



**Research Staff Collegium**  
**Monday 14 February 13.30**  
via Zoom

**1. Minutes of the last meeting and any matters arising**

The minutes of the last RSC were approved.

**2. Governing Board matters**

**2.1. New Chairman of the Board**

Dan introduced the first order of business: select a new Chairman of the Board.

Jan Eliasson has decided not to seek a second five-year term as Chair of the Board of SIPRI. His mandate ends at the end of May. Jan wants to remain engaged with SIPRI in an Associate role.

In practice, the only Swedish member of SIPRI's Board is the Chair of the Board and the Government has a great interest in the nomination process. Nomination is normally first agreed by the Board, the Research Staff Collegium, the Unions and then sent to the Swedish Government for official nomination. For the Chair of the Board's nomination, the practice is reversed, and the Swedish Government first suggests a name, whom the different bodies at SIPRI discuss.

The Swedish Government has suggested the name of the former Prime Minister of Sweden, Mr Stefan Löfven.

In the following discussion on the name proposed by the Swedish Government, different standpoints were brought forward. All recognized the great opportunity and honour to have Stefan Löfven acting as SIPRI's chair but some concerns were raised about gender diversity. Though the Board's membership as a whole is well balanced between genders as is the Senior Management Team, the Chair of the Board, Director and deputy Director would all three be male, as they have been for the last year and a half. There were also questions asked about the political identification of SIPRI, given that the former Prime Minister was also leader of his political party. There was a full discussion of these issues.

Using a silent procedure, the RSC agreed to nominate Stefan Löfven as Chair of SIPRI's Board.

**2.2. New member of the Governing Board**

Joakim informed the RSC that Mohamed ibn Chambas' nomination has been processed by the Government and the official appointment should be out on Thursday 17 February 2022. Dr ibn Chambas will therefore attend the next Board meeting in May.

Dan proposed to discuss the nomination of the next candidates to the Board during the next RSC. If we want a diverse Board, the suggestions of potential names should also be diverse and encompass important criteria such as the individual's standing and international network. Dan highlighted that the Board suggests someone with cyber or economics knowledge, or

from a region where we are not represented yet. Two seats are available on the Board. It would be good to have more suggestions.

### 2.3 Agenda for the Board meeting

Dan suggested that Timo, as staff observer on the Board, send a message to all staff to ask for suggestions for the Board's agenda in May. After further discussions in SMT and with Jan, and including the input from staff, the proposed agenda will be shared at the next RSC.

## **3. Returning to the office and Working From Home**

As announced during the Monday morning meeting, March 7<sup>th</sup> is the date for both the return to the office and starting implementation of the Working From Home (WFH) policy. The WFH policy has been discussed in a working group and revised based on the results of the staff survey on the topic and discussions at SMT and at the Cooperation Group. Joakim highlighted the main point of the document, which is the possibility offered to each employee to work from home up to 2 days per week once agreed with their line manager. The idea is to offer flexibility to both the line manager and the employee.

Florian asked if there is leeway when someone needs to pick up a child at school and if there is still the possibility of working remotely from their summer houses. Dan answered that apart from the VABing option that Swedish offers, there is flexibility if it has been agreed with the line manager. We don't have a clocking-in and clocking-off system nor a signing-in/signing out system. A new 'normal' has emerged during the pandemic that SIPRI management wants to regulate. As far as summer houses are concerned, Dan considered that it was a pandemic habit because we were all the time working from home. The idea of this agreement is to give flexibility to the line manager and the employee to find a mutual position within this framework of a maximum of 2 days. If it becomes problematic, then the agreement or the system needs to be revised.

Kheira asked if the agreements will be collected by HR. Dan confirmed that they will.

## **4. Reorganisation – Director's Office and Projects**

Dan presented the idea behind the reorganization of the Director's Office (DO'). The DO has had a formal existence for a long time but has not really functioned as a team, as DO members discussed after the &Frankly survey. Because the opportunity presented itself with a change in personnel, the management wanted to reorganize, and went through the usual process established when a reorganization is proposed – a discussion within SMT, then with the Unions and the Cooperation Group.

Sepideh has been appointed Head of the DO, Elin will work in it as the Coordination Officer and SIPRI is advertising to recruit a Management Assistant. Joakim as Deputy Director and Jakob as Research Assistant will also be part of the DO.

Connected to that, the Human Resources team is leaving the Operations Team, and will become a separate unit, headed by Helena who will report to Joakim.

Another reorganization concerns Operations and the proposal to create a team for projects management. The final name of the team is yet to be decided. It will initially consist of five people, comprising two who are currently working with programmes, one currently working in the finance team, the replacement for Lena who is leaving the post of Grants manager and a fifth person to be recruited. The idea is to have these five people would accompany projects from ideas and planning, through budgeting and application, by implementation and reporting to the extension and closure of such projects. One position will include responsibility for scanning for external funding opportunities that Lena was doing. It is also planned to ensure that, within this group of five people, there is adequate legal knowledge and understanding of contracts. All five should handle both at least 1 major project and some smaller ones.

Joakim reported that a working group has been established to work out the details of the new team's role. The working group will include one researcher from each cluster, from outreach, finance and and the persons who will be part of the projects team. The working group will give recommendations to the SMT for a final decision.

Vincent asked how many projects SIPRI currently manages, whether five people are enough and if it would make sense to link the positions to the different clusters. In response:

- Maria said that we have around 70-80 projects of different scales and durations.
- Dan reported that the SMT discussed the possibility to link the positions to the clusters and decided against. Part of the aim is to foster cross-over knowledge and cross-fertilization between the different clusters. Moreover, linking project managers to specific clusters could lead to problems when one leaves, gets sick or goes on vacation.
- Dan highlighted that having five people in the team increases the current capacity of Operations and raises the question of funding. The aim is for the positions to be directly funded as part of the projects. Further growth in the team, therefore, would be linked to project acquisition and should always be covered by new funding.

Vincent saw that it can be an opportunity to free some time for the researchers to focus on the content, instead of spending time on the logistical and overhead work when implementing the project. Dan confirmed that it is one of the main reasons why the projects team will be created, though part of the researchers' work will always be administrative.

## **5. Ukraine / Russia: discussion on SIPRI activities & role**

Dan initiated a discussion on whether there would be a war and what the most likely scenarios are. From that, he opened the question of what SIPRI can do, responding to a query raised by Simone during a Monday morning meeting. This led to a discussion about dialogue – whether dialogue activities are possible now, of what kind, involving whom, and addressing what issues. Dan remarked that SIPRI is highly committed to supporting dialogue but, over Ukraine and other issues, there has been shortage of dialogue in recent years.

Tytti agreed on the importance of dialogue but it is often difficult to have the right funding and enough time. Ian said that if dialogue goes forward, it must engage on the critical issues at stake here, between Ukraine and Russia and between the countries around the Black Sea and Russia. Pieter wondered to what extent our data can be used to kickstart discussions, and

whether we want to provide data for discussions when we have no control about the use made of the data.

Dan highlighted that we are doing both the Russian and Ukrainian translations of the Yearbook. It is funded by the Swiss Ministry of Foreign Affairs. While in negotiations for the renewal of the grant, Stephanie has been stressing the current situation. We could have other possibilities, perhaps a conference in Ukraine and in Moscow, where we have our board member Dr Fedor Voitlovsky.

Florian pursued the conversation on the role of SIPRI and emphasized that SIPRI has been providing very good data for years, and that is the key job. Many press outlets are referencing SIPRI. We are already providing significant information and facts and it would not correspond to our identity if we would move towards a more activist side. Florian proposed to use the channels we have to start a discussion and stay neutral.

Timo mentioned that in 2025, it will be the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Helsinki Final Acts and Finland will be chairing the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe. It would be a great milestone to keep in mind if we want to propose a research project for example.

Dan concluded that there were a lot of good ideas. He proposed not to jump out with any big initiatives. When there are many voices in the public domain, SIPRI speaks only if it can add value but we can provide both platforms for exchange if needed.

## **6. AOB**

No other business.

### **List of participants:**

1. Abeer Ahmad	44. Alexandra Kuimova
2. Ian Anthony	45. Xiao Liang
3. Cecicial Bagge	46. Jannie Lilja
4. Anniek Barnhoorn	47. Diego Lopes
5. John Batho	48. Claire McAllister
6. Virginie Baudais	49. Meray Maddah
7. Sibylle Bauer	50. Giovanna Maletta
8. Noah Bell	51. Alexandra Manolache
9. Lucie Beraud-Sudreau	52. Alexandra Marksteiner
10. Helena Berger	53. Karen Meijer
11. Vincent Boulanin	54. David Michel
12. Amal Bourhous	55. Jenny Mildton
13. Kolja Brockmann	56. Vongai Murugani
14. Emilie Broek	57. Dylan O'Driscoll
15. Mark Bromley	58. Olle Persson
16. Laura Bruun	59. Nikos Politis
17. Simone Bunse	60. Pauline Poupart
18. Marina Caparini	61. Nivedita Raju
19. Daniele Crimella	62. Annika Salisbury

20. Evelina Francesca Cristofano	63. Anant Saria
21. Erik Danielsson	64. Pranav R. Satyanath
22. Frederic Daudon	65. Lorenzo Scarazzato
23. Ludovico De Angelis	66. Timo Smit
24. Karolina Eklöw	67. Dan Smith
25. Johanna Eliasson	68. Elizabeth Smith
26. Elin Elmgren	69. Martina Selmi
27. Tytti Erästö	70. Katongo Seyuba
28. Frank Esparraga	71. Magdalena Söderqvist
29. Jakob Faller	72. Sepideh Soltaninia
30. Shivan Fazil	73. Jürg Staudenmann
31. Vitaly Fedchenko	74. Ming Sun
32. Janet Feenstra	75. Kheira Tarif
33. Joey Fox	76. Nan Tian
34. Andrea Gadnert	77. Caspar Trimmer
35. Farah Hegazi	78. Kristina Tschunkert
36. Ulla Hurtig Nielsen	79. Luc van de Goor
37. Maria Kaemmerle	80. Jair van der Lijn
38. Alexander Kaplan	81. Joakim Vaverka
39. Lena Kappelin	82. Maria Volakaki
40. Noel Kelly	83. Peter Wezeman
41. Shannon Kille	84. Siemon Wezeman
42. Kyungmee Kim	85. Shannen Young
43. Florian Krampe	86. Emma Zetterström