College of Europe
Collège d'Europe

Brugge

Natolin

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

# Challenges Facing the 21st Century Diplomat: Representation, Communication, Negotiation and Training

25-26 OCTOBER 2011

EU International Relations and Diplomacy Studies

## CONFERENCE REPORT

# FOREWORD

On 25-26 October 2011, the Department of EU International Relations and Diplomacy Studies at the College of Europe brought together around 150 academics, trainers and diplomats in a conference to discuss new challenges facing diplomats today. States and other international players interact through the mechanisms of representation, communication and negotiation, and all three functions of diplomacy have in the 21st century increasingly been challenged. There are more actors represented in the diplomatic field, more channels of communication and more issues to deal with, and these challenges need to be reflected in diplomatic training as well.

1. *More actors:* what are the challenges of multi-stakeholder diplomacy? What is the likely impact of the European External Action Service on EU diplomacy, what role for the BRICS countries in global governance, or what does postmodern economic diplomacy imply? And can multi-actor simulations help prepare 21st century diplomats for these challenges?
2. *More channels of communication:* which challenges does modern public diplomacy face, how important is intercultural communication, and has political reporting changed in the post-WikiLeaks era? How can 21st century diplomats be prepared for e-diplomacy?
3. *More issues:* how to deal with the challenge of integrating multiple issues into coherent diplomacy? What about global health diplomacy, conflict prevention diplomacy or raw materials diplomacy? And should 21st century diplomats therefore rather be trained as specialists or as generalists?

Sixteen high-level speakers have addressed these questions in three panel sessions over two days. Each session opened with a general introduction to the topic by the Chair, followed by presentations illustrating specific examples, and it concluded with a discussion on training diplomats for the challenges raised. This report briefly summarises the individual presentations in the order of the conference programme (see Annex).

**Contact:**
College of Europe, Department of EU International Relations and Diplomacy Studies, Dijver 11, BE-8000 Bruges, Belgium | Tel. +32 (0)50 477 251 | Fax +32 (0)50 477 250 | E-mail ird.info@coleurope.eu | www.coleurope.eu/ird | www.coleurope.eu/diplomacy21

# OPENING

## "Welcome"
## Paul DEMARET, Rector of the College of Europe

The Rector of the College of Europe opened the conference on the "challenges facing the 21st century diplomat" and welcomed its numerous participants. He pointed out the diversity of the speakers as well as of the audience. This heterogeneity was the perfect reflection of the challenges awaiting 21st century diplomats. The conference was designed to adopt a practical approach so as to find concrete answers to the challenges facing diplomats in the coming decades.


The Rector also underlined that the College of Europe was the ideal place for such a conference. Founded in 1949 in the wake of The Hague Congress, this unique institution in the landscape of European studies has not only been educating thousands of young people to work for European integration, many of which have pursued diplomatic careers, but has also developed specific professional training activities for diplomats and civil servants from many countries. Lying at the crossroads between academic and professional education, the College of Europe – a founding member of the International Forum on Diplomatic Training (IFDT) – was therefore a relevant training institution for 21st century diplomats.

## "Introduction"
## Sieglinde GSTÖHL, Director, EU International Relations and Diplomacy Studies

The 21st century is still very young. Yet, it has already faced remarkable challenges such as the 9/11 attacks, the rise of new mass technologies, a global financial crisis, the emergence of new powers and the Arab Spring. These profound changes have made the conduct of traditional diplomacy – focused on bilateral relations between states, supplemented by international organisations – more difficult, while adding significant new activities to the diplomat's portfolio.

Diplomacy is often defined in terms of the mechanisms of representation, communication and negotiation through which states and other international actors conduct their business. All three functions of diplomacy are increasingly being challenged in the new millennium. There are more actors, more channels and more issues to deal with. Training has to react by providing adequate knowledge and skills in order to

enable diplomats to live up to their tasks in practice. Today's diplomats must be proficient in a multitude of areas, familiar with a variety of tools and able to deal with multiple stakeholders.

The conference addresses the transforming nature of diplomacy by putting forward diverse aspects, which are part of today's diplomacy: the emergence of the BRICS and of non-state actors in diplomatic fora, the creation of the EU's European External Action Service (EEAS), the use of new diplomatic channels or the place of global heath and raw materials diplomacy, to name but a few. The new diplomatic reality therefore raises the question whether diplomats of the 21st century needed to be trained as generalists (as they used to be) or as specialists in order to effectively manage a more proactive, more public, more complex and multi-directional diplomacy than ever before.

## Key note address "EU diplomacy: the impact of the EEAS"
## Gerhard SABATHIL, Director, EEAS


The idea behind the creation of the EEAS, which was launched on 1 January 2011, was to merge diplomatic resources and staff from the Commission, Council Secretariat and member states so as to develop a unified European external representation. This dynamic took place in a context where, on the one hand, EU citizens requested more harmonisation and, on the other hand, national foreign policies faced severe challenges such as the growing importance taken by summits ('summitrisation' of diplomacy, like the G20) and by sectoral policies ('sectoralisation' of diplomacy). The triple-hatted High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (Vice-President of the Commission, Chair of the Foreign Affairs Council and Head of the EEAS) has, in that context, a difficult but essential role to play.

Three main priorities guide the EU's new external policy tool with its 137 delegations in the world. The most important challenge to the EEAS relates to the neighbourhood. Run by the Commission with the support of the EEAS, the European Neighbourhood Policy has overcome important challenges and made significant progress, albeit with better results Eastwards than Southwards. In the field of enlargement, the EEAS effectively assisted the Commission's services to achieve successes in Bosnia and Herzegovina. As a second main challenge, the EEAS helps the EU to better engage rising global powers and strategic partners and contributes to the representation of the EU as a strategic partner for them as well. Thirdly, the EEAS brings an essential

diplomatic contribution to the EU's missions and operations worldwide gathering more than 40'000 people, even though these missions do not make the headlines.

The Lisbon Treaty and its innovations (such as the single personality, the effort to bring more consistency to the EU's external relations, the permanent structured cooperation, and the neighbourhood agreements) give a strong legal basis for the EU to address further challenges. Moreover, by giving more coherence and consistency to the EU's foreign policy, the EEAS proved a useful tool in defending Europe's vision of human rights in the face of developments in the Arab world. The EU also succeeded in being granted an enhanced observer status at the UN General Assembly.

The setting up of the EEAS certainly opens a new era for the EU as an international actor, as it helps to project European values and interests around the world. Furthermore, the new institutional system, which brings the High Representative closer to the European Parliament's control, is an improvement in democratic terms. However, the challenge for the EU to speak with a single voice remains.

## SESSION I Representation: more actors

### "The challenges of multi-stakeholder diplomacy"

**Brian HOCKING, Loughborough University & College of Europe**

Are diplomats the only stakeholders of diplomacy? 'Multi-stakeholder' diplomacy is in effect one of several terms employed to indicate the changing environment of 21st century world politics. As such, it is indicative of profound changes in the working principles that have guided the functioning of the state-based diplomatic system as it has evolved over the last few centuries.

Defined as a 'set of images', diplomacy appears as a multidimensional phenomenon which brings up different perspectives such as 'active', 'adaptive' or 'guerrilla' diplomacy. In the eyes of John Ruggie, the United Nations is a diplomatic environment where a 'traditionalist' diplomatic culture, focused on member states and characterised by secrecy and a lack of accountability, is opposed by a 'modernist' culture marked by transparency and engagement with a wide range of internal and external 'stakeholders'. For Robert Cooper in *The Breaking of Nations,* world politics are relationships of mutual interference and the role of 'post-modern diplomacy' is the management of mutual interdependence with an emphasis on human rights and economic surveillance. In the post-modern world, actors are henceforth embedded into relations of dependency rather than domination.

Both the 'modernist' diplomatic culture and the post-modern analysis help frame the concept of 'multi-stakeholder' diplomacy, which lies at the crossroads of several dimensions (understandings) of diplomacy. As diffusion of authority, multi-stakeholder diplomacy first relates to multiple spheres of authority alongside the state with sometimes ineffective hierarchies challenged by leaderless networks. Secondly, diplomacy remains a process of trading resources (such as trust, legitimacy, knowledge, access and material resources), whereas norms and rules permeate diplomacy in new fashions, as the question of NGOs' or media's responsibility testify. Thirdly, the core role of the diplomat has undoubtedly been redefined, from 'gatekeeper' to 'facilitator' and 'coordinator'. Fourthly, the traditional function of representation has evolved following world policy developments: modern diplomacy entails 'internal stakeholders' dealing with diplomacy as a 'whole of government' activity in which the diplomatic mission represents a platform for government

departments (as a consequence of diplomatic 'sectoralisation') and 'external stakeholders' which redefine the rules of representation (as the increasing space occupied by public diplomacy shows). Finally, training becomes an essential element of multi-stakeholder diplomacy as it relates to the new skills needed to be developed (for building and managing 'coalitions of the willing' for instance) as well as to the question over the need for future diplomats to be trained as generalists or specialists.


**"Engaging the BRICS as new global players"**
**Stephane KEUKELEIRE, TOTAL Chair of EU Foreign Policy, College of Europe**

The presentation proposed an analysis of the nature of the link between new emerging powers, particularly the BRICS and the EU, so as to understand why (or why not) these countries would engage with the EU as strategic partners. The BRICS acronym was coined in 2001 and a political dialogue was established five years later before the first summit took place in 2009. The BRICS cooperation reflects accurately broader international policy developments as it mainly consists of summits ('summitri-sation' of diplomacy) and sectoral cooperation on technical issues ('sectoralisation' of diplomacy) with action plans focussed on health, scientific innovation and pharmaceutical industries among others. These issues are of utmost importance for the EU, which, in turn, poses the question of the awareness of EU diplomats of these developments and their possible future implications. However, the latter remain unclear for the time being.

The question of EU diplomats' understanding and ability to manage the BRICS reality and the new set of networks it entails is of crucial importance as the EU strives to be a global power and to be perceived and addressed as such. The Copenhagen climate change negotiations were an example of the relative marginalisation of the EU in international forums and of its inability to be at the centre of effective

multilateralism, contrary to what it claims. Furthermore, the EU's values-provider role tends to be challenged by alternative sets of values (such as the equality of states) which prove increasingly attractive on the world stage.

Against this background, effective 21st century EU diplomacy cannot be set up unless more attention is devoted to a better understanding of other powers' diplomatic strategy, underpinnings and interests. An 'outside-in' approach (as developed by the TOTAL Chair on EU Foreign Policy at the College of Europe in Bruges) is therefore crucial for the management of the EU's future diplomacy as well as for the training of EU diplomats. In particular, area specialists and diplomats with proficient language skills are needed in EU delegations abroad to develop effective communication, representation and negotiation strategies.

Only by following this path – which, on the one hand, highlights the central role of training and education in contemporary diplomacy and, on the other hand, arbitrates the debate 'generalists vs. specialists' – can the EU create the conditions to be engaged by emerging powers and perceived as a strategic partner.

## "Postmodern economic diplomacy"
## Raymond SANER, Diplomacy Dialogue

The latest international policy developments have induced profound changes to the nature and activities of diplomats. The example of international economic policy-making suggests that the traditional definition of diplomacy by Sir Harold Nicholson (1939) ("the management of international relations by negotiation, the method by which these relations are adjusted and managed by ambassadors and envoys") needs to be renewed. Gorden Smith's (1999) definition of modern diplomacy as "the art of advancing national interests through the sustained exchange of information among governments, nations and *other groups*" proves helpful in this context. Post-modern diplomacy can be defined as "the mechanism of representation, communication and negotiation through which states *and other international actors* conduct their business" (Jan Melissen, 1999). A more sober definition of today's diplomacy was given by former US Secretary of State George Schultz (1997): "the raw material of diplomacy is information: getting it, assessing it, and putting it into the system for the benefit and puzzlement of others".

Diplomacy has therefore broadened to include states and non-state actors whereas its scope has enlarged to facilitate communication between them and to exert influence on the policy-making. The relevant diplomatic levels are henceforth local, regional and international. In a nutshell, diplomacy has become the continuation of politics, economics and business by other means.

The diplomatic arena is thus made of different types of diplomats. Besides traditional diplomats in the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, diplomacy is nowadays made by:

1. economic and commercial diplomats from other ministries who follow different goals and adopt new codes and procedures;
2. transnational companies playing an increasing role in international politics and trying to make their interest prevail with the activities of business and corporate diplomats;
3. civil societies being represented in the international and diplomatic arenas by national and transnational NGOs with their respective diplomats.

The three categories of newcomers in the diplomatic scene defend specific interests, which diverge from the traditional 'high politics' issues dealt with by political diplomats. Business and corporate diplomats promote transnational business development, economic and commercial diplomats defend foreign direct investments and economic multilateralism, whereas NGOs' diplomats try to bring up socio-economic and ecological development issues on the diplomatic agenda. A clear example of how these developments impinge upon the traditional concept of diplomacy is given by the inclusion of NGOs' diplomats specialised on commercial issues in the national diplomatic delegations of least developed countries.

Against this background, it can be claimed that post-modern economic diplomacy is defined by the overlapping zone of interests of the three new categories of diplomats and consists of shaping socio-economic and ecological development policies, negotiating the global economic governance architecture, setting the standards for multilateral organisations and managing multi-stakeholder coalitions and alliances. This new state of play, however, entails some uncertainties. Applying for example the definition of diplomacy as "a discourse with measured incentives and disincentives whose failure cannot rule out the use of force" to non-state actors can be worrisome. In other words, the new roles played by state and non-state actors in the diplomatic arena need to be accompanied by a new sense of responsibility.

**"The use of multi-actor simulations in diplomatic training"**
**Rabih EL-HADDAD, UNITAR**

The United Nations Institute for Training and Research was established in the 1960s with the mandate to assist and support newly independent countries to participate effectively in multilateral conferences and achieve efficient decision making, as well as to support their development strategies and enhance the effectiveness of the UN through appropriate training and research.

Participating in multilateral conferences requires skills to overcome complex deadlocks. Simulation exercises are an unparalleled tool for training in diplomacy since they provide opportunities for practice, repetition and thus perfection of one's reactions and behaviours when faced with challenges and/or opportunities in negotiation settings. Simulation exercises are an essential element of UNITAR's training methodologies. They provide opportunities for diplomats and officials to put into context the skills learned through lecture sessions, or through experience outside of the training room, and to understand better their own skills as well as to learn from the experiences and practices of others.

The design of a simulation exercise follows six main steps:

1. *Learner analysis.* It is necessary to thoroughly analyse the beneficiaries (why they have become diplomats, age, experience, etc.) and their specific needs.
2. *Learning objectives.* The learner analysis will help setting out clear learning objectives.
3. *Content development.* This step consists of drafting the exercise: aspects which are particularly important during the simulation such as stress and lack of time should not be forgotten, possible deadlocks should be identified and background material needs to be elaborated.
4. *Instructions.* Participants need instructions. However, providing instructions in the shape of 'directions' entails the risk of seeing them negotiating without relying on their sense of improvisation. Hence, leaving room for participants' creativity by providing them with 'guidance' is essential. In this regard, a seemingly chaotic simulation with unforeseen developments can be very beneficial to the participants as it often reflects reality. Therefore, instructors should refrain as much as possible from intervening during the negotiation when unfolding.
5. *Debriefing.* This step consists of collecting participants' views and feelings on the experience.
6. *Assessment.* Based on the debriefing, the instructor can elaborate a feedback session to assess the process and the learning objectives.

## SESSION II Communication: more channels

### "The challenge of modern public diplomacy"
### Alan HUNT, Oxford University Foreign Service Programme

Very often, too much is expected from public diplomacy. As long as 'hard power' is more important than 'soft power' as a determinant of a nation's success in the international world, public diplomacy will only be one of many different kinds of diplomacy. On the other hand, although the term 'public diplomacy' is only 50 years old, this modality is not new in itself, but existed already at the times of Ancient Kings, in the Middle Ages and throughout modern history. So how new are the challenges it faces nowadays? Human communications had already undergone many important changes before our century, through a process in which the old culture was replaced by one able of producing (written, printed and telegraphed) records. Nevertheless, nowadays information can be conveyed in real time through cheap social media, and this allows individuals to influence thousands of millions of people only by using a mobile phone or computer.

Thus, in the 21st century the challenges for public diplomacy are caused by the various effects of globalisation (such as the speed of news dissemination and of policy-making, competition for governments from non-state actors) and by growing democratisation, which has increased demand for accountability worldwide. As a result, governments (used to thinking in hierarchy) now face an increasingly horizontal world of networks, which requires them to embrace the technology. Many are already trying to do so by using tools such as blogs, Facebook and modern websites.

But what else is to be done to address the new challenges? According to Nicholas J. Cull, diplomats should observe the following guidelines:

1. listening (and be seen as listening) – this is key in order to influence people;
2. connecting public diplomacy to policy – this challenge is particularly relevant for the EU because of its difficulty to ensure coherence;
3. public diplomacy should not be considered a performance for domestic consumption – international audiences are narrowly linked to the domestic one;
4. attention should be paid so that public diplomacy conducted by governments is not undermined by that conducted by other actors (journalists, etc.);

5. sometimes the most credible voice in public diplomacy is not that of a government, but another one (that of academic experts, etc.);
6. public diplomacy is not always 'about you' because many people are involved;
7. public diplomacy is everyone's business. However, this last statement remains open for debate as many, including the speaker, believe diplomacy is primarily a function of states and international organisations, which have to work with other actors but are still the main ones.

As for the implications of these findings on training, it can be concluded that diplomats must be taught how to master five tools:

- inter-cultural communication, in order to engage with other actors in a mutually beneficial way;
- speech-making, as very often speeches still convey important information;
- relations with the media (organising conferences, talking to journalists, giving interviews);
- project management, as it is vital, before beginning the construction of a campaign, to think about its priorities, its timeframe, the resources needed, etc;
- the IT (although most young people nowadays are used to it).


**"Intercultural communication crises in contemporary diplomacy"**
**Raymond COHEN, Hebrew University of Jerusalem**

Besides the cases in which crisis diplomacy has to be conducted across cultures, international crises may result from a breakdown in intercultural communication, which is different. In such cases, there is no constructive public diplomacy but rather destructive 'public anti-diplomacy'. Two new features stand out in intercultural communication crises:

- the boundaries between the inside (domestic level) and the outside (international level) are blurred as minorities appeal to populations overseas;
- the crisis is exacerbated by the revolution in information and media technology that characterises our era.

Culture can be a political minefield for the ignorant. It can be thought of as a system of meanings, values and symbols. Culturally-grounded expectations (related to abstract notions such as 'justice', 'apology', 'peace' 'compromise', and so on) can collide, causing misunderstanding and conflict. Miscommunication may then escalate, spilling over very quickly in a world of instant communications. The archetypal example of this process is the Danish 'cartoons crisis' of 2005-2006.

An intercultural crisis is basically a confrontation which spirals out of control. It starts with a clash of incompatible fundamental values, is fed by a media feeding frenzy, raising mutual fears, and escalates into a clash of collective identities. Because of immigration the limits between inside and outside are blurred (the 'cartoons crisis' went well beyond Danish Muslims and non-Muslims). In the end, the crisis resulted in riots, deaths, and trade boycotts, with high economic and political costs for all.

Intercultural crises can be of various kinds:

- They may involve an innocent but culturally uninformed guest worker. This was the case with Gillian Gibbons, a British teacher working in Sudan who brought a teddy bear to class and asked the children to name it. When they called it *Mohammed* the teacher was tried and imprisoned for blasphemy. Both governments were drawn in to sort out the mess.
- They frequently involve high-spirited tourists. A young German tourist was held in custody in Turkey in 2007 for eight months on the charge of under-age sex with a British girl. Germans considered his actions normal teenage behaviour and were outraged.
- They may revolve around an unhappy joint investigation, in which two governments find difficulty working together. This was the case after 'Egypt Air 990' crashed into the Atlantic: the American and Egyptian governments reached opposite conclusions based on different cultural readings of the pilot's last words and actions, souring bilateral relations.
- Then there are crises in which the values of free speech and blasphemy collide. There are many examples of this (for instance the Salman Rushdie case).

So how can these crises be dealt with? Quiet diplomacy always seems to be the best solution, as media publicity only makes the crisis worse. Timely apology can be helpful and save lives. Nevertheless, opportunities are often missed. Therefore, the best option is always crisis prevention. Education is thus crucial in creating awareness

of cultural sensitivities and avoiding gratuitous offence. Early warning of impending collision may also be crucial, meaning that governments must keep a finger on the pulse of cultural relations in society.

## "Political reporting in the post-WikiLeaks era"

**John HEMERY, Centre for Political and Diplomatic Studies & College of Europe**

Political reporting nowadays has to take into account the actions and interests of numerous and diverse actors, ranging from the governments of the BRICs and developing countries to multinational corporations, which have many resources and a clear strategic vision. As for governments, there are as many diplomatic realities as Ministries of Foreign Affairs and some (as those of developed countries) are more concerned than others about the challenges of today. Still, all governments have to face the changes of the 21st century.

What has been the impact of WikiLeaks on political reporting? As it puts in danger people who send political reports, will it lead to the end of reporting? Two main points have to be made on the possible impact of WikiLeaks:

First, it raised concerns of the reporters over the accuracy of the information sent, as it could be disclosed. Moreover, reporters might become more careful when naming their sources, as they sometimes do it unnecessarily (just to enhance the credibility of the information) and, by endangering their sources, lose them. However, these impacts are still very modest, since the greatest inhibitor in reporting has always been self-censorship rather than leaking.

Second, WikiLeaks had an impact on the relation between the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and their public (the outside world). After the 9/11 attacks, many governments were 'closed' to the public and thus lost the possibility to influence minds. On the contrary, since increasingly people bypass governments, "the latter should go out and join them". Indeed, as events become harder to predict and mobile phones and wireless internet connections allow conveying information instantly, governments can do nothing to stop it. As suggested by Nick Gowing in *Sky Full of Lies and Black Swans*, policy-makers should rather seek to adapt to those new realities.

The main lesson to be drawn from the WikiLeaks episode is that it was "the dog that did not bark", that is an event with no lasting impact as long as it is a one off. However, if it becomes the norm, governments

not ready for open governance will need to find other means of secret communication. The net result of WikiLeaks is that it is easier to find information nowadays, but still a lot of staff is needed to go out and report, so governments need to make choices on the places they want to be represented in and by whom.

When it comes to European diplomacy in particular, John Hemery observed that the political reporting of the EEAS was still not satisfactory. Reports should be shorter and more focused in order to describe what is behind the appearance in a society. Unlike journalists who discover stories, diplomats should be able to see what is hidden behind those stories. Good political reporting can be done by pooling together the knowledge of experts from very different backgrounds. Inter-institutional cooperation and information sharing are, thus, crucial. This would allow to anticipate (although prediction will remain impossible) and to better understand political events. Moreover, reporting is better done without fear, as information might be confidential, but the truth should be acknowledged if it comes out. An additional challenge for the EEAS is to overcome the problem of national over-stretching. This will require pooling the best skills and resources for political reporting, but the biggest EU states with more solid diplomatic services might not easily agree to this. It would help turn the EEAS into a multiplier with a tremendous capacity.

**"Branding the EU? The emerging EU public diplomacy"**
**Maria KOKKONEN, EEAS Strategic Communications**

Based on the Finnish example, country branding can be defined as a strategy meant to ensure that the world relies on that country. This kind of image cannot be developed by campaigns but by deeds, and thus all the important figures of a country must participate in this strategy. But can the 'country branding' concept be used with regards to the EU?

At the core of the idea of country branding is the aim to inform about the country in order to influence others. However, the EU is not a state and, therefore, a new approach should be used in order to enhance its public image. One of the main challenges is that of ensuring the EU is perceived as a coherent actor. In the post-Lisbon Treaty era the European External Action Service can enhance coordination of the EU's public diplomacy efforts at different levels:

- between the EU Delegations abroad and the central services: together with the Commission, the EEAS gives guidelines to the Delegations and CFSP/CSDP missions, press materials, lines to take, etc.;

- between the EU institutions: an External Relations Information Committee was created, in which coordination is carried out between the EEAS and several Directorates-General of the Commission (Development Cooperation, Trade, Economic and Financial Affairs, Enlargement, Communication, Climate Action, ECHO, etc.). A specific EEAS Unit also deals with relations with the European Parliament;
- between the EU and the member states: their embassies and the EU Delegations abroad coordinate both in the field and in Brussels.

As for the tools available to the EEAS to devise its 'brand', they include, among others, audio-visual materials, the social media (Facebook, Twitter, Flickr, etc.), the EU information centres worldwide and its cultural cooperation.

Only if the EU succeeds in coordinating its Public Diplomacy activities will it manage to enhance its image. In periods of austerity such as the present one, pooling its resources in a creative way is key. The EU should build its 'brand' on the fact that it is a package of values that gives it a very unique identity. The main challenge is to seize the opportunity offered by the Lisbon Treaty and to set up a well-functioning coordination mechanism between the EEAS, the Council Secretariat and the Commission for public diplomacy activities, for promoting the brand "A stronger EU in the world".

**"Training for e-diplomacy"**
**Jovan KURBALIJA, DiploFoundation & College of Europe**

In diplomacy, the gap between what is taught and what is learned can be very wide, and it becomes even wider when talking about e-diplomacy. This is due to the effect of a 'cognitive illusion' triggered by a very low entry point into e-diplomacy and a very high bar for making e-diplomacy communication effective. Indeed, while we can learn to write a blog or use Twitter or Facebook in a few hours, we need much longer, at least one month, to understand the social media milieu, and much longer still to embed new ways of working into a team or an organisation.

There are many reasons why social media should be used by diplomatic services:

- the typical reason is that of trend and fashion – everybody uses those media;
- but also: to influence decision-making;

- for public diplomacy, as these media have a wide outreach across the globe;
- for communication in crisis situations, where it has proven to be very effective because, in these contexts, communication is a key part of the solution;
- to connect the diaspora with their home country, as these media allow turning previously sporadic contacts into an almost constant presence. This possibility has not really been exploited yet;
- to engage local public in foreign policy.

The adaptation to a 'social media-friendly organisation' should be encouraged by an organisation's leaders, but it cannot be imposed. Indeed, the introduction of social media into diplomacy can be threatened by some challenges:

- the counter-intuitive nature of social media: people need to change their routines and habits in order to really integrate them in their lives;
- the need to deal with diverse national, professional and social cultures: the e-diplomat needs to learn how to communicate in an engaging way with different audiences;
- the need to preserve diplomatic credentials: the e-diplomat needs to develop excellent writing, political and social media skills in order to avoid causing controversies and losing influence;
- the need to integrate 'digital migrants' (who learned how to use IT technologies in their adult age) into the process. In order to do this, senior officers need to allow 'digital natives' to teach them;
- the barrier of hierarchy in diplomatic services, and the bottom-up nature of the social media: to the contrary of what happens in diplomatic services, in social media everyone starts on an equal footing and acquires leadership authority through the development of a strong following. Some creative solutions, such as the use of e-diplomacy as an element for career promotion, could be devised;
- the different importance of 'the unspoken' in diplomacy and in the use of social media: while diplomacy is a profession of rituals (body language, presence, etc.), social media require a very open and transparent communication, which should be used carefully.

Social media are here to stay, as the number of 'digital natives' increases. As a result, there is a need to use them well in order to protect the core values of diplomacy, and speaking, negotiating and listening capabilities have to be developed in order to better use e-diplomacy. Indeed, "the smart use of smart tools saves time and enables effective diplomacy".

## DINNER SPEECH

**"The Middle East after the Arab Spring"**
**Amb. Marc OTTE, former EU Special Representative for the Middle East Peace Process**

The Arab Spring is not happening in a strategic void. It is part of an arc of crisis stretching from Morocco to Pakistan. All the players are participating in all the games, with different strategies. The denomination of 'Middle-East' is a foreign one, as the countries involved do not speak in these terms themselves. This shows that the characteristics and challenges of these countries need to be better analysed. In doing so, it is relevant to start by saying that the Middle East is an area full of conflicts of all kinds (inter-state and intra-state as well as asymmetric conflicts), in which not only Arab, but many other countries participate.

Moreover, several 'conflict multipliers' exist in the region, such as the proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction or transnational terrorism, turning non-state actors into strategic players. The confrontations between ethnic and religious communities are also instrumentalised by different leaders. There is a governance deficit linked to the lack of human development. Finally, the West is a part of the problem. Even when it brings positive ideas to the region it has not always supported long-term transformations. Its lack of coherence causes popular mistrust in the region.

What do we know in Europe about the Arab Spring? We know that it was generated from the inside, as the peoples of Tunisia, Egypt, Libya and Syria have been the main actors. We know that the movements started spontaneously when courage became as strong as fear once was. However, it is difficult to know who is leading the revolutions: is it young people, women, social networks, or political and religious groups? The outcome of the revolutions is also not clear. Initially, the aim was to build democracies peacefully, through an agenda including ensuring personal freedom and a decent life for the populations. Thus, the long-term causes of the revolutions were socio-economic. But the sort of political system to be established is still unclear, as the only common purpose to all revolutionaries was to oust dictators from their countries. The international response of the different actors has also been diverse.

The countries have a low capacity to absorb the changes. A bridge needs to be built between the fast emergency response to the crisis and the creation of institutions for a sustainable transition.

Some countries are at the beginning of the transitions (Egypt, Tunisia). Their systems have not changed yet (Tantawi was going to succeed Mubarak anyway), but the Islamist groups stand a better chance to obtain power because they have the better organised structures. Moreover, the economic situation is not improving fast enough, thus causing a risk of popular frustration. In sum, those transitions are fragile and the disagreements between communities might arise again. In other countries (Yemen, Syria), the uprising continues. The political leaders of those countries have lost legitimacy, and the consequences can be as serious as states collapsing. On the contrary, the Arab monarchies (Jordan, Bahrain) resist better, mostly because of the support from Saudi Arabia.

There are three major non-Arab powers in the region: Israel (causing a lot of nervousness), Iran (with a declining popularity in the eyes of the Arab masses) and Turkey, the only country proactive in a positive way (Prime Minister Erdogan has sought to foster the idea of secularism in the region). However, Turkey's old alliance with Iran, Iraq and Syria on Kurdistan has failed.

The international community seeks to mediate and is involved in issues such as the Western Sahara conflict (the longest closed border in the world), the gas reserves in the Mediterranean (Israel, Turkey and Lebanon claim the right to exploit them) and the Iranian nuclear file, which is not progressing at all.

In such a context, what should be changed in Europe's policy response? First of all, Europe needs to learn the lesson that no Arab exception for democracy exists. Second, it needs to understand that there will be no economic reforms in the region without corresponding political reforms. Third, Europe needs to admit that it ignored the real situation on the ground in these countries, and it thought that the status quo was favourable to the West's strategic interests. The Europeans have neglected the impact of the economic crisis in the region (which seriously affected sectors such as food and services), either because their intelligence failed or because of voluntary blindness. Moreover, Europe has never really interacted with the civil societies of its neighbouring countries.

On the other hand, European policies (such as the European Neighbourhood Policy or the Association Agreements) were well devised and managed, but Europe did not fulfil its promises. Finally, the European Union still lacks capabilities for crisis management, especially in the military dimension, which led, instead, to the use of 'coalitions of the willing'. This provoked a lack of coherence between the crisis management actions of the member states.

A new European approach is thus desirable, which should consist of the following:

- Putting an end to patronising attitudes towards Arab countries, as their peoples are preparing themselves to rule their own destiny.
- Ensuring the legitimacy of international interventions by using the UN as an overall umbrella in sectors such as Security Sector Reform, civil-military relations, state-building (strengthening of institutions and the rule of law) and the organisation of democratic elections. Moreover, the legislative framework for economic activities in those countries should be enhanced in order to ensure a good business environment for the private sector and the civil societies to operate.
- Devising new and creative approaches by establishing burden-sharing rules for the numerous international organisations.
- Reinstituting a real dialogue with its Southern and Eastern neighbours in a region rich in economic resources.
- Fostering the establishment and empowerment of regional institutions around the Mediterranean Sea.
- Considering the Arab Spring not as a threat, but rather an opportunity. Europe is already losing influence in the Gulf region, where its investments are declining and shifting towards Asia.

In sum, Europe should keep in mind that what happens in this region remains vital for Europe too, at a time when the 'old continent' risks becoming the periphery of the world in view of Asia's rise. Europe's future will be bright and peaceful only if the Middle East enjoys the same fate.

## SESSION III Negotiation: more issues

### "The challenge of integrating multiple issues into coherent diplomacy"

**Alan HENRIKSON, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University**

Among the 'functions' of a diplomatic mission listed in Article 3 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, negotiation – "Negotiating with the Government of the receiving State" – arguably is the most important. It is the primary method by which a state attempts to control its relations with other states, and is therefore political by its very nature. With the increasing variety of issues to be negotiated with other states, bilaterally as well as in multilateral settings, the degree of complexity – procedural as well as substantive – confronting diplomats has risen to such a level as to challenge the capacity of the diplomatic institution and its personnel to handle it. 'Managing complexity', it has been suggested, is the major new task for diplomacy.

However, without either the specialised knowledge or richness of professional experience that negotiators in highly technical fields such as international health or raw-materials markets usually have, diplomats, regarded by many (even by themselves) as 'generalists', can be relegated to the near-impossible task of 'coordinating' the work of others, who do the real, substantive work.

Rather than settling into this hollowed-out role, diplomats would do well to assert themselves in the following way: as the essential providers of political understanding – particularly of foreign governments and the influences that bear on them and also of the institutional realities of international governance. Coordination is, of course, necessary for the diplomatic system of a country to work. A diplomat's 'political' understanding is deeper and more strategic. It should encompass not only foreign situations but also the administrative mechanisms and surrounding social and economic structures of his/her own country. The nexus between the domestic and the foreign, with chains of foreign policy activity in different fields constantly revolving, inward and outward, is a complex dynamic. Management of this process – or these many processes – requires, according to theorists of complexity management, an overall, or holistic, approach, alongside a compelling and sound strategy, transparency as to actual costs and benefits, and an ability to make trade-offs in order to achieve total value.

In short, a national policy system must be directive, informative, and adaptive. The role of the diplomat, working at home or abroad, can be to help identify the facts and factors that are most policy relevant, and to insert that informed assessment into the policy planning process as well as the negotiating process. The heads of missions

to technical conferences may justifiably be senior experts in their particular fields. But professional diplomats, included as members of those missions, can provide valuable perspectives as well as local knowledge. By the same token, bringing specialists in scientific and economic matters into Ministries of Foreign Affairs can bring about interpersonal and intellectual interchange that produces more policy coherence and negotiating force.


**"Global health diplomacy"**
**Thomas ZELTNER, The Graduate Institute Geneva**

Global health diplomacy is a new and rapidly growing discipline. At the multilateral level, it can be considered a method for reaching compromise and consensus in matters pertaining to health, usually in the face of other interests related to power politics and economic interests, but also to values and principles. Health diplomacy is – as is all diplomacy – an essentially political process. As health becomes politically more relevant – in both domestic and foreign policies – health diplomacy plays an increasingly important role. For instance, health as a business sector is the second most important economic sector worldwide, which means increasing amounts of money and potential conflicts of interests in the way it can be spent.

Global health diplomacy can be best understood by looking at its five main characteristics:

1. the nature of the subject matter: health is a trans-boundary concern for all nations, requires joint action, and has a 'global public goods' character;
2. the role of science and scientists: the response to the spread of disease is heavily dependent on understanding the causes, and the productive interface between diplomats and health experts is critical to successful health negotiations;

3. the complexity of negotiations: the interface between diplomacy and science, the multi-level, multi-factor and multi-actor negotiations and potential repercussions for trade, power relations and values are altogether causes for complicated negotiations. Moreover, since health issues are very technical, science may be seen as too slow for diplomats when negotiating and trying to move forward;
4. the unique equity and human rights issues involved: equity is a driving force of the global health agenda since its inception, but has gained force with the adoption of the Millennium Development Goals and a range of global health strategies deal with equity issues in specific ways (such as differential pricing);
5. innovative features and approaches: throughout its history in each institutional phase, health diplomacy has been highly innovative in developing methods, instruments and organisational forms.

Based on his personal experience as Secretary of Health of Switzerland (1991-2009), Thomas Zeltner illustrated how global health diplomacy has matured over the last 20 years from a discipline focusing on issues of developing countries and an emphasis on infectious diseases into an area dealing with global health risks, global public goods and sustainable development. In doing so, he distinguished several phases throughout the process:

- *Level zero:* states rather willing to turn a blind eye on the health-related issues of activities led by companies (such as Nestlé, a Swiss transnational company, during the 'baby killer scandal'; or such as the dispute between Roche and South Africa about TRIPS); international organisations lacking in common understanding of health-related issues (for example, lack of cooperation between the WHO and the WTO);
- *Level one:* first efforts by public authorities to elaborate a more visible and coherent approach (such as the 'Swiss Health Foreign Policy' document released in 2006 aiming at clarifying the objectives in this respect);
- *Level two:* efforts are undertaken at the international level, especially with regard to the Millennium Development Goals (example of the Oslo Ministerial Declaration on 'Global Health: a pressing foreign policy issue of our time', co-signed by seven countries). Health is recognized as an important driver of foreign policy;
- *Level three:* development of WHO leadership in the field of global health diplomacy (especially thanks to the UNGA Resolution 64/108 on 'Global health and foreign policy' in 2009);

- *Level four:* reinforcement of this WHO leadership through increased cooperation with the WTO in order to create common understandings (for example, on the notion of 'intellectual property rights') combined with an on-going reform process of the WHO itself and strengthening its normative function (for example, WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control, 2005). In parallel, development of a 'polylateral diplomacy' involving a wider spectrum of global health actors (international organisations, NGOs, charities, etc.) channelling and managing more funds. In order to manage this complexity, the creation of a 'World Health Forum' (to gather on a yearly basis all the relevant actors; although most NGOs oppose this project which gives, according to them, too much power to business actors) or of a 'Committee C' of the World Health Assembly has been proposed;
- *Towards a level five?* Launch of the 'One Health' project, which focuses on the human, animal and environmental interface to tackle system failures such as antibiotic resistance, a growing risk for the decades to come.

## "Conflict prevention diplomacy"
## Fabienne HARA, International Crisis Group

With the end of the Cold War, the nature of conflicts has changed. Increasingly states have to interact with or confront non-state actors – national and international civil society groups, rebel movements, warlords, sometimes even criminal gangs – often operating out of the reach of the state. The changing nature of conflicts has exposed shortcomings in traditional diplomacy. Today's wars rarely take place directly between two states but are caused by factors such as political exclusion and competition for local resources, as well as a range of communal, environmental or economic grievances. They need more comprehensive responses going beyond classic diplomacy, addressing all stages of the conflict. Across the continuum of conflict, from early warning to post-conflict state-building and recovery, agents of 'unofficial diplomacy' play multiple roles that go beyond traditional diplomacy.

In conflict prevention, NGOs contribute to identifying and implementing appropriate policy responses to imminent crises. They are often critical to the dissemination of information and the mobilisation of public opinion. Civil society actors help address

longer-term root causes of violence, through the provision of development assistance, confidence-building activities, improving education systems and media, or through campaigns for strengthened international treaty regimes and norms. Advocacy NGOs also play an essential role in mobilising political will when the warning signs are there but policy makers are reluctant to act. NGO communities dominate the field of delivery of humanitarian assistance, and they play an important role in reconstruction. Civil society has, in recent years, even encroached on actual peace-making activities, the field most associated with 'official diplomacy'. Civil society actors have supported negotiations and in some instances civil society actors have negotiated settlements themselves.

As Vice-President in charge of multilateral affairs at the International Crisis Group, Fabienne Hara drew lessons from her personal experience. She considered that several events throughout the 1990s had a strong impact on conflict prevention: the fall of the Berlin Wall, the wars in Bosnia and Somalia, and the genocide in Rwanda. Consequently, UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali included this topic in his 1992 'Agenda for Peace'.

Which lessons learnt can be summarised in the field of conflict prevention? For Hara, three elements are key in this respect:

- It is possible to negotiate after war crimes, even in situations of intense ethnic and political tensions. It is possible to transform attitudes and representations, even in such contexts.
- Short-term power sharing agreements are not enough to make peace. What is needed is the building of institutions protecting the citizens in the long run (20-25 years).
- Given the emerging public interest in the field of peace and security, there is an important role to be played by civil society organisations, in particular (but not only) through conflict prevention.

The state of play in the field of conflict prevention is quite straightforward: it suffices to say that an increasing number of organisations are working on a widening spectrum of activities. In this respect, what is then the role of the United Nations in this field? Throughout 2011, the UN has been particularly active in several aspects: the Palestinian bid for UN full membership, the post-conflict transition in Côte d'Ivoire and the intervention in Libya. It is noteworthy to say that the last two cases are conceptually linked to the so-called 'Responsibility to Protect'. Finally, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon has been very vocal about the Arab Spring and the current situation in Syria.

The examples of the two UN resolutions authorizing actions against Gadhafi's regime in Libya are striking: the decision-making process at the UN has been especially fast and efficient. Several factors can explain it: the fear of mass atrocities in Benghazi, the display of emotions by Libyan diplomats at the Security Council, the region-wide sea change, but also (and especially) the key role of the Arab League throughout the process. The UN Security Council has, however, to bear some costs. On the one hand, one can now observe more and more clearly a distinction between the 'P-3' (UK, US, France) and the BRICS (plus Germany) over the implementation of such resolutions. On the other hand, there is also a cost to be considered in terms of relations with the African Union, left aside by the UN to the benefit of the Arab League in tackling the Libyan issue.

## "The EU's raw materials diplomacy"
## Signe RATSO, DG Trade, European Commission

Global prosperity, rising levels of population and consumption have increased demand for raw materials. Energy, agricultural and industrial raw materials' trade currently accounts for about 27% of the total global trade. As most of these resources are not being renewed, there are many implications from an economic, environmental and development point of view, but also from a geopolitical one.

There is a recent surge in demand for raw materials, driven by strong global economic growth, particularly in emerging economies such as China. Moreover, increased volatility on the market is caused by the growing impact of finance, with a significant impact of financial investment flows into commodity derivate markets. The current global situation is also characterised by a high interdependency of countries: countries being in turn importer/exporter and producer/consumer with an increasingly diversified supply chain of raw materials in the global web supply chains. Protectionist tendencies are growing while the WTO is not catering for all export restrictions (such as duties). Finally, there is a need to acknowledge the fact that the EU is very dependent on imports of several 'critical' raw materials (for example, it imports 100% of its cobalt, its magnesium, its tantalum).


That is why the EU has developed an integrated approach encompassing all these aspects, especially through the 2008 Raw Materials Initiative (being updated in 2011), with the aim of securing sustainable supplies of raw materials. Focusing on the

economic dimension of the issue, growing consumption will cause increased scarcity and higher prices of raw materials. Considerable time and investment will be required to put in place alternative sources or solutions to meet the increasing demand. Increased competition for, and supply problems with, raw materials, have prompted governments to intervene in raw materials markets. In recent years, we have seen a surge of measures by third countries applying export restrictions, dual pricing and other measures aimed at making more raw materials available for their domestic processing industries. The EU is opposing this because, when a third country is granted access to EU markets, through the WTO for example, it is desirable for EU-based industries to be able to compete on an equal footing with foreign industries – that is, having access to base resources under the same conditions.

This does not only affect the EU but constitutes a global challenge. That is why the EU is promoting, together with its trading partners, an open economy and a framework with conventions to determine the future rules of the game. The EU's raw materials diplomacy consequently intends to promote undistorted access to global markets by bringing the topic to the world stage (G20, OECD, WTO) and by strengthening its own trade policy (promotion of new rules and agreements on sustainable access, monitoring of export restrictions and tackling of barriers) on both bilateral (Free Trade Agreements, Partnership Agreements) and multilateral (WTO dispute settlement) levels.

## "Training diplomats as specialists or generalists?"
## Amb. Kishan S. RANA, former Indian Ambassador & DiploFoundation

The question whether diplomats should be trained as specialists or generalists perhaps presents a false, overdrawn dichotomy. Consequently, Ambassador Rana suggested the following six points to reflect on this question. Taken as a whole, they add up to today's training challenge for Foreign Ministries.

1. For most major diplomatic systems, the generalist skills of their professional staff are rooted in specialisation, in foreign languages, area studies, and in functional specialisation. That trend has strengthened over the years. There are no pure generalists or specialists, but rather 'specialised generalists', people with both broadband management ability and 'people skills', with specialised knowledge, and an ability to work closely with specialists.
2. Most Western Foreign Ministries present a blend: officials on a life-long career track and those that have joined at mid-career levels, mostly as specialists. Managing these two tracks and blending them at Ministries and at overseas assignments presents some challenges.

3. Training becomes a core management task in this respect. It should be seen as an investment for the future rather than as a cost for Ministries.
4. What is then the best training model? Two schools of thought exist about this issue. On the one hand, some suggest one or two full years of intense training at entry level (in most of Latin America, Germany or India). On the other hand, some countries deliver a rather short initial training at entry level, directly followed by a process of 'learning by doing' (American, Canadian, British or Malaysian systems).
5. There is a need for integrated diplomatic services, bringing external aspects of several Ministries together in order to increase cooperation, coherence, and efficiency.
6. There is finally a challenge of 'promotion', understood as the capacity for diplomatic engagement.

# CONCLUSION

## "Conclusion: training the 21st century diplomats"
## Sieglinde GSTÖHL, Director, EU International Relations and Diplomacy Studies

Sieglinde Gstöhl thanked all speakers and participants for two stimulating days of presentations and discussions. In her view, the answer to the question of how to respond to the many challenges facing the 21st century diplomat that emerged from the rich and lively debate could best be captured by the concept of *networks*.

First, representation: there are more actors and they are increasingly part of various networks in addition to the traditional hierarchy in which diplomacy is embedded. Many important areas of today's international relations (human rights, development cooperation, health, sustainable development and others) would be unthinkable without the active contribution of the NGO community and other non-state actors. Global governance today is becoming inconceivable without the new role – and responsibility – of the emerging powers. These challenges require more thinking in terms of an 'outside-in' perspective. Inter- and transnational networks allow for processes of socialisation and learning. To a considerable extent the lines between the multiplicity of different actors tend to become blurred; they share common interests and they are interconnected. Attempts by traditional diplomacy to exclude these actors risk to be short-sighted. Illustrative examples range from the inclusion of NGOs in official government delegations or conflict prevention, over multinational corporations asking for diplomatic training to the rotation of diplomats between academia, business and government.

Second, communication: there are more channels of communication, in particular e-tools, which function as networks. The World Wide Web has consequences for a profession which relies so much on words and communication. In the past, the advent of the telegraph was also decisive as the first real-time information tool. The media (print, broadcast, social) and diplomacy need to be seen as complementary to each other. The diplomat has to work with journalists and modern media. Public diplomacy has become increasingly important and "diplomats must go where people are". Nevertheless, intercultural communication crises still happen when fundamental values clash in a form of 'public anti-diplomacy'. In such cases government need to react fast even if at first sight a conflict appears to be of a purely transnational private nature.

Third, negotiation: there are more issues to deal with and the diplomats or Ministries of Foreign Affairs are no longer 'gatekeepers' but part of larger vertical and horizontal networks, encompassing key words like 'summitrisation' and 'sectoralisation' of diplomacy. For many domestic issues there are experts in national Ministries or other government offices who have also established networks of foreign contacts with their homologues in other countries and international organisations. Modern diplomats must learn to share their competence with other officials, scientists and private actors and to work together. They have become 'managers of complexity', able to insert political understanding into complex problems and to enhance coherence across issues and between interests and values. They are coordinators, facilitators and team workers.

Finally, concerning training, the modern diplomat should not be a 'Jack of all trades, master of none', but a generalist who has acquired knowledge and skills that make him or her a specialist in the art of diplomacy – a 'master of managing relationships' or simply an excellent networker.

**ANNEX**

# PROGRAMME

## Tuesday 25 October 2011

**9:00** **Registration**

**9:30** **Welcome and opening**
*Paul Demaret*, Rector of the College of Europe
*Sieglinde Gstöhl*, Director, EU International Relations and Diplomacy Studies, College of Europe

**9:45** **EU diplomacy: the impact of the EEAS**
*Gerhard Sabathil*, Director, European External Action Service, Brussels; Visiting Professor at the College of Europe

***10:30-10:45*** *coffee break*

### SESSION I Representation: more actors

**10:45** Chair's introduction: **The challenges of multi-stakeholder diplomacy**
*Brian Hocking*, Loughborough University; Visiting Professor at the College of Europe; Senior Visiting Fellow at Clingendael

**11:00** **Engaging the BRICS as new global players**
*Stephan Keukeleire*, TOTAL Chair of EU Foreign Policy at the College of Europe; University of Leuven

**11:30** **Postmodern economic diplomacy**
*Raymond Saner*, Diplomacy Dialogue, Geneva

**12:00** Discussion: **The use of multi-actor simulations in diplomatic training**
opened by *Rabih El-Haddad*, Multilateral Diplomacy Training Programme, United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), Geneva

***13:00-15:00*** *lunch*

### SESSION II Communication: more channels

**15:00** Chair's introduction: **The challenge of modern public diplomacy**
*Alan Hunt*, former Director, Foreign Service Programme, Oxford University

**15:15** **Intercultural communication crises in contemporary diplomacy**
*Raymond Cohen*, Professor Emeritus at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem

**15:45** **Political reporting in the post-WikiLeaks era**
*John Hemery*, Director, Centre for Political and Diplomatic Studies, Oxford; Visiting Professor at the College of Europe

***16:15-16:30*** *coffee break*

**16:30** **Branding the EU? The emerging EU public diplomacy**
*Maria Kokkonen*, Deputy Head of Division, Strategic Communications, European External Action Service, Brussels

**17:00** Discussion: **Training for e-diplomacy**
opened by *Jovan Kurbalija*, Director, DiploFoundation, Malta/Geneva; Visiting Professor at the College of Europe

***19:00*** ***Dinner*** – after dinner speech: **The Middle East after the Arab Spring**
*Amb. Marc Otte*, former EU Special Representative for the Middle East Peace Process; Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Brussels

## Wednesday 26 October 2011

### SESSION III Negotiation: more issues

**9:30** Chair's introduction: **The challenge of integrating multiple issues into coherent diplomacy**
*Alan Henrikson*, The Fletcher School at Tufts University, Medford

**9:45** **Global health diplomacy**
*Thomas Zeltner*, Global Health Programme, Graduate Institute, Geneva; Professor of Public Health, University of Bern; former Secretary of Health of Switzerland

**10:15** **Conflict prevention diplomacy**
*Fabienne Hara*, Vice-President (Multilateral Affairs), International Crisis Group, New York

***10:45-11:00*** *coffee break*

**11:00** **The EU's raw materials diplomacy**
*Signe Ratso*, Director for Market Access and Industry, DG Trade, European Commission, Brussels

**11:30** Discussion: **Training diplomats as specialists or generalists?**
opened by *Amb. Kishan S. Rana*, former Indian Ambassador, Delhi; Professor Emeritus; DiploFoundation, Malta/Geneva

**12:45** **Conclusion: training the 21st century diplomats**
*Sieglinde Gstöhl*, Director, EU International Relations and Diplomacy Studies, College of Europe

***13:00*** *lunch*