre l’influence et l’indépendance», juge James McGann.


Après plusieurs rencontres régionales, le sommet genevois doit renforcer la coopération entre les groupes de réflexion, sur des thèmes comme les prochains objectifs de développement, leur financement et leur mise en œuvre.
The moderator opened by highlighting the international nature of Geneva as well as the various aims of the UN, including human rights, sustainable development, and the millennium development goals. The moderator proceeded to underscore how the UN translates these ideas into actions and norms for people around the world. The moderator suggested that for the UN to remain relevant, it must be open to new ideas and able to translate them into actionable programs at the country level. He then invited the panel to reflect upon how think tanks can help with these endeavors.

A panelist with experience in a national government, the UN system, and most recently, a non-governmental organization, described their own experience in managing the interaction between policy and research. In so doing, he highlighted the capacity of think tanks to bridge academic learning and the policy world. This panelist called 2014 the most dramatic year since 1989, one that marks a new era requiring “big picture” thinking. The end of the Cold War brought both optimism (Fukuyama’s thesis of the end of history predicted the prevalence of a liberal, capitalist and democratic system, with pockets of trouble being merely transitory phenomena) and pessimism (Mearsheimer predicated the rise of non-state-actors whose latent conflicts had been kept under a lid by the Cold War particularly in the Northern hemisphere). Both sentiments were correct – China and Russia’s embrace of the Capitalist regime, evidenced by their accession to the WTO, painted the image of a globalized world; on the other hand, state collapse, failed states, non-state actors, and terrorist networks represented very dramatic undercurrents. The year 2014 saw the return of unruly disorder sparked by strategic competition between strongly opposed states (some violent, like Ukraine, and others non-violent, such as East Asia) and state failures. This panelist saw a real crisis in global governance in the significant trouble at the WTO, failure of the Security Council to act confidently, the loss of trust between states, and the loss of trust within states (people living in countries slowly emerging from the financial crisis have not noticed improvement of their own living standards with widening inequality between the rich and the poor in developed countries and rapid accumulation of wealth of a small number of people undermining social cohesion in developing countries). The outlook is gloomy if one takes into account anti-globalization campaigns and problems with the integration of foreigners; however, with hyper-connectivity also comes endless opportunities, and starting a discussion about how to manage them is very important.

The next panelist, a UN official, concurred with the first panelist in noting that the outlook has not been good, particularly in regards to human rights: 2014 has seen the rise of many acute crises and more types of violations of human dignity and human rights. To combat these difficulties, UN officials need strong partnerships. One UN agency surveyed views on the key sustainable development goals, and the overwhelming majority of respondents singled out human rights. Though states are technically duty-bound to protect human rights, individuals also...
have human rights-related responsibilities: climate justice, use of natural resources, the links of indigenous peoples to their environments. For example, the Ebola crisis has shown the virus to merely be a surface issue: larger issues are adequate state funding of healthcare, the government’s relationship with citizens, and so forth. Despite this difficult outlook, the panelist pled for stubborn optimism and suggested a return to the basics enumerated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the UN Charter to ensure future generations will be spared from the scourge of war and enjoy freedom from fear and the freedom from want.

The next panelist, a think tank representative, mused on the important role of think tanks in global governance. Many think tanks have assisted the UN over the years: some think tanks have contributed staff, while others have had significant interactions with the UN which provided meaningful and important input to the UN’s agenda. Stronger partnership creates potential to leverage on more assets and deeper research – strong governance bodies rely on independent research to help make informed decisions (for example, federal governments cannot make informed decisions or provide real analysis because they are too close to the issues at stake). Think tanks advise governments, multilateral organizations and companies in certain areas, provide a platform for floating policy ideas, spark debates, convene meetings, and generate ideas leveraging their partnerships with other institutions, including academia. Think tanks are as good as their ideas, which are only as good as they have impacts.

The following panelist, a representative of the private sector and the non-governmental sector, gave an overview of the international outlook of Geneva in terms of its population, economy, and politics. Geneva plays a prominent role in international standardization, soft lawmaking, and pragmatic international negotiation.

The final panelist, a representative of the private sector, concurred with an earlier panelist in that the private sector had an important role to play in international governance. The panelist mentioned the tremendous change in the relationship between civil society and the private sector in the last ten years. One major milestone is the Global Compact, established by the former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, and another is UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon’s inclusion of the private sector in the discussion of the post-2015 millennium development goals. The recent Human Rights and Business Conference was unthinkable ten years ago. The private sector’s advantages in such collaborations are skills and the capacity to scale-up. For example, this panelist’s company has a presence in most countries in the world and relationships with 700,000 farmers, and thus can create significant impact if guided towards and well-coordinated for important priorities in sustainable development. The private sector is a good partner for policy-making, as good policies are also important to the private sector. This panelist noted that in his company, every standard that is produced is structured around the ten principles of the UN Global Compact.

Comments and questions from the audience prompted discussion on the private sector’s role in sustainable development, non-state actors’ roles in a more globalized world, the role of ethical values in the future, development financing, and the impact of superpower individuals.
PLENARY I – THINK TANKS, PUBLIC POLICY AND GOVERNANCE: NATIONAL, REGIONAL AND GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

The moderator questioned why public institutions have had great difficulty dealing with social crises, such as religious war and territorial conflicts, whereas scientists have made significant progress in their respective domains. He suggested that there is no better place to start making such progress than in Geneva.

The first panelist discussed recent research on the inability of the international community to deal with global gridlocks, often under the auspices of the UN, in climate change, international trade, conventional and nuclear disarmament. The panelist explained that such causes have been traced to the increasing number of states involved in various negotiations; the lack of adaptation by these international institutions, which were created in a post-Second World War context; and the increasing complexity of global problems. While acknowledging that some of these causes are structural and cannot be easily modified, they echoed the opening panel by stressing the importance of perseverance in the face of challenges, and underscored the potential of think tanks to assist in finding solutions to problems of governance. The panelist reminded the audience that there is broad consensus that global governance is not limited to states or formal institutions. With the global surge of private authorities in governance, an increasing number of public-private-partnerships, multi-stakeholder initiatives, informal inter-governmental organizations, more inclusive access to inter-governmental organizations, and the proliferation of standard setting, different transnational actors orchestrate their actions considerably, creating complex forms of transnational policy networks. These networks are groups of individuals sharing common expertise, technical language, broadly overlapping concerns though not necessarily agreement in many issue domains. These networks are not contractual but can
include partnership, are less institutionalized than multi-stakeholder initiatives, and focus on policy functions, particularly on reforms. Every actor participates, but from more than one vantage point. The role of think tanks in transnational policy networks could include providing a neutral space for meetings; conducting diplomatic and professional training; legitimating action through monitoring, evaluation, and ranking; research, especially on issues that governments and UN agencies do not have the technical capacity or political space to undertake; the generation of policy ideas and principles; and framing policy issues. The panelist also referred briefly to new forms of dissemination of knowledge, such as mobile applications.

The following panelist, a think tank representative from Asia, gave an introduction of their institution, which is attached to a Foreign Ministry, and conducts research in five areas: bilateral relations, maritime security cooperation, global governance and institutions, arms control, and international security. Its research is not financially independent, but is intellectual independent, with research staff having control over their own programs. Its products include internal reports, academic books, and media articles. In recent years this think tank has published working papers and reports which have had a notable impact: the think tank’s advocacy of “responsible protection” exerted a great influence on it’s Foreign Ministry’s ‘responsibility to protect’ (R2P) policy.

A different think tank representative, from North America, presented an overview of the variety of think tanks in their country, which account for more than a quarter of all think tanks worldwide. The think tanks in this country conduct academic research (both theoretical and action-oriented), generate new thinking, publicize new voices, convene professionals, and educate and engage with the public. This representative provided examples of how both quantitative and qualitative assessments demonstrate think tanks’ influence on policy making. The greatest challenge facing think tanks right now is that the trend towards ideological advocacy work makes it important to be critical about the motivation for think tanks. Even independent think tanks have funders, and transparency must be paramount. At this panelist’s think tank, contracts are concluded in a way that gives the think tank exclusive control over its work and permits no interference from the funders upon its recommendations. These principles are upheld even to the point of losing donors.

The next panelist, a think tank representative from Latin America, presented a summary of the emergence of think tanks in the region. Historically, democracy and economic development have not existed together in the region: the 1960s saw economic growth without democracy, while the 1980s and 1990s saw democratization without economic growth. It was only after 2000 that good economic development accompanied democracy. In the 1960s, think tanks emerged from a private sector focus on economic growth, with only a couple of think tanks centered on human rights and democracy. Nowadays, think tanks play an important role in Latin American politics, influencing both the electoral process (see Chile and Paraguay) and the deliberative process by supplying ideas from academia and the private sector, and facilitating agreement between political parties on issues like education.

The final panelist, a think tank representative from Africa, presented on challenges facing think tanks in a globalized world. The role of their think tank sits at the intersection of the explanation of policy through new ideas, and the promotion of good governance. Their think tank is government-funded meaning the extent to which it can be critical of government policies is tied to both the director general heading the think tank, and the level of academic freedom allowed by
the government. In an unusual twist, this panelist noted that military regimes sometimes provide more funding and allow more academic freedom to think tanks than democratic regimes. Think tanks need to reign in support and legitimacy in order to turn theory into actions, in view of the diminishing civil society, limited impact of gender studies, and the challenge posed by Western-style think tanks. Globalization has also reoriented think tanks in the region, from the focus on the new economic order in the 1950s and 1960s, to tackling global challenges like the climate, economy, and terrorism.

Comments and questions from the audience related to coordination among think tanks in different regions, balancing between advocacy and policy analysis, the need for creating transnational policy networks, the legitimacy of think tanks’ work given the lack of mandate, demand for speedy analysis, measurement of impact of think tanks, the relationship between the UN and think tanks, sharing experience in facing challenges and opportunities, the public image of think tanks, objection to the binary description of government funding and independence, and the capacity of government-funded think tanks to meet government expectations.
PLENARY II – THE ROLE OF THINK TANKS IN THE FACE OF THREATS AND CRISES: EBOLA, REGIONAL CRISSES, AND ISIS

The moderator highlighted the need for explicit guidance to make sense of the crises the world is currently facing, including regional crises, Ebola, and ISIS.

The first panelist, a think tank representative, saw the current, multiplying threats and crises as generally diverse by nature because of their roots in previous developments: an epidemic due to overpopulation ill-supported by infrastructure, or regional crises due to deepening social and economic inequality. The panelist plotted the crises along vertical and horizontal axes. Vertically, the Arab Spring grew out of poverty and corruption, and the Ukraine crisis was born out of the corruption of the last four years. Horizontally, crises were ignited a quarter-century after the end of the Cold War with attempts to correct or restore old international order, as can be seen in Europe, the Caucasus, MENA, and Asia. Some crises are legacies of the First World War, such as Syria. Against the background of extremism, the failure of multiculturalism in Europe, revolution, humanitarian intervention, coup d’états, and the failures of Iraq, Libya, Afghanistan, and Syria, solutions are difficult to find. Think tanks however have key institutional advantages in conducting multidisciplinary research which can address threats and through developing joint projects with strategic foresight. In times of tension, they can establish dialogue between experts, which is important when opposing sides will not listen to each other. The panelist underscored that nine of out twelve points included in the Ukraine ceasefire plan were borrowed from think tanks. This suggests that amid ideological contradiction, propaganda in the media, and intense competition, think tanks should try to be objective and stick to their expertise or multidisciplinary competence. The establishment of a “magic circle” or “ivy league” of think tanks to boost international recognition of inputs into and outputs from these think tanks, should be considered.

The second panelist, also a think tank representative, explored how effectively think tanks can combat regional issues through collaboration with relevant governments and organizations, particularly UN specialized agencies. Most important, think tanks can provide good inputs at the appropriate time: for example, an Australian think tank convened a ‘G20 think tank meeting’ in advance of the G20 summit to probe the same issues as the main summit. Think tanks that attended the ‘G20 think tank meeting’ reported back to their respective governments, and succeeded in influencing the outcomes of the main G20 meeting through its adoption of a statement on Ebola. Similar think tank meetings were held in advance of the September 2014 G7 meeting, which lead to the adoption of a statement on ISIS. This panelist also underscored the ability of think tanks to engage in track 1.5 meetings, where official and non-official actors can work together to solve problems. Finally, this panelist, in citing recent violations of international norms (immigration bans on travelers from African countries, and deviation of international maritime law), counseled that think tanks should be guided by international law and universally-agreed norms in their discussion of regional crises.

The following panelist, again a think tank representative, focused on ISIS and the role of media. Media representations of ISIS have focused on the organization’s strengths and its subsequent collateral damage (including the taking away of individual rights and liberties, the withdrawal of passports, travel bans, criminal sanctions, restrictions on University debates, and sanctions of permissive exposure to websites), which have the effect of giving more space to the voices and opinions of minority Islamists. This portrayal only serves to support the clash of civilization
rhetoric that immigration breeds terrorism, and that only violence can combat violence, which ignores good governance-based advice on state building. While think tanks cannot replace government intelligence, they can bring lucid analysis, knowledge and data to the table. To put the situation in perspective, the panelist raised the case of how in one country, the media warped the information provided by the government on ISIS. A government official presented his country’s situation vis-à-vis ISIS to his parliament. The media only picked up on the sensational negatives around the story, rather than the relatively positive points, such as that by all analyses, this country is at an extremely low risk of terrorist attack. The panelist concluded by emphasizing the need for think tanks to engage with politicians and the media to help avoid such “collateral damage.”

Comments and questions from the audience related to the effectiveness of think tanks in identifying and predicting crises, the role of media in crises, multi-disciplinary approaches, the working methods of think tanks in responding to crises, the dilemma of policing radical Islamists in moderate Muslim countries, management of religious communities, fast-thinking versus slow-thinking by think tanks, think tanks’ influence on policy makers, transnational governance, and referrals by international think tanks to local think tanks, for grounded, local expert analysis.
PRACTITIONERS OF TODAY AND TOMORROW MEETING GLOBAL CHALLENGES TOGETHER: LUNCHEON WITH GRADUATE STUDENTS AND YOUNG PROFESSIONALS

The think tank Foraus – Swiss Forum on Foreign Policy was the catalyst for this luncheon discussion, which sought to unite the current generation of think tank personnel with the future generation represented by post-graduate students and young professionals. A keynote speech from Robin Niblett of Chatham House punctuated the luncheon.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

Dr. Niblett began his address highlighting the fascinating juncture of contemporary International Relations and the many opportunities that exist for future progress. He identified interdependence, geopolitical competition and domestic fragmentation as important forces at work in IR currently. There is the potential of the 21st century to be stronger internationally than the twentieth, he said, but not without hard work, and not without think tanks.

Dr. Niblett’s first point was on interdependence, the first force he identifies in shaping international relations today. He stressed the need to create a “new interdependence,” through globalization and rebalancing of the world stage. The globalization of today is different than that of The Golden Age, as the globalization of today is more about open economies, technology and FDI, as opposed to trade and dominating markets. He highlighted the projected growth of the global middle class, from 1.8 billion to 4 billion in the next 30 years, reflecting more widespread development through the improved conditions of so many. He also highlighted Brzezinski and the idea of the global political awakening, whereby the increasing flows of information today have required governments to be more responsible with regard to their people. In sum, there is little to be gained from conflict in the international stage in today’s world, and a shared approach to global challenges is more likely to move us forward.

The second topic Dr. Niblett discussed was geopolitical competition. He identified this as a potential roadblock to collective action on global challenges. The world today has similarities to the world of the 1930s, with rising nationalism as a result of the changing power structure. Some established states are resentful of their declining positions, while some rising states do not trust the established powers to work with them. Dr. Niblett pointed out that key new players have come to the stage with sovereign outlooks on IR, namely Russia and China, and that as a result, no governments are stepping forward to collaborate on necessary global governance reforms. The international organizations currently in place, such as the UN, WTO and IMF, were all created by the US and Europe in the mid-twentieth century and are in need of reforms to continue their relevance to the present day. The rising and established powers have lost trust for
one another; the rising powers do not trust the established ones to relinquish power, while the established powers do not trust the rising powers to maintain the rules. This has resulted in the rise of smaller collaborations, such as the AIIB and the BRICS.

Domestic fragmentation is the third force Dr. Niblett identified as a cause of instability in global governance. He says that politically awakened populations throughout the globe are now demanding effective governance of their home governments, which has led to a decline in faith in government. In both the developed and the developing world and in democracies as well as authoritarian regimes, governments are struggling to keep up with the demands of globalization. The United States is returning to an interwar period outlook of IR. It is not isolationist per se, but is characterized by selective global engagement, with the primary goals of defense and off shore balancing. The EU is undertaking serious reform but its demographic makeup means that it will be vulnerable economically for the foreseeable future. Support for the traditional parties is falling, with support for populist alternatives rising, such as UKIP in the UK. In the Middle East, Dr. Niblett identified elements of the past and present at work simultaneously. In the traditional sense, battles for political control in Iran and the Gulf States, as well as in Syria, Libya, Yemen and Iraq are ongoing. In the modern sense, the mass movement of people across borders in the Middle East represents globalization of the present day. In addition, the circulation of new ideas and expectations of government and society via the Internet and social media have changed the Middle East. Dr. Niblett stressed how the failing governments of this region can no longer keep up with the pressure, giving way to the rise of non-state groups.

Dr. Niblett concluded his address by summarizing that the world is facing many challenges today. However, issues of past experience, the balance of power and domestic fragmentation have made addressing these issues difficult. He did not expect the west to have the will or capacity to continue to lead on global governance. He also did not expect any particular country in general to take the lead either.

Dr. Niblett’s concluding points were on how think tanks can help address these issues. First, he highlighted that think tanks can play a key role in public policy debates. Through long-term, evidence-based insights and ideas, think tanks can provide relevant information in policy considerations. Second, he described a role for think tanks in keeping citizens and policymakers in tune with the goals of others throughout the globe. By keeping an eye on important states or regions, think tanks can keep domestic actors up to date on the world. Third, he stressed the need for think tanks to highlight problems with interdependence. Governments do not address the weak spots of globalization and are therefore unprepared to deal with them. He believes that think tanks can help. He highlighted four areas where think tanks could play a role. The first was natural resource issues, including conservation and the development of more efficient energy sources. The second was the future of intervention, including ideas about the most effective types of force and assistance in times of humanitarian crises. The third issue was the internet, and the need for global governance to maintain it as open and free. The last issue where think tanks can help was climate change.
Dr. Niblett’s final point was that solving the important issues cannot be left to governments alone. He said that in addition to this sentiment being a key belief of the Chatham House, it was also a call to action for think tanks to engage in the pressing problems of today.

### TABLE CONVERSATIONS WITH FUTURE LEADERS

**Bernhard Blumenau**  
*How to Deal with ISIS: International Perspectives*

**PREMISE:** ISIS is unlike existing terrorist groups. In seeking a durable solution, ISIS will likely need to be at the negotiating table. International organizations have a role.

**DISCUSSION:** Can Western or neighboring governments engage in negotiations due to its radicalism? Consensus that a military approach will not suffice since it ignores underlying causes of ISIS. International organizations can play a role in mediating the grievances that led to ISIS’ rise.

**Killian Dorier**  
*One Size Does Not Fit All (Rethinking Global Governance)*

**PREMISE:** Global governance, as a construct, presumes that all states are equal. The reality of international decision-making is that all states are the same, with particularities overlooked. Such a reality means that many international solutions are ineffective. A bottom-up process can account for variations in the needs and differences between actors. Regional efforts should be organized to feed into state efforts. Think tanks, NGOs, and epistemic communities have a role in building such ground-up efforts.

**Kalok Yip**  
*Communicative Action with ISIS: Three Stories*

**FIRST STORY:** How John Kerry’s off-the-cuff remark led to an opening with Syria in 2013; is the use of force a communication failure?  
**SECOND STORY:** U.S. “gag orders” on information from Guantanamo – spurs irrational communication.  
**THIRD STORY:** The Syria Airlift Project, which used drones to deliver humanitarian aid as well as art therapy.  
**DISCUSSION:** How to build intersubjectivity with our ideological opponents.

**Andrea Kaufmann and Elizabeth Koechlein**  
*Social Policy Response to Crisis*

**PREMISE:** Crises such as Ebola can awaken unresolved issues related to prior violent conflicts. Local ownership and local knowledge can solve some of the current issues faced by the international community and their implementation of aid programmes.  
**DISCUSSION:** The long legacy of inequality; using funds raised for crisis to support development and
infrastructure; the conflicting goals of development and humanitarian initiatives; the necessity to integrate local community leaders into humanitarian aid programmes.

Nicholas Zahn

Fulfilling the Promise of Representation

**PREMISE:** Global partnerships are key because the cooperation of diverse actors is required to solve common challenges.

**DISCUSSION:** Expectations may be too high in discussing representation in global partnerships – it is already difficult to achieve on a national level. To begin to rectify representation and increase inclusion, we must begin at the national level.

Yixian Sun and Kathryn Chelminski

Addressing Finance in Sustainable Development

**PREMISE:** Finance is key to the successful implementation of the SDGs. It can be incorporated through integrating the social and environmental costs of economic externalities in capital markets, increasing the financial literacy of different stakeholders, and encouraging better inter-ministerial and inter-governmental coordination.

**DISCUSSION:** The key role of financial literacy and inclusion; the fact that sustainability is not an important issue to financial actors; the need for government regulation and intervention to achieve sustainable development. Two promising ideas are incentivizing financial markets to include sustainable development in capital investment, and government regulation to encourage sustainable development.

Matel Sow and Rohit Ticku

Conflict Prevention and “Religious” Conflicts

**PREMISE:** “Religious” conflicts in the Central African Republic and India have been found to be recurrent and immune to policy responses. National and international partnerships can facilitate conflict resolution. A study
encompassing historic, economic, and political factors would be a good starting point to uncovering the enduring drivers of conflict.

**DISCUSSION:** Conflict prevention must encompass a long-term peacebuilding approach; a lack of knowledge about a given religious situation leads to misguided policy approaches and recommendations.

Maximilien Stauber

*Reversing the Biodiversity Loss in One Move*

**PREMISE:** Biodiversity loss is continuing at an alarming rate, despite international efforts. This is not helped by national environmental legislation requiring commercial crops to be genetically homogenous. By abolishing such rules, a major ecological burden is lifted.

**DISCUSSION:** There is no concrete evidence that such deregulation would lead to increased biodiversity. Models can provide a sound analysis of the situation, or perhaps a trial run in a smaller country, such as Switzerland.

Xinwan Liu and Nicolas Erwes

*Cleaning Up the Final Frontier: Proposals on Enabling Space Active Debris Removal (ADR)*

**PREMISE:** The space environment is increasingly challenged by debris which threatens active space objects (ex. Satellites). Current international efforts focus on risk mitigation, but ADR is needed despite its great expense. ADR should be incentivized via the market and incentives.

**DISCUSSION:** Employing a modelling tool to test the proposition; suggestions for bond schemes which could serve as model.

Dunja Krause and Marie-Adélaïde Mathei

*Overcoming the Policy-Practice Gap: Approaches and Instruments for Sustainable Futures*

**PREMISE:** Sustainability is key today, but it tends to be measured by economic, rather than social or environmental benchmarks. The way in which it is applied reinforces the current system rather than fundamentally transforming it. A more profound sustainability transformation would have to systematically address questions of inequality and social justice, of poverty and environmental degradation and find ways of putting social and environmental goals ahead of economic ones.

**DISCUSSION:** Can the SDGs address the root causes of uneven development; can social and solidarity economies provoke a sustainability transformation; the importance of thinking globally but acting locally; sustainability only flows from a diversity of actors.
PLENARY III – IMPLEMENTING THE POST-2015 AGENDA: GLOBAL GOVERNANCE FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The moderator, panelists, and audience discussed the sustainable development goals (SDGs), a set of tools whose aim is to eliminate poverty and hunger by 2030. They discussed them with awareness that new common goals, such as measures to alleviate chronic youth unemployment, are needed. Global sustainability goals require a set of base conditions: an awareness of the required governance, clarity on shared objectives, and well-functioning institutions. The 2015 SDGs are a somewhat compromised agenda: not all of the goals included in this initiative are likely to be implemented.

Initiatives requiring global governance do not fundamentally transform the system: rather, they favor the existing key players. There is also the fact that such initiatives, like the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the SDGs, involve a multiplicity of actors and sites of actions at the global level. Perhaps it would be more beneficial to work with a minimalist agenda. Economic agreements and benchmarks are important to understanding the progress of such global agreements. Economic international organizations can also serve as a role model. The World Trade Organization’s platforms to handle trade negotiations and disputes can serve as a model for the health and education sectors.

Think tanks have a role in the SDG framework: they can influence policy and outcomes downstream. They can advocate for universal standards, and enter the debate about parties to be included in such initiatives and meetings. A good way to view think tanks may be as a set of individuals acting organically as empowered stakeholders. The post-2015 agenda is also in great need of more Southern voices, and a greater space for partnership with the Least Developed Countries. It is important for the post-2015 agenda to be coherent: this permits global coordinated action. Support mechanisms (architecture) are necessary. Implementation at the national level will ensure that no one is left behind. Non-state actors become very important in the post-2015 agenda. Additionally, it is important to note that paradigms are shifting: for instance, South-South trade is essential, though difficulties to access world markets remain.

A discussion was sparked about the role of local communities in global initiatives. Some offered that the response has generally been to include ‘local’ voices in global summits, which does not trickle back to the local communities.

Five dimensions to keep in mind when envisioning sustainability goals were discussed: equity, economic efficiency, endogeneity, environmental solutions, and ecological harmony. Together these five ‘e’s’ bring empowerment. Additionally, access and availability are required to make opportunities. A line of discussion considered how to make these concepts self-reliant and renewable. The role of policy enablers was mentioned to this end.

It was noted that sustainable development goals do not include the concept of “learning.” Those gathered at the panel queried whether think tanks could and should take the role of learning link.

A final line of query dissected the role of the Arab region in implementing the post-2015 agenda.
I – SDGS: A POST-2015 PLAN OF ACTION

The co-chairs opened by discussing two potential paths for the SDGs after 2015: either moving forward with the existing framework, or rethinking the SDG framework entirely. In regards to the latter, it was noted that it would be difficult to obtain a new consensus. Regardless of the way forward, implementation of SDGs was noted to be a particular challenge. While think tanks will have little role in implementation, there is space for them to be involved at the conceptual stage.

The discussion sought to address the points raised by the co-chairs. It was agreed that the existing consensus on SDGs was very valuable, leading to a decision that the debate about the fundamental nature of the SDGs should not be re-opened. It was agreed that data will be important to monitor the progress of the SDGs, and that think tanks can have an important role in proposing indicators and in monitoring the situation. While it was generally agreed that think tanks will have little to no role in the implementation of SDGs, a possible opening exists in the design of policies which will help to implement and achieve the SDGs. The participant agreed that the private sector is an important partner in the implementation of SDGs because it has the resources to bring initiatives to fruition, but was weary of how to engage the public sector in a way that will not perceived as self-serving.

The discussion concluded by expanding on the possible role for think tanks in the implementation of the SDGs. It was noted that think tanks are often helped or hindered by the amount of space which their host government provides them in national discussions and policy planning. An important contribution which think tanks can make in regards to SDGs is by providing more and better information on how SDGs affect life on the ground. However their most important contribution might be keeping the question of why are greater numbers of people in poverty after decades of development at the forefront of any discussions on SDGs.

II – FORGING STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS BETWEEN THINK TANKS AND IGOS

The discussion centered on two different strains of thought: first, what think tanks and IGOs can do to strengthen their links, and second, what think tanks alone can do to encourage strategic partnerships. In regards to the potential for collaboration between think tanks and IGOs, a better understanding of the needs of the other party, at all levels, was strongly encouraged. This can be achieved through more and improved communication, both on a formal level and an informal level. To establish trust with each other and to project credibility to outside parties, the great importance of maintaining transparency was raised. Finally, in regards to key areas for collaboration, it was noted that strategic partnerships between think tanks and IGOs would be most important in the areas of disaster preparedness, knowledge exchange, and joint research projects.

In regards to steps think tanks can take on their own to encourage strategic partnerships, the discussion highlighted the importance of think tanks to be keen on and deeply involved in knowledge sharing; to have a clear understanding of their audiences; to be open to working with
third parties (beyond project financiers); to be keen on capacity building in their work with IGOs; and by avoiding “business as usual” in favor of working in truly multilateral environments.

III – GENEVA AS A CATALYST FOR GLOBAL GOVERNANCE AND POLICY INNOVATION: AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME?

The discussion began by dissecting Geneva as a place: more organizations of all sorts are coming to Geneva to conduct business, and it was agreed that think tanks should have a focal point to facilitate their insertion into this world. Specifically, Geneva has a particular expertise on disarmament which could be very fruitful for future think tank efforts in this domain.

The discussion took a philosophical turn, musing on Geneva as a state of mind: Geneva has the strength of innovation and ideas. In particular, the environment in Geneva was noted to be much more accessible than that around the UN in New York: the diplomats based here are polyvalent, which is not the case in New York – meaning that discussions here tend to cover a greater range of issues and outcomes. Geneva’s potential is its brand.

Geneva is key for international collaboration and cooperation: the city can act as a broker, encouraging actors occupied with disparate subject areas to leave their silos and collaborate. The discussion noted a particular need for engagement with regional efforts, such as those in Middle East, but also more generally with foreign ministries so there is not a lack of continuity or great duplication. Collaboration could be fostered through a Global Think Tank Lab whose duties are to carry out virtual meetings, international visitor programs, and online efforts.

However, Geneva faces some challenges. For one, while Geneva can be thought of as a ‘Silicon Valley’ for global governance, it lacks the engagement of the ‘angel investors’ (business community). Also, within Geneva, there is a tendency towards groupthink rather than to expose a multiplicity of views. In terms of think tanks, Geneva is in the curious position of having many organizations with tank-like capacities, but which are not in and of themselves think tanks.

The next steps for Geneva will be to convince others of the value of engagement, relevance, and inclusiveness; expand its palette of service; target gaps in engagement, such as that with the business community; and finally to export the feeling of the Geneva brand.

IV – THINKING ABOUT THE FUTURE OF THINK TANKS: NEW STRATEGIES AND STRUCTURES

The discussion first took stock: think tanks can have a philosophical direction (for example, a focus on peace, or improving Europe’s role in the world); a strategic direction (for example, improving policies in a given area); or an operational direction (seeking to secure agreements in certain areas).

It then moved to dissecting the challenges facing think tanks. First, there was noted to be an imbalance between specialized think tanks and generalist think tanks, with a ratio of approximately four specialist think tanks for each generalist think tank. In general this was noted to be more of a problem in developed countries. A multi-disciplinary function is another key
challenge for think tanks: for one, economists are hard to attract to think tanks because the pay is comparatively low. There was also an intense debate on the merits and demerits of multidisciplinary in given situations and environments. Links with academia are challenging for think tanks: academic language needs translating for a broader audience; certain academic disciplines are less likely to collaborate with others and/or with think tanks, due to biases regarding the intrinsic value of different types of knowledge.

Information technology was noted to be an area in which think tanks have room for improvement: in some think tanks, physical libraries have given way to digital repositories; also there was noted to be room for improvement between think tanks on the sharing and usage of data. A crucial point was the fact that the outputs of think tanks have tended to be shaped by funding rather than by consumption. For instance, a significant proportion of World Bank reports have never been downloaded. One idea to combat this trend is to improve think tank marketing of their products through an increased usage of social media. The discussion also remarked upon the trend whereby there is a tendency towards concise, specialist briefs rather than what has traditionally been the in-depth content produced by think tanks. While this trend is a consequence of increased exposure and impact for think tanks, there is the possibility that some think tanks veer into duties traditionally reserved for news agencies, although some noted that journalistic style has had great success in making otherwise obscure research findings accessible to a wider audience. A final challenge for think tanks is maintaining impartiality in the face of collaborations with governments.

Recommendations for think tanks include adopting a story-oriented approach which uses big data, video, and infographics; joint training of staff across think tanks; greater retention of experienced staff by increasing remuneration; installation of a mentoring program across different think tanks, regions; permitting governments or private foundations to incentivize the work of think tanks in order to keep standards high; increasing institution-based (as opposed to project-based) funding; and finally helping think tanks in emerging markets to build capacity.
KEYNOTE SPEECH BY BERRIS GWYNNE - A CALL TO ACTION: GLOBAL PARTNERSHIPS FOR PEACE, PROSPERITY, AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

The speaker’s remarks were delivered in a personal capacity, and did not represent the views of World Vision International.

The privileges of living in Geneva, free of worries about power or heating for instance, dull sensitivities to and create distances from others with different points of reference. Within World Vision and other NGOs, there is an awareness of power in conversations between the headquarters and the directors of national offices: for example, if money is introduced into the discussion, the conversation will deteriorate. Smaller NGOs are critical of international NGOs for interfering with the local economy and local priorities, which World Vision takes to heart, as evidenced by its use of accountability platforms.

How unequal is the world in domains such as agriculture, research, health (Ebola versus lifestyle diseases)? The speaker urged us to think forward and differently in order to combat against the trend whereby orthodoxy discourages young researchers from expressing their own points of view. She cautioned against humanity’s habit of pushing to the brink, which engenders an unsustainable lifestyle and growth model. Current such challenges include food security, water scarcity, mortality, health outcomes, power shortage, climate change – but which one should be addressed first? In general, people are unhappy about their prospects because of the unequal sharing and distribution of the benefits of globalization. Case in point: when the MDGs were conceptualized, money was available to achieve them. With better organization, they could have been achieved.

The concentration of work in Geneva coincides with its concentration of talents – experts here are those best placed to shake off the paradigm of the last era. The speaker provocatively suggested that instead of dealing with the MDGs and the like, think tanks need to stay sharp. This means providing higher-level analysis and paradigm challenging critiques which can push the global community to correct the failures of the Westphalian system, the UN, and the global governance deficit, and combat naïveté and mis- or dis-information about phenomena such as unfair trade rules, global financial crises, conflict economics, illegal economies, and all forms of violence.

The speaker counseled embracing strategic foresight and encouraging students and practitioners not to continue to strengthen existing paradigms. For example, the global North does not need to develop any further frameworks as it is already cognizant of what needs to be accomplished. Rather, the global North should focus on paradigm, purpose, proportion, precaution, prioritization, and partnership.

Comments and questions from the audience prompted discussions on the relationship between think tanks, and on the link between policy and practice.
PLENARY IV – CATALYSTS FOR POLICY INNOVATION AND ACTION

The first panelist, a think tank representative, discussed the definition of think tanks. In his country, any organization can call itself a think tank, even advocacy or lobbying organizations: the reality is that think tanks can mean lots of things to lots of people. What is clear is that the role of think tanks is very different from that of NGOs. Those based in London or Geneva need to dialogue with their counterparts the world over, given the importance of partnership and the potential to enhance existing think tank networks. The panelist’s think tank has been partnering with think tanks around the world for many years. The benefit of a global think tank summit for think tanks is akin to the benefits that an individual business can derive from a trade association – a space to discuss challenges, regulatory matters, and strategy. The time has come for a collective discussion of challenges. One challenge is the fallacy that think tanks are part of the ivory tower. The panelist’s think tank engages with academics, of course, but also with thought leaders and frontline policy makers, not to mention many other organizations. Another is the development of best practices in terms of accountability and on what is feasible: for example, no think tank can single-handedly claim credit for a major change in policy. A key challenge is that donors often look for similarly-minded think tanks, but such acceptance of interested funding can mean a think tank will face comments regarding its independence. Think tanks are about good governance, and not delimiting direct assistance to the frontlines on particular issues. Thank tanks should not pretend to be INGOs. Think tanks can look forward by using new technologies to diffuse their work.

The second panelist, a think tank representative, attributed the independence of their state-funded think tank to the important role that national policy makers accord to think tanks. In the face of cross-cutting, overlapping, and interconnected challenges, officials of this national government have envisioned small government initiatives to reach to urgent issues through short-term solutions. These policy makers hope that think tanks can provide independent views on pressing issues; in order to provide these independent views, the policy makers understand that the think tank must have autonomy. Autonomy is guaranteed by a think tank governing body comprised of wide representation, an expert committee likewise with wide representation, a research agenda driven by a mix of sources (as opposed to only the government), the avoidance of conflict of interest, staff discipline in carrying out their research, openness and transparency, and peer review.

The third panelist, a global health practitioner, used health as an example to illustrate significant global governance challenges and the need for better governance. The panelist traced the problem to the framing of health as a domestic development issue rather than a global one. ‘Health’ highlights the challenge of financing a global public good. Global health is full of governance innovation, and think tanks are involved in analyzing global health to contribute solutions. The interaction between the technical and the political saw the emergence of technical élites in the form of health and development specialists. Think tanks can help overcome the silos between health and policy.

The fourth panelist, a representative of a philanthropic foundation, discussed development financing and welcomed the UN Secretary General’s report on the post-2015 MDGs. He echoed previous summit panelists in recalling that think tanks hold power through the generation of ideas. Governments cannot be left alone to deal with challenges. Think tanks play a crucial role
influencing the public, informing the public, and facilitating neutral spaces for discussions, particularly contested discussions. Philanthropic organizations fit into this relationship because they have changed the development and funding landscape.

The moderator concluded the plenary by discussing the independence of think tanks in the face of varying funding sources; the diversity of funding sources; the legal framework governing think tanks; and the institutional and societal support of think tank independence. He touched upon definitional issues for think tanks, including the trend towards “hybridization”; a rebalancing of think tanks’ self-definitions; more focus on research (including public policy research) in universities; the distinctions which can be made between think tanks: do tanks, talk tanks, phantom think tanks; media organizations which occupy think tank space; and finally other potential competitors to think tanks, including law firms, consultancy firms, advocacy groups, and IGOs.

Comments and questions from the audience prompted discussions on the independence, credibility and influence of think tanks; the idea of a trade association for think tanks; the relationship between think tanks and political parties; funding for think tanks; the issue of phantom think tanks; the use of media for dissemination; and the distinction between think tanks and media.
Conclusions

One of the two summit conveners opened with a summary of the summit proceedings and outcomes with a view to laying down the foundation for the future, including expectations for follow-up documentation, and future related summits.

A think tank representative highlighted the changes in politics triggered by the opening of access to data. Think tanks compete with each other in terms of the quality of the data they use and provide. Their institution is more research-focused, an attitude defined at the birth of this think tank. While different societies and cultures define the concept of think tanks differently, there is a need to identify unifying factors. The participant stressed the importance of intellectual freedom and debate, transparency of funding, policy-driven research, legal regulatory frameworks, the provision of platforms for different views, neutrality of institutions (including an internal multiplicity of viewpoints), and opportunities to work with IGOs.

Another think tank representative touched upon whether think tanks can be neutral, and whether their findings are based on science or values. This representative provided the example of his own organization, a value-based think tank originally founded by a political party with a specific party line. The participant questioned whether scientific works can actually be value-free, and suggested that a better approach for think tanks may be to deal openly with their values instead of upholding a pretense of neutrality.

A Swiss government representative commented on the importance of innovation and action. Innovation can occur in regards to formats for exchange, the combination of people involved in a given initiative, and through dialogue with the IO community and inclusive partners. He provided the example of the establishment of the UN Human Rights Council as one of an instance where think tanks played an important role in innovating ideas to overcome paralysis in the UN system, a task which many international civil servants do not dare to take on. He expressed the wish that Geneva can become a hub for think tanks to exchange ideas which have an operational aspect.

The other summit convener took the floor to remark how struck he was by both the diversity of think tanks participating in the summit, and yet by the commonalities faced by these same think tanks. Common concerns included questions of independence, legitimacy, accountability, transparency, and impact. This convener underscored the importance of critical thinking in the work of think tanks, a quality facing constant challenges from funders, as well as from within think tanks (self-censorship). The Global Think Tank Summit is a significant event because it confirms the desire of think tanks to broaden their horizons, and to establish greater linkages which permit consultations and support in times of need. He expressed the hope that this marked the beginning of a longer-term collaboration between Geneva-based institutions, think tanks, and IOs.
RECOMMENDATIONS

1.) Think tanks and donors need to develop a more intimate relationship; they should better plan how funds are to be used and create a framework to monitor the resulting quality of work and ensure expectations are met on both sides.

2.) Think tanks are in need of more sustainable and transparent funding. The process of donating to think tanks should be made clearer and more legitimate, with a distinct focus and preference towards long-term funding.

3.) Donations to think tanks should be flexible and able to be used for in many different ways.

4.) Capacity building for researchers as well as the institution itself is a great way for donors to help think tanks.

5.) The channel of communication between think tanks and policymakers needs to be improved. Policymakers should make themselves more accessible to think tanks, and vice versa.

6.) Governments in countries throughout the world should ensure they have a legal framework in which think tanks can operate. This includes setting legal procedures for donating to think tanks.

7.) It is fiercely important for think tanks to maintain their independence in order to stay credible; policymakers should encourage the independence of think tanks.

8.) Policymakers should also encourage networks of think tanks, and provide funding to them as part of the government’s budget if necessary.

9.) Networks of think tanks should be created within different countries and geographic regions. There should also be a global network of think tanks, perhaps set up as a formal organization. It is extremely important that the avenues of communication between think tanks be opened so that vital information can be shared among them.

10.) It is equally as important for think tanks to produce quality, respectable research as it is for them to have a strategy for disseminating their findings to those who can use it.

11.) Think tanks should work on creating more partnerships and fellowships between themselves, to share experiences and best practices at think tanks around the globe.

12.) Institutions should investigate issues that are at the forefront, perhaps even those that policymakers have not yet dealt with; they should be proactive rather than reactive in their approaches.

13.) Yearly meetings among think tanks are helpful and should be formalized to occur every year, maybe even more frequently than once a year.

14.) Communication of best institutional practices is quite beneficial for think tanks. This includes issues of governance, research, communication, etc. Think tanks throughout the world are interested in new ideas of what is working in other places.
### 2014 Global Summit Agenda

**THURSDAY, 4 DECEMBER 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(all day)</td>
<td>Participants arrive in Geneva, Switzerland and check-in at their hotels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The United Nations Office at Geneva (UNOG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16h-17h30</td>
<td>Enter the United Nations Office at Geneva complex through the Pregny Gate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregny Gate</td>
<td>Registration table after security at the Pregny Gate. Make sure to pick up your delegate packet and to let us know you are here!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18h-19h30</td>
<td><strong>Opening Panel Discussion – Global Issues, Actors and Governance:</strong> The Potential of Power Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Moderator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sarah Cook, Director, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Panelists</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Steven Bennett, Vice President and Chief Operating Officer, Brookings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Espen Barth Eide, United Nations Secretary-General’s Special Adviser on Cyprus, former Minister of Defense and Minister of Foreign Affairs, Norway, and Managing Director, World Economic Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Flavia Pansieri, United Nations Deputy High Commissioner, Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ivan Pictet, President, Fondation pour Genève, former Senior Managing Director of Banque Pictet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rolf Ramsauer, Senior Vice President &amp; Global Head of Corporate Communication, Nestlé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20h-21h30</td>
<td><strong>Welcome Dinner sponsored by the University of Pennsylvania, at UNOG.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palais,</td>
<td>United Nations Office at Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th floor,</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegates</td>
<td>• Michael Møller, Director-General, United Nations Office at Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>• Ambassador Jürg Lauber, Head of the United Nations and International Organizations Division, Swiss Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• William Burke-White, Richard Perry Professor and Inaugural Director, Perry World House, Deputy Dean and Professor, PennLaw, University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Keynote</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Philippe Burrin, Director of the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva, will introduce the keynote by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Francis Gurry, Director-General, World Intellectual Property Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FRIDAY, 5 DECEMBER 2014**

The Graduate Institute, Geneva | Maison de la Paix  
Chemin Eugène-Rigot 2 | CH-1202 Geneva | Phone: +41 (0)22 908 57 00  
*Please note that street level at the Maison de la Paix is considered to be level 3 (levels 1&2 are underground, and levels 3-8 are street level or above).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8h30-10h15</th>
<th>Plenary I—Think Tanks, Public Policy and Governance: National, Regional and Global Perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maison de la Paix, Petal 2, Level 1, S8</strong></td>
<td><strong>Moderator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benedikt Wechsler, Diplomatic Advisor, Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Division of UN and International Organizations / e-diplomacy &amp; think tanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Panelists</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Biersteker, Professor of International Relations / Political Science, and Director of the Programme for the Study of International Governance, the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manyuan Dong, Vice President, China Institute of International Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Josiane Gabel, Vice President for Programs and International Partnerships, Center for Strategic and International Studies (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fernando Straface, Executive Director, Centro de Implementación de Políticas Públicas para la Equidad y el Crecimiento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharkdam Wapmuk, Research Fellow, Nigerian Institute for International Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10h15-10h45</th>
<th>Coffee break</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maison de la Paix, Petal 2, Outside S8</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10h45-12h30</th>
<th>Plenary II—The Role of Think Tanks in the Face of Threats and Crisis: Ebola, Regional Crises, and ISIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maison de la Paix, Petal 2, Level 1, S8</strong></td>
<td><strong>Moderator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mohammad-Mahmoud Ould Mohamedou, Deputy Director and Academic Dean, Geneva Center for Security Policy, and Adjunct Professor of International History, the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Panelists</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Said Djinnit, United Nations Special Envoy for the Great Lakes Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander Dynkin, Director, Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the Russian Academy of Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toshiro Iijima, Deputy Director General, the Japan Institute of International Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paolo Magri, Executive Vice President and Director, Italian Institute for International Political Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 12h30-14h

**Practitioners of Today and Tomorrow**  
**Meeting Global Challenges Together**

Luncheon sponsored by the Fondation pour Genève

#### Keynote
- Robin Niblett, Director, Chatham House

Post-graduate students and young professionals will be present at each table to facilitate discussion following the keynote address.

- Bernhard Blumenau, Research Fellow, International History, the Graduate Institute, Geneva
- Killian Dorier, Masters Candidate, International Relations/Political Science, the Graduate Institute, Geneva
- Andrea Kaufmann, Gender Expert, and Elizabeth Koechlein, Research Analyst, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development
- Dunja Krause, Associate Expert, and Marie-Adélaïde Mathei, Research Analyst, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development
- Xinwan Liu, and Nicolas Erwes, Masters Candidates, International Affairs, the Graduate Institute, Geneva
- Matel Sow, Masters Candidate, Development Studies, and Rohit Ticku, PhD Candidate, Development Economics, the Graduate Institute, Geneva
- Maximilien Stauber, PhD Candidate, Faculty of Law, University of Lausanne
- Yixian Sun, and Kathryn Chelminski, PhD Candidates, International Relations/Political Science, the Graduate Institute, Geneva
- Ka Lok Yip, PhD Candidate, International Law, the Graduate Institute, Geneva
- Nicolas Zahn, Masters graduate, International Affairs, the Graduate Institute, Geneva

A 3-minute walk to the reception space in the Maison des étudiants Picciotto

### 14h-15h45

**Plenary III—Implementing the Post-2015 Agenda:**

**Global Governance for Sustainable Development**

#### Moderator
- Liliana Andonova, Professor of International Relations / Political Science, the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva

#### Panelists
- Gibson Chigumira, Board Member, the African Capacity Building Foundation, and Executive Director, Zimbabwe Economic Policy Analysis and Research Unit
- Arancha Gonzalez, Executive Director, International Trade Centre
- Mustafizur Rahman, Executive Director, Centre for Policy Dialogue
- George C. Varughese, President, Development Alternatives Group
- Maya Yahya, Senior Associate, Carnegie Middle East Center

#### Maison de la Paix, Petal 2, Level 1, S8

Moderator

### 15h45-16h

Coffee break
16h-17h30  Break-out Sessions on Overcoming Global Policy Gridlock: Strategies for Change

Maison de la Paix, Petal 2, Level 3, Cafeteria

I - SDGs: A Post-2015 Plan of Action

Co-Chairs
- Leonardo Luis Céspedes Mandujano, Coordinator of the Technical Assistant Unit and Adjunct Researcher, Latin American Center for Rural Development
- MoonJoong Tcha, Senior Fellow Korea Development Institute (KDI) (TBC)

Summary and Response
- Valeria Esquivel, Research Coordinator, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development

Rapporteur

II - Forging Strategic Partnerships between Think Tanks and IGOs

Co-Chairs
- Anita Prakash, Direct Policy Relations, Economic Research Institute for ASEAN, East Asia (ERIA) (TBC)
- Junko Shimazoe, Director in Charge of Research Management, Special Advisor to the President for Think Tank Relations, Senior Research Fellow in the Research Planning Department, Institute of Developing Economies - Japan External Trade Organization

Summary and Response
- Katja Hujo, Research Coordinator, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development

Rapporteur

III - Geneva as a Catalyst for Global Governance and Policy Innovation: An Idea Whose Time Has Come?

Co-Chairs
- Steve Glovinsky, Special Adviser to the Executive Secretary UN Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA)
- Charlotte Warakaulle, Chief of Section, Political Affairs and Partnerships Section, United Nations Office at Geneva

Summary and Response
- Johan Rochel, Vice President Foraus-Swiss Forum of Foreign Policy

Rapporteur
IV - Thinking about the Future of Think Tanks: New Strategies and Structures

Co-Chairs
- Marlos Lima, Executive Director of the Latin American Center for Administration and Public Policies, Fundação Getulio Vargas
- Andrew Selee, Vice President, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

Summary and Response
- Melissa H Conley Tyler, National Executive Director, Australian Institute of International Affairs (AIIA) (TBC)

Rapporteur

World Meterological Organization (WMO)
Avenue de la Paix 7bis | CH-1202 Geneva | Phone: +41 (0)22 730 81 11

17h45-18h15 Optional tour of think tank office space available at the WMO

WMO, Meet in entry hall Conducted by Benedikt Wechsler, Diplomatic Advisor, Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Division of UN and International Organizations / e-diplomacy & think tanks, and Lea Suter, Deputy Director and Head of Office Geneva, foraus - Swiss Forum on Foreign Policy

18h-20h Reception sponsored by the Swiss and US Missions to the UN in Geneva

WMO, Restaurant l’Attique, 8th floor Welcome from the venue host
- Michel Jarraud, Secretary-General, World Meteorological Organization

Welcome from the reception hosts
- Alexandre Fasel, Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Switzerland to the United Nations and other International Organizations in Geneva
- Pamela Hamamoto, Ambassador, Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations and other International Organizations in Geneva

Brasserie des Halles de l’Ile
20h-21h30  The Global Think Tank Summit evening in Geneva

Bar area  Continue the discussion with graduate students and young professionals downtown in Geneva.

SATURDAY, 6 DECEMBER 2014

The Graduate Institute | Maison de la Paix
Chemin Eugène-Rigot 2 | CH-1202 Geneva | Phone: +41 (0)22 908 57 00

8h30-9h30  A Call to Action: Global Partnerships for Peace, Prosperity, and Human Development

Maison de la Paix, Petal 2, Level 1, S8

Keynote
- Berris Gwynne, Director and UN Representative Geneva, World Vision International

9h30-11h  Plenary IV— Catalysts for Policy Innovation and Action

Maison de la Paix, Petal 2, Level 1, S8

Panel members propose a set of ideas for the participants to consider, discuss and formulate into a set of recommendations to policymakers, donors and the think tank community.

Moderator
- James G. McGann, Senior Lecturer and Director, Think Tanks and Civil Society Program, Lauder Institute, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania

Panelists
- Steven Bennett, Vice President and Chief Operating Officer, Brookings
- Sen Gong, General Director of the Institute of Public Administration and Human Resources, Development Research Center of the State Council, China
- Fatima Harrak, President of Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA), and Research Professor, Institute of African Studies University Mohammed V, Rabat
- Ilona Kickbusch, Director, Global Health Programme, and Adjunct Professor, Interdisciplinary Programmes, the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva
- Luis Montero, Senior Program Officer, Global Policy and Advocacy, The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation

(10h-11h30)  Coffee available in the foyer outside the meeting room.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11h-12h</td>
<td>Conclusions, Future Plans, and Closing Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison de la Paix, Petal 2, Level 1, S8</td>
<td><strong>Comments and Conclusions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hvidt, Nanna, Director, Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS) (TBC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Schillinger, Hubert René, Director, Geneva Office Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Representative United Nations Geneva Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Marlos S Lima, Executive Director of the Latin American Center for Administration and Public Policies Swiss Mission or Swiss Ministry of Foreign Affairs (TBC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Denzil Abel, Senior Member Myanmar Institute of Strategic and International Studies (Myanmar-ISIS) (TBC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Representative Swiss Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Future Plans and Closing Remarks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Thomas Biersteker, Professor of International Relations / Political Science, and Director of the Programme for the Study of International Governance, the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• James G. McGann, Senior Lecturer and Director, Think Tanks and Civil Society Program, Lauder Institute, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12h-14h</td>
<td>Luncheon sponsored by the Republic and State of Geneva and the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung Turkey Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison de la Paix, Petal 2, Level 3, Cafeteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Name (Last, First)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Jazeera Centre for Studies</td>
<td>Abdullah, Jamal M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank Institute (ADBI)</td>
<td>Park, Jae-Ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Institute of International Affairs (AIIA)</td>
<td>Conley Tyler, Melissa H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenir Suisse</td>
<td>Adler, Tibère</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB)</td>
<td>Bacaria, Jordi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs</td>
<td>Burek, Josh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertelsmann Stiftung</td>
<td>Empter, Stefan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookings Institution</td>
<td>Bennett, Steven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruegel</td>
<td>Dann, Matt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Europe Center</td>
<td>Techau, Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Middle East Center</td>
<td>Yahya, Maha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Moscow Center</td>
<td>Tugan-Baranovskaya, Svetlana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for International Governance Innovation (CIGI)</td>
<td>Dewitt, David B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Social and Economic Research (CASE)</td>
<td>Hartwell, Christoper A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS)</td>
<td>Hendytio, Medelina K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Policy Dialogue (CPD)</td>
<td>Rahman, Mustafizur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centro de Implementación de Políticas Públicas para la Equidad y el Crecimiento (CIPPEC)</td>
<td>Straface, Fernando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham House</td>
<td>Niblett, Robin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China Institute of International Studies (CIIS)</td>
<td>Manyuan, Dong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China Institute of International Studies (CIIS)</td>
<td>Xu, Longdi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA)</td>
<td>Sall, Ebrima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIS</td>
<td>Center for Strategic and International Studies (USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS)</td>
<td>Hvidt, Nanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Alternatives Group</td>
<td>Varughese, George C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Research Center of the State Council (DRC)</td>
<td>Gong, Sen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Research Center of the State Council (DRC)</td>
<td>Feng, Wei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Research Center of the State Council (DRC)</td>
<td>Song, Yijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Research Center of the State Council (DRC)</td>
<td>Zhang, Li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Research Institute for ASEAN, East Asia (ERIA)</td>
<td>Prakash, Anita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foraus – Swiss Forum on Foreign Policy</td>
<td>Forster, Nicola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foraus – Swiss Forum on Foreign Policy</td>
<td>Rochel, Johan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES) Turkey Office</td>
<td>Schmidt, Felix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES)</td>
<td>Schillinger, Hubert René</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundação Getulio Vargas (FGV)</td>
<td>Lima, Marlos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundación Alternativas</td>
<td>Carnero, Carlos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundación Real Instituto Elcano</td>
<td>Ortega, Andres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva Centre for Security Policy (GCSP)</td>
<td>Mohamedou, Mohammad-Mahmoud Ould</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF)</td>
<td>Hänggi, Heiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Development Institute (DIE)</td>
<td>Fues, Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf Research Center</td>
<td>Koch, Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institut français des relations internationales (IFRI)</td>
<td>Pertusot, Vivien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)</td>
<td>Otsuka, Takashi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Developing Economies - Japan External Trade Organization (IDE-JETRO)</td>
<td>Shimazoe, Junko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Developing Economies - Japan External Trade Organization (IDE-JETRO)</td>
<td>Kataoka, Masaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of International and European Affairs (IIIEA)</td>
<td>Arnold, Tom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the Russian Academy of Sciences (IMEMO RAS)</td>
<td>Dynkin, Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Strategic Research Organization (USAK)</td>
<td>Çolakoglu, Selçuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Strategic Research Organization (USAK)</td>
<td>Yegin, Mehmet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Institute for International Political Studies (ISPI)</td>
<td>Magri, Paolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea Development Institute</td>
<td>Tcha, MoonJoong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea Institute for International Economic Policy (KIEP)</td>
<td>Jung, Sung Chun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American Center for Rural Development (RIMISP)</td>
<td>Mandujano, Leonardo Luis Céspedes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar Institute of Strategic and International Studies (Myanmar-ISIS)</td>
<td>Abel, Denzil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA)</td>
<td>Wapmuk, Sharkdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Razumkov Center</td>
<td>Yakymenko, Yuriy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Center for Strategic Studies in Cairo (RCSS)</td>
<td>Ragab, Eman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), Nanyang Technological University (NTU), Singapore</td>
<td>Emmers, Ralf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Centre</td>
<td>Montes, Manuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI)</td>
<td>Anthony, Ian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI)</td>
<td>Ramay, Shakeel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation</td>
<td>Montero, Luis J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Graduate Institute, Geneva</td>
<td>Biersteker, Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mo Ibrahim Foundation</td>
<td>McGrath, Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA)</td>
<td>Iijima, Toshiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA)</td>
<td>Glovinsky, Steve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>McGann, James G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN University Wider (UNU-Wider)</td>
<td>Addison, Tony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars</td>
<td>Selee, Andrew</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hosts and Organizers

Summit Partners
THINK TANKS AND CIVIL SOCIETIES PROGRAM, LAUDER INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program (TTCSP) of the Lauder Institute at the University of Pennsylvania conducts research on the role policy institutes play in governments and civil societies around the world. Often referred to as the “think tanks’ think tank,” TTCSP examines the evolving role and character of public policy research organizations. Over the last 25 years, the TTCSP has developed and led a series of global initiatives that have helped bridge the gap between knowledge and policy in critical policy areas such as international peace and security, globalzation and governance, international economics, environmental issues, information and society, poverty alleviation, and healthcare and global health. These international collaborative efforts are designed to establish regional and international networks of policy institutes and communities that improve policy making while strengthening democratic institutions and civil societies around the world.

The TTCSP works with leading scholars and practitioners from think tanks and universities in a variety of collaborative efforts and programs, and produces the annual Global Go To Think Tank Index that ranks the world’s leading think tanks in a variety of categories. This is achieved with the help of a panel of over 1,900 peer institutions and experts from the print and electronic media, academia, public and private donor institutions, and governments around the world. We have strong relationships with leading think tanks around the world, and our annual Think Tank Index is used by academics, journalists, donors and the public to locate and connect with the leading centers of public policy research around the world. Our goal is to increase the profile and performance of think tanks and raise the public awareness of the important role think tanks play in governments and civil societies around the globe.

Since its inception in 1989, the TTCSP has focused on collecting data and conducting research on think tank trends and the role think tanks play as civil society actors in the policymaking process. In 2007, the TTCSP developed and launched the global index of think tanks, which is designed to identify and recognize centers of excellence in all the major areas of public policy research and in every region of the world. To date TTCSP has provided technical assistance and capacity building programs in 81 countries. We are now working to create regional and global networks of think tanks in an effort to facilitate collaboration and the production of a modest yet achievable set of global public goods. Our goal is to create lasting institutional and state-level partnerships by engaging and mobilizing think tanks that have demonstrated their ability to produce high quality policy research and shape popular and elite opinion and actions for public good.
THE LAUDER INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

The Lauder Institute of Management and International Studies offers an MA in international studies, and conducts fundamental and policy-oriented research on current economic, political, and business issues. It organizes an annual conference that brings academics, practitioners and policymakers together to examine global challenges such as financial risks, sustainability, inequality, and the future of the state.

THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The University of Pennsylvania (Penn) is an Ivy League school with highly selective admissions and a history of innovation in interdisciplinary education and scholarship. A world-class research institution, Penn boasts a picturesque campus in the middle of a dynamic city. Founded by Benjamin Franklin in 1740 and recognized as America’s first university, Penn remains today a world-renowned center for the creation and dissemination of knowledge. It serves as a model for research colleges and universities throughout the world.
THE GRADUATE INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AND DEVELOPMENT STUDIES, GENEVA

The Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies is an institution of research and higher education (Master and PhD). Selective and cosmopolitan, it is located in the heart of international Geneva and specializes in the study of the major global, international and transnational challenges facing the contemporary world. It also offers professional development programs and expertise to international actors from the public, private and non-profit sectors.

Through its core activities, the Institute promotes international cooperation and makes a contribution to the progress of developing societies. More broadly, it endeavors to develop creative thinking, foster global responsibility and advance respect for diversity.

The Graduate Institute’s history dates back to 1927, the time of the League of Nations. The year 1961 saw the birth of the Institute for Development Studies (known at the time as the African Institute), a pioneer in the field. In 2008, the two institutes decided to unite under the same roof, thereby combining the study of international relations and development in a unique way.

The Graduate Institute’s Programme for the Study of International Governance offers a forum for faculty and students to interact with practitioners from the policy world to analyse international governance across a range of global issues. Serving as a hub of research on international governance, the programme managed the 2014 Global Think Tank Summit.
SUMMIT HOST AND ORGANIZERS

Dr. James G. McGann
Senior Lecturer and Director, Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program Lauder Institute, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania

Professor Thomas Biersteker
Professor of Political Science / International Relations and Director, Programme for the Study of International Governance, the Graduate Institute, Geneva

SUMMIT COORDINATORS

Dr. Cecilia Cannon
Researcher and Coordinator, Programme for the Study of International Governance, the Graduate Institute, Geneva

Dr. Jaci Eisenberg
Summit and Report Coordinator, Global Think Tank Summit

PRINCIPAL RAPPORTEUR

Kalok Yip
PhD Candidate, International Law, the Graduate Institute, Geneva

ASSISTANT RAPPORTEURS

Sorina Crisan
PhD Candidate, International Relations, the Graduate Institute, Geneva

Tayná Martins Morais
MA Candidate, the Graduate Institute, Geneva

Ashley Pilipiszyn
MA Candidate, the Graduate Institute, Geneva

Our deepest thanks to the Swiss Ministry of Foreign Affairs, whose generous support made this report possible.