

## CPS Cluster meeting, April 4 (Discussion on new Strategy)

### Dan introduced his ideas about SIPRI's coming five-year strategy

The purpose was to share ideas and receive the Cluster's feedback during or after. The first outcomes of the process will be shared with the Board during the meeting in May. The new draft strategy should be shared with the Board by the end of 2023.

The goal from the last strategy was to enhance a global conversation. The two main ways contribution to this conversation was:

- **Research** (faithful to the facts, balanced and policy oriented)
- **Convening power** (for both large gatherings such as SSC and smaller meeting)

SIPRI needs to find new areas that we can mobilize and add weight to this. Dan stressed that the current programmes and research remain relevant and on the agenda of the Institute. Existing areas for SIPRI will continue as before. Yet, the Institute should continue moving into new areas in order to stay relevant. Dan has identified four new geographies and four themes.

### Geographies

#### **Colombia**

**Somalia** (potentially to be seen in relation to the Horn of Africa)

**Northeast Asia**. (This is currently the front line. The cold war between USA and China)

**Arctic** (opening up due to climate change, there is an institutional history at SIPRI)

### Themes

#### **Cyber**

Urgency of vulnerabilities in society and mobilization of technology. Are non-state actors becoming active, and what are their responsibilities according to international humanitarian law?

#### **Ecological security**

With environment of peace report, we wanted to open the discussion on other ecological risks beyond climate change. There is research that needs to be done, which should go in parallel with SIPRI's work on climate security.

#### **Resisting alignment**

We see that countries are divided over Ukraine. These changes of multilateralism are important to study.

#### **Public education**

We are doing work on Alva Myrdal summer school. There is training in climate change and risk team on peacebuilding. We lecture at various places, but should we do something more systematic about that.

### Discussion with Dan Smith

- Are we including inherent security threats such as **organized crime** in countries like Colombia.
  - o Dan – There is indeed a need to include all aspects such as organized crime when studying these countries.

- Will we be doing a mapping of stakeholders in these areas to know what other actors/'competitors' already do research on this?
  - o Dan – There will be no mapping on what has been researched on these issues before. There is a lot missing, and we need a number of research actors on these topics (more than what exist today).
- Difficult to discuss Somalia without looking at the region.
- Training could be a new revenue stream. Doing courses etc. We were asked if we could give short courses, so there is a demand for this.
- Alignment resistance – is this a moment of regionalism? There is an opportunity/potential need to open up to regional discussions.
- There is a value of researching various perceptions of ecological security such as Russia and China who have different working definitions compared to the West.
- Will there be room for the traditional issues, for example transitional justice?
  - o Dan – There is no question of losing things that we are already doing at the Institute.
- How do we use our existing strengths within the new strategy?
  - o Dan – We need to sit down together, across clusters, and discuss the issues and address them from different angles.

*CPS discussion*

- Are we expected to add elements of the strategy into our future proposals? If so, we need to think more actively about these pillars, but do we have the expertise to do so in order to include this in our proposals?
- What is the process of this? Is it SMT or external consultants that will sit down to develop and take the strategy forward?
- It is good to explore new niche areas like the strategy does, but a strategy must primarily focus on how to develop the bulk of the Institute's research. This has not been addressed in the strategy so far. The most important part of the strategy is to figure out how to move the bulk research forward.
- Training could be good but only if it is creating surplus for researchers in funding and time. Otherwise, this will be another example such as the Yearbook that is eating up researchers' time, without the funding. Another example is the disarmament school that we subsidize with free time. Further, the wording of "public education" rather than "training" gives the impression that this is free time. If we want to take this on, we need to invest in it with resources and time.
- We should also have a strategy on output. We should think more about how we want to publish (possibly shorter pieces).
- Where will we find new funding and resources for these new ideas? We already have funding for existing commitments in projects that we cannot drop at this point.