



SIPRI Armament and Disarmament Cluster - Away Day 2022

Stockholm, Thursday 5 May 2022 (9:00-16:00)

Location: van der Nootska Palace (Library), Sankt Paulsgatan 21, Södermalm

Participants:

Sibylle Bauer, Lucie Béraud-Sudreau, Kolja Brockmann, Mark Bromley, Vincent Boulanin, Laura Bruun, Tytti Erästö, Vitaly Fedchenko, Justine Gadon-Ferreira, Lauriane Héau, Noel Kelly, Shannon Kile, Alexandra Kuimova, Xiao Liang, Diego Lopes, Giovanna Maletta, Nivedita Raju, Lorenzo Scarazetto, Nan Tian, Andrea Varisco, Wilfred Wan, Pieter Wezeman, Siemon Wezeman.

To prepare beforehand

Please (re-)read the document we circulate with this agenda: the overall Institute strategy, including the A&D cluster strategy.

Please reflect on the following questions:

For Session 1:

- Research priorities and strategy (each team will share current and mid-term research priorities as well as blue sky thinking about future research)
- How to strengthen the institute goal of peace research capacity-building
- Your ideas for SSC 2022

For Session 2:

- Diversity within the A&D cluster and in A&D activities

For Session 3:

- Work environment: What can I contribute? And what can we do as a cluster?

Agenda

09:00 - 09:30 **Welcome breakfast (coffee and sandwiches served)**

09:30 - 12:30 **Session 1: Research priorities and strategy**

There will be a leg-stretching/email checking break half-way through.

12:30 - 13:30 **Lunch Break**

13:30 - 14:30 **Session 2: Diversity within the cluster**

14:30 - 15:30 **Session 3: Work environment**

15:30 - 16:00 **Fika and finish**

AT away day talking points – 5/5/2022

Research priorities and strategy:

Mid-term research priorities:

First priority: Arms transfers database. Data work and analysis. Continuous monitoring international arms transfers (database, analysis: fact sheet + yearbook, continuous interaction with researchers, media, public), understanding background, context, policy behind it. Time consuming.

Other:

AUDoD project

UNSCAR 2021 project

PSC project

SALW/embargo project

A&D school

Transparency and embargo monitoring – YB chapters.

UNSCAR 2022 project – to start in 2022

Current project proposals (also touching ideas for SSC):

Transparency tracker: idea to develop a new webpage in our website that can track states' submissions to different transparency instruments like UNROCA, ATT, OSCE, EU.

Major arms review: Reviewing major arms and their role in 'battlefields of the present' and of the future. Reflection in two internal seminars with experts + one session at SSC + one blog publication. For the moment, sent ideas to Germany only until end of 2022, but possibility to have a larger project with funds also in 2023, culminating with another session at SSC 2023.

Blue sky thinking – limited by high percentage of time for database work.

Within database – longer term: Major arms and TIV reflection

Procurement: either replacing some transfers – some categories.

Outside database: Work with other projects.

Arms transfers and conflict: which arms, which conflicts, risks etc. + cases studies.

Stabilising/destabilizing. Historical assessment in Yemen.

Arms procurement decision-making. How does it work? Also on arms export decision making. Drivers. What they mean for foreign policy relations? Export processes in states (how states support arms export). Export processes in the companies. How they answer to a bid, how they evolve (direct offset teams growing).

Technology transfers: governments and companies, how do they see it. Industrial cooperation, integration. Arms procurement process, development. How countries absorb foreign technology?

Regional focus: AU DoD project and similar.

Connection with other programmes in the A&D cluster. DUAT, MILAP, Nuclear technology, Emerging technologies.

How to strengthen the institute goal of peace research capacity-building

Risk of unintended consequences of our data? Related to strategy and objectives of the Institute. Example of data on import/exports, or maybe also linked to other projects (i.e.: top 100).

What to do? Mapping these unintended consequences – good that we are quoted, but by whom and with which goal?

Maybe making the goal clear in our products? Providing a disclaimer or something similar in our work clarifying that goal is promoting peace.



STOCKHOLM INTERNATIONAL
PEACE RESEARCH INSTITUTE

DUAT Programme research ideas – Cluster Away Day

5 May 2022

current and mid-term research priorities

- **IHL and the erosion of restraint – The programme is interested in developing projects that** would examine (a) how major exporters are taking into account of IHL risks when assessing their arms transfer decisions; and (b) the impact of how such decisions are framed on both the humanitarian dimension of ongoing armed conflicts and the relevant international legal arms transfer controls framework.
- **Further work on the ATT assistance mapping database –** The programme is interested in developing projects that would tools and activities that to build awareness of the database and promote its use by key stakeholders
- **Achieving effective and harmonised implementation of EU controls on the export of cyber-surveillance technology –** We have been trying to get funding for a 9-12 month project would support the implementation of the revised EU Dual-use Regulation by developing an initial framework for a set of guidelines for states to use when interpreting and applying the expanded controls on exports of cyber-surveillance technology.
- **China's evolving approach to export controls –** We remain interested in developing a project that would examine the causes, content and consequences of ongoing changes in China's national system of arms export controls and its engagement with the international community's set of export control regimes. It will map the responses these changes are generating and assess the opportunities and challenges they present.
- **The further Europeanisation of arms export controls: Mapping the options, challenges and opportunities –** We are keen to develop a 1-2

year project would examine the range of options available to EU member states and EU institutions as they consider new mechanisms for achieving greater harmonization in arms export controls and deepen cooperation in the field of common security and defence.

- **Mapping EU and US policies on Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) screening** – We are keen to develop a 1-2 year project that would examine the growing use of FDI screening tools in the United States and the EU to identify and prevent transfers of sensitive technologies, assess the effectiveness of these measures, and identify barriers to the better coordination and alignment of national approaches.

Blue sky thinking about future research

- **Future of export controls taking a function or institutional approach** - We are keen to develop a 1-2 project that would address the following question: How and to what extent can multilateral strategic trade controls continue play a key role in identifying and tackling WMD non-proliferation? The focus of the study will be a series of state and technology-focused case studies.

MILAP Away Day 22/03/2022

1. MILAP: peace research meets strategic studies

MILAP should consider conducting research in both peace research and strategic studies.

- Two sides of a coin that MILAP can/should cover

- SIPRI's 2019-2024 mentions both human security and international security.
- MILAP has the capacity and expertise to consider both.
- We can and should focus on both peace & security. The A&D cluster and AMEX have already been doing both. One depends on the other.
- We don't have to be normative. The objectivity lies in the methods.
- Military spending relates to peace research in the following ways:
 - how military spending affects the prospects of war and peace? (This question could be asked both from a peace research or strategic studies angles)
 - how military spending is used to perpetuate situations of structural violence?

- Unresolved questions/To think about for the future

- How the team can/should be structured to cover both peace research and strategic studies perspectives? Do we need a formal structure for this?
- AP workstream currently needs to strengthen both fronts: for now, it is mostly about data collection, but not really involved in either peace research or strategic studies.
- Even if we can/should do both, sometimes they are at odds with each other. For instance: the war in Syria (responsibility to protect vs causing instability); the war in Ukraine (disarmament or balance of power).
 - While disagreements are ok for individual projects, they may become difficult to handle when we pursue collective projects.

- Other research fields:

- The team already indirectly researchers in the field of political economy, i.e. politics and economics behind countries' spending. The team should consider how military spending and arms production work links to political economy
- Areas the team not well-versed in include hard security, military doctrines, military structures defence policy etc. It's maybe not worth pursuing these topics since they are not our area of expertise.

2. The future of the ‘military reductions’ research agenda

There are two conflicting views in the team on keeping ‘military reductions’ as part of the research agenda that were expressed:

- one in favour of keeping the topic of military spending reductions as a research topic
 - Argument: This topic is important and must survive somehow.
- one in favour of letting go of the phrase and finding a new way to approach military spending from a peace research perspective.
 - Argument: Focusing too much on reductions will do more harm than good. We need to save the work by distancing ourselves from it.

The **common point** to these two visions is the aim to keep a ‘peace’ angle to the research on military spending. Against this backdrop, several research avenues emerged from the conversation (2.1-2.4). These are still broad topics but they could frame more specific research questions and projects.

2.1 Rethinking military spending as part of ‘single security’ spending for long-term peace

This research avenue follows from the paper by Elisabeth Wuyi and Michael. The paper now talks about **‘rebalancing military spending’** instead of ‘military spending reductions’.

The notion of ‘rebalancing’ could still be refined, but basically it aims to include state security as well as human security. The paper poses several questions:

- We need to cast a different glance on the topic: how is security funded? What other aspects of security do we consider beyond military spending?
- in a world where military spending is going up, how can other services, such as Health, Electricity and Education be provided? How do we provide people with the basic needs and have the resources for military spending? This shifts the focus from reductions to a discussion about rebalancing.
- Big problem is the long term vs short term: How to reconcile the short term versus the long term issues. One the one hand: immediate needs due to military threats; but on the other the climate crisis is still looming.

Pursuing this research avenue allows us to ‘piggy back’ on the German coalition agreement, which gives some impetus to this idea, with the 3% goal for development, defence and diplomacy. It still makes sense to combine those three elements from a **‘single security space’** perspective. There will be lots of different costs to guarantee all dimensions of security.

- One option to build on is to use the concept of ‘single security space’ instead of ‘human security’ (which easily equated with just development aid). This builds on an idea from Dan Smith.¹
- So, the idea to move forward the security concept approach – it’s not necessarily about ‘reducing excessive military spending’ but ‘redirecting’ military spending, and redefining the nexus security—development (and the funding that goes with it).

Moving from ‘reductions’ to ‘rebalancing’ helps mitigating the **risk of colonialist undertones**. The reduction narrative can sound patronizing, as if Europe wouldn’t have to reduce military spending for its own security, but other areas of the world do. Conflicts are taking place in many places, so why would it be illegitimate for other countries to pursue increases in military spending if they see it necessary for their own security?

- For some countries, raising military expenditure is important to maintain security, thereby allowing for development.
- In countries after a civil conflict: if military spending is going up, maybe it’s because they need to reconstitute an army to integrate all rebel groups; it’s costly.
- At the same time, the bias could be the other way around: other wars were and are happening and they didn’t seem to weaken the discussions about military spending reductions. **The fact that a European war can weaken an idea that is applicable to the whole world is in itself a bias.**

2.2 Crowding out effect for development aid; opportunity costs discussions to continue

A key theme that emerged is the risk of reduced development spending in European countries that increase military spending. This relates to the broader discussion of opportunity costs, which will likely become increasingly relevant. Under this theme, several research questions emerged:

- European countries who are the biggest ODA donors are increasing military spending. But they also allocate more resources to respond to the Ukrainian refugees crisis. How will countries deal with this?
- How higher military spending and EU spending to help Ukrainian refugees will impact its activities outside Europe. Will it lead to reduction in ODA elsewhere? These discussions are already happening.
- We can contribute to the European debate with a discussion of the opportunity costs of the increases. Germany will spend €100b.: what is the opportunity cost of this? Are other commitments sacrificed? Will the rise in military affect commitments to ODA and climate change?
 - We can study the effects on the war on commitments to ODA donations. And more generally, how wars change a country’s

¹ <https://www.sipri.org/commentary/essay/2021/security-insecurity-and-anthropocene>

expenditure composition. This would be linked to the work we want to do with military spending as a share of government expenditure.

- One of the things we can do is to map these developments.

2.3 Effectiveness of military spending

The planned increases in military spending raise the question of waste of resources. How to ensure that the additional public spending is used effectively? Under this theme, several dimensions were brought up:

- Pursue the work on transparency and scrutiny of military spending
- Focus on the budgetary process and oversight:
 - Who participates in military spending decision making processes? How are forecasts of military capability requirements done, what do you project for future procurements? And how do you assess the risks?
 - Who oversees the expenditure?
- Focus on efficiency of spending? How to avoid wasteful spending? Monitor how the money is spent? This relates to the topic of collecting disaggregated spending data.
- This also relates to the theme of corruption in military spending.

This topic has the advantage of being applicable to all regions of the world. Looking at the announced increases in Europe: having this angle of research allows to have some constructive criticism: it's not just announcing the overall figure that matters, but also not to waste the extra money spent. The transparency of procurement processes also applies to the Global South.

2.4 Military spending and threat perceptions

We often attribute rising military expenditures to threat perceptions in our work (Yearbook chapter, Data launch). The changing European security context could lead us to dig deeper into this – and it applies to all regions.

- For instance: how do shifts in security perceptions change country decisions that impact arms industry and military spending? (i.e. Germany F35 and its impact on European strategic autonomy?).

Understanding the security perspective and the drivers behind increases could help us with the reduction agenda: We can talk about reductions indirectly by discussing drivers of increases (which can then help identify drivers of decreases?).

This is also part of our core work to provide context to the trends we observe.

3. Other research ideas and perspectives

The list below puts together the different ideas that were put forward during the day. They are not exhaustive but could be the starting point of a 'menu of ideas' for the team to pick from to pursue research projects and fundraising.

MILAP large-scale potential projects

Disaggregated military spending

This is a long-running theme for MILAP and SIPRI; the team always gets asked for this data. Question remains how to implement it – although we can now build on the work done for the UNSCAR project.

Scenario/Prospective on the outcome of the Ukraine war

We could try to project ourselves further down the road and think about what we could say in the event of a peace agreement between Ukraine and Russia:

- What will be the consequences of the war? Higher military spending in Western and Central Europe even after a peace agreement is signed
- How will this affect threat perceptions?
- What are the consequences of higher military spending in Western and Central Europe and how will it impact relations with Russia?

Filling the data blanks

This applies for both arms production and military spending.

European increases: how are they funded?

How will the European countries fund higher military spending and spending on refugees? Debt? Taxes? Cuts to other areas of spending?

Individual research ideas

(Diego) Military spending and Political institutions

- How autocrats use military spending to remain in power.

(Nan) Relationship between conflict and military spending

- Link between military spending and conflict - what that can offer us. If we cannot talk about reductions, we can still explore the links between conflict and milex. This relates to the MILEXIPRECS project.
- Conflict and Milex (Milexiprecs), milexpocs, milex during conflict - Nan (feedback loops, nuance)

(Alex K) Thesis idea – which bridges the work of AT and MILAP. The idea is to look at flows of military aid (both with equipment and dollars).

- Where is this military aid going?
- Idea to look at net transfers: part of the military spending for many countries in conflict are not really part of domestic military spending but instead coming from abroad.

(Alex M)

- Arms industry - emerging tech companies
- EU defence spending (how do we count that, what are the decision mechanisms and where is it going?)

(Anant) Milex and sanctions.

- What are the effect of sanctions and are they good at deterrence.

Security sector reform? link with transparency & accountability in milex? SSR
= coming from donor countries? Also link with ODA.

4. Other points raised

How to do more analysis

There is still a sentiment in the team that we are not doing enough analysis. The question remains how to balance the time between data collection and analytical work & publications.

How to do policy-relevant research?

How to make more policy-relevant research? One idea is to summarize literature reviews and communicate this, like the climate security team. And if we want to add to this generating new evidence, then this links to the question above on making time for more analysis.

Diversify funding base

Where to get funds? Governments and EU now, but it would be good to diversify. Other options include:

- Foundations
- High net worth individuals
- We discussed exploring ties with OECD to see if they would be interested in partnerships/funding projects.
 - The World Bank uses our data, we could also approach them for data-oriented work?

We can also look diversify the type of governments we approach (not just the usual suspects, e.g. Europeans and South Korea)

5. Work environment

To continue

- cooperative work environment
- empathy, consideration of others
- positive reinforcement and constructive criticism
- need to tolerate mistakes precisely because we cannot make them. We shouldn't get mad at each other if there is a mistake, otherwise we would stop reporting them. Everybody needs to be able to say when something is wrong
- willingness to offer help to each other
- try not to put too much ego in collaborative writing projects: not fight to keep a sentence in the text that we wrote, if it no longer fits
- be nice and constructive in how we provide comments, and take them well
- Try to take care of one another, not overwork each other

To improve

- What more we can do to help interns who are based remotely? Several ideas were raised:
 - look into who can create a teams group for interns,
 - help with interactions outside the programme/cluster for remote interns
 - someone can help facilitate meetings one-to-one with other researchers
- work structure: how to improve planning and workload?
- More knowledge exchange with other teams in the cluster, and in the institute: how to get better at communicating our work to colleagues and vice versa

Hybrid office

- Most of us are now used to the hybrid office; in particular interns have known almost only remote work with Covid
- The hybrid office means we have to communicate even more;
- In the remote work environment = communication matters most to get the work done: need to get the point across precisely and avoid miscommunication;
- Try to avoid making decisions informally (i.e. in person in the office while others who are remote cannot participate to ad hoc conversations).
- The Teams chat function helps to make work less lonely; gives a space for more informal for discussions, sharing, complaining!

6. MILAP communications protocol

- We agreed to use the 'send later' email function to avoid sending emails outside business hours
 - This applies to all email outside 8am-6pm
 - Exceptions are emergencies and data launch period
- We agreed to prioritize different communications channels depending on the expected response time
 - Email: not urgent, longer-term questions, response not expected in 1-2 days
 - Teams Chat: need to respond quickly (couple of hours)
 - Whatsapp message/Phone call: Emergency (see phone book on Teams)

7. Action points

For the team

- Continue thinking about research proposals and projects linked to the ideas that emerged during the away day, both large-scale team efforts or individual project ideas
- Apply new communications protocol
- Consider the OECD to partner for a project
- Plan for MILAP learning and sharing sessions
- Create list of things for all interns should acquire from throughout their time
- Consider convening a learning & sharing session on producing policy-relevant research – relevant problems that we are thinking about? How do we provide policy recommendations?
 - Make it a point in the cluster agenda?

Commented [LB1]: @Lucie Béraud-Sudreau to email @Ming Sun @Alexander Kaplan @Anant Saria

For SIPRI

Human Resources

- Think about an internship programme for career development and skillset to acquire when doing an internship at SIPRI? There needs a common platform/space for interns ; organize joint activities
- Create an interns team chats channel?
- Designate a coordinator to facilitate exchanges between interns and the research staff?
- *Long term reflections and discussions*
- Continue discussions on peace research+strategic studies and broaden to include arms production in the conversation
- How to hop off the project treadmill?
- How to better prioritize urgent vs important?
- How to be more agile and adapt to new circumstances and innovate?
- Partnership with other research institutes to do bigger projects
- Link better with Comms/Sibylle
- Hire economist(s)

Commented [LB2]: @Lucie Béraud-Sudreau raise with HR

Research Priorities

- 1) Continue work on existing strands
 - a. Nuclear forensics and nuclear security (Vitaly)
 - b. Arms control and nuclear disarmament, with incorporation of tech (Tytti)
- 2) Find natural ways to extend that work
 - a. Proposal: Nuclear security in conflict situations, after war in Ukraine
 - i. Builds off Black Sea nuclear smuggling work from Ian and Vitaly
 - ii. State activity, shortcomings of international legal framework
 - b. Broader: Forensics as approach and relevance to non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament verification?
 - c. Proposal: Strategic developments in space and nuclear arms control
 - i. Considering offense-defense arms racing
 - ii. Centered on missile defense and ASAT developments
 - d. Planned events: with Alva Myrdal Center on TPNW, with UNODA on NPT
- 3) Some newer areas in the short and medium terms
 - a. Broadly:
 - i. Increase activity around bio and chem
 1. Maintaining norms of non-use, compliance politics
 2. Targeted use of weapons and dis/mis-information
 - ii. Nuclear through developments of other domains (esp. space)
 1. Escalation pathways as the angle
 2. As deterrence concepts and capabilities evolve(On WMD/tech, Nordforsk application submitted on exploratory workshop series: “WMD Governance, Understandings, and Technology”)
 - iii. Build off nuclear forces data
 1. Explore interactive dynamics and trends across
 2. Links to strategic armament dynamics, arms racing
 - b. More narrowly (and less fleshed out)

Potential projects:

Bio-Tech Convergence (...Bio Plus X Plus ;-)

- Advances in bioreactor research, plus dual-use and more indirect aspects – including information sharing and communication that increase vulnerability
- “Tech for good” (biosensor detection, medical countermeasures, verification)
- Engagement and monitoring with industry and scientific community
- Discussion of governance framework, including BWC S&T Review Mechanism

Outer Space and Nuclear Deterrence

- Considers potential impact of outer space militarization on nuclear assets
- Systematic overview of nuclear and space doctrines and policies
- Identifies space-related modes of deterrence failure (i.e., “risk” angle)
- Broader consideration of evolution of deterrence in response to new domains
- Link with other tech developments – including cyber and non-kinetic weapons – that impact on space-nuclear connection

WW – WMD Programme Away Day Notes

WMD Regimes and Decision-Making in the Information Age

- Examines information (sources), burden of proof, and threshold linked to compliance decision-making in WMD regimes
- Tracks trends in information sharing with regimes, e.g., use of national intelligence sources (and role of open sources and civil society)
- Considers link with mis/disinformation campaigns
- Identifies lessons learned across regimes, compliance politics, and ways forward

Multiple layers to the value of greater inclusion and diversity

- First, value for its own sake: our field should be reflective of the world we live in
 - o “Hard” security areas (especially WMD) are closed off, with women and minorities severely underrepresented, difference more pronounced at senior positions
- Second, need to include the voices of those most likely to be affected by these issues
 - o In WMD, we know there is differential impact on populations
 - Humanitarian movement in the nuclear space: effects of ionizing radiation on women v. men, social impacts (if there is food insecurity, or mass migration, etc., psychological health)
 - Chemical and biological space about differences in susceptibility and exposure to agents, societal norms, and impacts
 - o Given consequences, warrants inclusion in the process
- Third, diversity of views & perspectives can drive new ideas, innovative thinking
 - o Research on how gender engagement in peace processes, including participation, and inclusion of gender-responsive text or content or obligations in treaties and agreements, can lead to longer-lasting peace
 - o Humanitarian consequences movement, borne out of frustration partly with the pace of arms control and disarmament, with massive civil society involvement, led to the nuclear ban treaty – which while seen as controversial has filled in an international legal gap, changed the conversation and created pressure to disarm
- Fourth, diversity is key to substantive and research integrity
 - o In WMD, there are a lot of changing realities
 - Multilateralization of arms control processes, spread of strategic technologies, industry engagement in chemical and biological weapons – overall more stakeholders in armament and disarmament
 - o Essential to engage experts from those sectors or regions or backgrounds

Experience with developing internal policy...

- Important for us to share our policy and action plan (by putting in on the website), to demonstrate our commitment
 - o We need people to buy in at all levels
 - Worked with staff, lots of consultation to develop realistic but also meaningful goals
 - Important to acknowledge a lot of this work is simply about raising awareness and educating in this context

Diversity

There have been many discussions in SMT, and it is mentioned in our SIPRI strategy.

In EUNPDC work we try to mainstream this across all our activities, events, publications and whatever we do. In SIPRI we include it in our KPI indicators but not sure the data gathering has been successful? We collect data on a lot of other things, but it would be very interesting to collect data on ourselves.

How are we doing on events in terms of diversity? In terms of geography, age, gender, and all sorts of aspects for speakers (easiest), participants (?). Who asks the questions?

Could we have some guidance and good practice in how we proactively encourage more diversity?

- Gathering data on ourselves
- Recruitment
- Diversity of interns
- Diversity across seniority levels

We have many issues where we could self-analyse.

Wilfred then shared his experience from UNIDIR (See WW – notes on diversity)

A point was raised on diversity of sources being used in our research. Are we aware of biases? (Are we using mainly those with a western media focus/sources?) What can we do as researchers? What can we do at the institutional level?

Not enough thought has been given internally on these issues, but it is starting now. The gender seminar was the first organised by the armament-disarmament cluster (referencing: EUNDP seminar on gender in disarmament and non-proliferation, 30 March).

Please see for all to read and should be shared with SMT as an example:

https://unidir.org/sites/default/files/2021-06/UNIDIR_GenderDiversityActionPlan_2021-2022%5B1%5D.pdf

Internships

There was a broad consensus that our interns should be paid, or some benefits given. Is it possible under Swedish law? Other ways to help perhaps is by reimbursing travel costs or housing costs. Not paying interns or supporting them coming here means a less diverse pool of candidates to select from and the opportunity is available only for a privileged few.

Attitudes have changed against unpaid internships. It is seen more now as exploitation. Well known think tanks like the Council of Foreign Relations, Brookings Institution etc. came out as having revised their policies and are offering paid internships. It was highlighted there was a backlash against The Stimson Center for advertising unpaid internships recently and they

had to take down the internship notice they had posted on Twitter. It is time to discuss this at SIPRI and it is encouraged to see some movement on this question.

The virtual internships offered at SIPRI has been great opportunity for widening diversity and the MILAP Programme has reported a very positive experience. Currently MILAP have three interns situated in three different continents. It is important that those who are virtual have as good as possible an experience as those who join us in the office. One way of overcoming the remote barrier suggested is having a dedicated internship programme where someone takes on the roll on of internship coordinator and creates groups chats across the institute so they can speak about what they are working on. Have a dedicated speaker's series for interns – a researcher presenting and speaking about what they are working on in a relaxed environment is a very positive past intern experience highlighted.

AOB

No feedback was received on nominations for the Ypres Peace Prize and colleagues were requested to send any suggestions by the end of this week.

- We consciously avoided any sort of naming & shaming or taking punitive stance
 - Diversity as a matter of culture, which requires personal accountability and openness to improvement
- Related, we need to see this as a long-term process
 - Recognize some of the structural constraints given the field we work in, and thus be realistic and pragmatic and flexible but still being proactive and committing to our values and principles
 - For instance, we dealt with States a lot, and the invitation goes to the mission and they designate somebody to come. And obviously, given the disproportionate numbers in diplomacy, it's hard to ensure gender balance. But you can indicate the importance of ensuring gender balance and diversity in the text of your invitation.
 - So just project outward these things matter to you personally or institutionally.
- So I'll give another concrete example: one of our actions had to do with the issue of 'panels'
 - We all committed that in events that we organized, that we would never have a single-gendered panel
 - And in events that we were invited to speak in, that we inquired about the composition of the panel to ensure that it was not a single-gendered panel
 - BUT sometimes we couldn't get that information beforehand
 - We expressed our strong desire not to have a single-gendered panel and directed them to the Institute's policy
 - And if we were informed that something happened and it was a single-gendered panel, then we looked at circumstances and consider what to do... (Conference on Disarmament story)

Takeaway is that there's always something that you can do, at all levels

- Important to feel like we can consult with each other, line managers, colleagues, etc. on these things, and draw on each other's experiences and knowledge
- And to reiterate, it will improve the quality of the work
 - Not just about events or even staff composition (which is maybe the most visible part of diversity), but really all aspects of your work
 - Goal is for inclusion to permeate structure and process