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OUTCOME STATEMENT
Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi being received before the Inaugural Session of Raisina Dialogue 2022, April 25, New Delhi
The Inaugural Session at Raisina Dialogue 2022 allowed world leaders and opinion makers to pick up where they had left off before the onset of the pandemic. The session featured remarks by President Ursula von der Leyen of the European Commission, External Affairs Minister Dr S Jaishankar, and Dr Samir Saran and Sunjoy Joshi of the Observer Research Foundation.

The session began with an acknowledgement of the vast challenges facing the world. From the American withdrawal from Afghanistan and Russian actions in Ukraine, to the devastating damage inflicted by the pandemic, the inaugural speakers laid out a host of tasks that must be grappled with.

In a world where conflict has spread both in the real and digital realms, and once-trusted financial systems and supply chains have been weaponised, institutions that once defined international engagement have been found wanting. While communities have mobilised to fill the gap and remind the world of the abiding power of local solutions, ORF Chairman Sunjoy Joshi stressed the need to create a new consensus for a new world order.

This new consensus, argued President von der Leyen, must be forged by building stronger partnerships between key actors such as India and the European Union. The shared values of democracy and respect for a rules-based international order would help these players set global standards, secure their supply chains and create a Free and Open Indo-Pacific. This partnership becomes ever more important in a world where challenges to sovereignty and the rules-based order have become more acute. President von der Leyen argued that the Ukraine war’s impact on food prices and inflation in Asia demonstrated that the tasks ahead of us are ever more global. Europe’s commitment to playing a positive role in the Indo-Pacific is evident in the newly unveiled Global Gateway project, which seeks to pour billions into infrastructure investments in the emerging Indo-Pacific.

By supporting clean, value-driven investments into the economies of the future, President von der Leyen sought to drive home a message: “With Europe, what you see is what you get”. Further, she highlighted two specific areas of future cooperation with India: energy transitions and digital policy. On the former, Europe’s newly launched Global Gateway project will help build renewable energy infrastructure necessary for enacting green transitions. On the latter, India and Europe have launched a joint Trade and Technology Council which recognises that the Indo-European partnership is built not just on investment but also developing “talent and technology based on shared values”.

Dr Jaishankar found that the diversity of opinion and origin represented in the 1,200 delegates at the Raisina Dialogue reflected the multipolar nature of our times. He echoed President von der Leyen’s assessment of the importance of the India-EU partnership and the multifaceted challenges that both geographies need to tackle together.
“As vibrant democracies, the EU and India share fundamental values such as rule of law, fundamental freedoms, and democracy. Despite our geographic distance and the differences in the languages we speak, we are poised to form the strongest of partnerships.”

-Ursula von der Leyen
President, European Commission
A year ago, almost to the day, a terrible despondency, despair, and dejection descended upon this world. Nations big and small, rich and poor, spread far and wide, struggled to cope with the second wave of the pandemic. COVID-19 will be remembered as the scourge that tormented us for two years; like a malignancy, it lingers on, threatening to resurface in all its fury.

This time last year, nobody was sure—as all certitudes of our times had been turned on their head—that we would meet in New Delhi to resume the Raisina Dialogue in person. But here we are, and that fact alone restores faith in the resilience of the human spirit. These past two years have tested and, in a cruel and perverse manner, revalidated Darwin’s theory of survival of the fittest. That survival has come at an enormous cost, not only in terms of human lives but also in terms of values and principles. It has exposed the harsh reality that the ‘fittest’—who are also the global richest—have little or no compunction in leaving the ‘weakest’—the world’s poorest—to fend for themselves. A verity since ancient times has been accentuated by the pandemic in the 21st century.

Therein, lies a primary lesson for all: Buffeted, battered, and bruised by disease, climate-induced devastation, and the folly of relying on guns and bombs alone, we really have no option but to navigate our way collectively and collaboratively through turbulent waters. The alternative, as we continue to witness, is in nobody’s interest. More so, when global institutions, in which nations repose their trust, are unable to either respond with alacrity or deliver swiftly.

There is hope yet. As we meet in New Delhi, the diversity in the room tells us that we can come together and work together. Dialogue is the first step. Let me extend a very warm welcome to all our esteemed public and thought leaders, participants, speakers, and online viewers. Together, they are engaging in and contributing to the many relevant conversations at the Raisina Dialogue.

The past two years have seen some watershed developments, and to say that the world is not the same anymore would be an understatement. For many of us, there are three important lessons from grappling with a
virus that continues to stalk us, the aggressive and unrelenting political expansionism in the Himalayas, crises that linger in the Middle East, and the reopening of festering wounds in Europe.

The first lesson: The COVID-19 pandemic has made it absolutely and starkly apparent that we, the people—families, communities, societies, and cities—are the single most important respondent to the challenges posed by disruptions. The centrality of these have never been more apparent. Similarly, the importance of otherwise ignored frontline health workers, poorly paid municipality staff, and good Samaritans in helping us tide over difficult times has been highlighted as never before. The urban proverb—not all heroes wear capes—came true during the pandemic.

Global governance institutions and national governments can no longer afford to exclude them from the calculus of their strategies to deal with crises like these. It is time to invest in individuals, families, and societies—the ‘third tier of governance’—that rose admirably and responded to the
devastation.

The second lesson: The crises of these past two years have served to underscore the necessity of embracing diversity. Decades of globalisation should have made us more inured, if not tolerant, to different perceptions, viewpoints, customs, cultures, and interests. Instead, it became an instrument of homogenisation by the rich and, therefore, the powerful. They embarked upon recasting the world in their own image, to suit their own fashion and preference. That forced homogenisation has only yielded resentments and invited a blowback.

The solution lies in embracing diversity and recognising rising aspirations in a world where many identities are colliding at the speed of bits and bytes, even as our handheld devices give us the illusion of an integrated world. To this end, I am delighted that we have been able to put together a star cast of diverse thinkers, a catalogue of varied conversations, and a community of participants that represent the idea of diversity. The Raisina Dialogue is as much about your voice as about listening to other voices;

“Global institutions created in the 20th century were no longer able to protect us from the challenges of the 21st century. We need to refocus, re-engage, and rewire our world.”

-Samir Saran
President,
Observer Research Foundation
it is about engaging with others, not merely talking to or above others.

The third lesson: The relentless upheaval and misery has also revealed aspects of humankind that generate and sustain hope—the enthusiasm of our youth, the determination of our people, and the resolve of our leaders to take tough decisions at a time when consensus was impossible. In our haste to see change happen, we must not overlook the cohorts of citizens, communities, corporations, and countries who are driven by the passion to make a difference. This is evident from their responses to the challenges of climate change, the task of ensuring sustainable and equitable growth, and reaching out to those whom globalisation has passed by.

Conversations at the Raisina Dialogue will catalyse this passion as we discuss the six broad themes:

1. Rethinking Democracy: Trade, Tech, and Ideology
2. End of Multilateralism: A Networked Global Order
3. Water Caucuses: Turbulent Tides in the Indo-Pacific
4. Communities Inc: First Responders to Health, Development, and Planet
5. Achieving Green Transitions: Common Imperative, Diverging Realities
6. Samson vs Goliath: The Persistent and Relentless Tech Wars

Over the next two days, let us not get obsessed with smart words and clever statements that only serve to excite specific ‘silos’ online. Instead, let us talk to and compare notes with those who sit alongside us so that the takeaways from the Raisina Dialogue are rooted and meaningful.

Let dialogue and diversity renew our one and only planet and sculpt Terra Nova—a new world—in this coming decade. Stay safe, mask up, and engage intensely.
Fellows from the Asian Forum for Global Governance (AFGG) 2022 at Raisina Dialogue
After a pandemic-imposed hiatus of two years, we are pleased to finally host the seventh edition of the Raisina Dialogue in New Delhi, as an in-person rather than a virtual event. This dialogue, a joint endeavour between the Ministry of External Affairs and the Observer Research Foundation, has become a venue for conversations among global leaders and thinkers across government, business, media, civil society, and academia.

Yet, in the midst of eager anticipation, we confess some trepidation too. Trepidation because even as the world battled to recover from the devastation caused to lives and livelihoods by a once-in-a-century pandemic, it was struck by two bolts that came from out of the blue. The first saw a dark veil descend yet again over Afghanistan; the second has just redrawn the iron curtain through the heart of Europe. The Raisina Dialogue 2022 now takes place in the lengthening shadow of these events.

Our theme for this year, “Terra Nova: Impassioned, Impatient, and Imperilled,” seeks to interrogate our responses to all three watersheds. We
endeavour to discover how we find ourselves on a planet that looks and feels nothing like the one that saw us gather in these very rooms to debate at Raisina 2020.

Have we moved forward two years, only to go back? We allowed a virus to divide us into a world of the vaccinated versus the unvaccinated. In doing that, we succeeded in reagitating the old, supposedly forgotten cleavage between the North and the South.

Then, just as the fall of Kabul in August 2021 was signalling a new geo-economic architecture that sought to respond to the strategic competition of the 21st century, 24 February 2022 threw us back into the old bipolar global order of a bitter Cold War that the world should have relegated to history, 30 years ago.

Together, these three events force us to examine the political undergirding of a rapidly de-globalising world. The cracks in the post-war multilateral liberal system have now become tectonic rifts. If history has taught us anything, it is that such a confluence of event-chains can alter power dynamics and reshape the world order.

A pandemic that should have brought us together ended up exposing the limits of transnational cooperation. It made us acutely aware of the frailties of global public goods, its supply chains, and institutions. Large tech companies gained influence across a multitude of sectors—from financial services to healthcare—while regulators struggled to keep pace. Authoritarian states perfected the use of technology for controlling lives. Technology spawned a new generation of deep fakes that brought us to a post-truth era. Our health, our safety, and our well-being have all become part of someone else’s business model.

The sanctions following the conflict in Ukraine now undermine trust in the integrity and cohesiveness of the global financial system, once considered the backbone of global value chains. And climate action has been reduced to trending hashtags and empty speeches, as the taps of green finance and green technology continue to run dry.

We are in the midst of a perfect storm, and our assumptions are shaken. It is no longer the time to hark upon our pre-pandemic ‘normal’—riddled as it was with inequality and exclusion. It is time for a ‘new world’, a time to talk coherently about what is substantive and sustainable, and thereby, make the right choices. This is the challenge right here, for all of us in New Delhi at Raisina 2022. The war in Ukraine sadly continues, and so must this dialogue that gathers diversity and gives us reason for hope.

To this end, we have gathered different voices from across nearly a hundred countries because we believe that dialogue is indispensable. I wish you all insightful and thought-provoking conversations that may yet pave the way for a more inclusive future.

“We find ourselves today on a planet that is vastly different from the one where we gathered in person prior to the pandemic, forcing us to grapple with the tectonic rifts that mark global dynamics today.”

- Sunjoy Joshi
Chairman,
Observer Research Foundation
Hashtags Without Collectives: We Bargain in the Digital World; Carl Bildt, Aminath Shauna Anniken Huitfeldt, Hongqiao Liu (AFGG Fellow)
Over the past two years, COVID-19 has ravaged health systems and economies across the world. A pandemic of a deadly mystery respiratory disease was predicted by many—but the devastation and the insufficiencies across the globe came as a surprise even to the experts. For example, countries identified by academic exercises like the Global Health Security Index as best prepared to tackle a pandemic, were seen to be particularly badly affected by it.

Given this context, the panel discussed how COVID-19’s virulence and resurgence could depend essentially on the gaps in vaccination coverage. Many countries are witnessing a “pandemic of the unvaccinated”; and internationally, countries with large unvaccinated populations have the potential of creating new and dangerous variants. There is a stark divide that the world must reckon with: Before the G20 Summit in October 2021, it was found that G20 members had received 15 times more COVID-19 vaccine doses per capita than countries in sub-Saharan Africa.

The uneven distribution of health, social as well as economic risks within and between countries was laid bare by the pandemic. Scientific achievements during the pandemic helped the fightback, but access to diagnostics, vaccines, therapeutics, and hospitalisation were largely dependent on socio-economic status, leaving millions of people vulnerable to the virus. Given the stark inequities, there are innovative technology transfer deals that are attempting to make new antivirals for COVID-19 available in poor countries at affordable prices, but there is a real possibility that are we looking at history repeating itself.

The pandemic has brought forward the interlinkages between health, social structures and the economy, and the recognition now opens a window of opportunity to realise decades of global commitments to prioritise health equity choices. Choosing to act at this historic moment can dramatically reduce the inequities entrenched in the system. V.K. Paul described India’s pandemic response, including a hugely successful vaccination campaign across the country and suggested that there are learnings of multistakeholder collaborations that can be shared with the world. India’s move toward finding technological solutions, including vaccines in particular, was not only for the country alone, but for the world in the spirit of equitable and affordable access.

Initiatives like ACT Accelerator may be flawed, but they are all that we have to facilitate global health equity currently, Ayoade Alakija argued. There is need for reform of the global health governance structures, because in most such initiatives, experts decide what is good for

PANEL DISCUSSION
Taking the Knee: The Battle Against Vaccine Apartheid

MODERATOR
Anjali Nayyar, Executive Vice President, Global Health Strategies, India

PANELLISTS
V.K. Paul, Member, NITI Aayog, India
Joan Benson, Executive Director, Public Health Partnerships, Global Vaccines Public Policy, Merck, United States
Ayoade Alakija, Co-Chair, African Union’s African Vaccine Delivery Alliance; Special Envoy and Co-Chair for ACT-Accelerator, World Health Organization
Jean-Pierre Le Calvez, Founder, Novonda, France
Jesal Doshi, Deputy CEO, B Medical Systems, Luxembourg
The innovations that have happened across the spectrum will have enormous impact on the future of healthcare. Investing in and strengthening national health systems is absolutely necessary, to make sure that the benefits of these innovations are equitably distributed across the board. Unfortunately, inequity is embedded in the global system.

the low-income countries of the world without having any voice from said countries present at the negotiating table. During the pandemic, the global health governance system failed because we dealt with a humanitarian emergency as though we were dealing with a development problem: We moved too slowly.

The global pharmaceutical industry during the last couple of years witnessed innovation and the acceleration of R&D probably by decades, according to Jesal Doshi. The innovations that have happened across the spectrum will have enormous impact on the future of healthcare. Investing in and strengthening national health systems is absolutely necessary, to make sure that the benefits of these innovations are equitably distributed across the board. Unfortunately, inequity is embedded in the global system. There are diseases like cervical cancer which are preventable through vaccination and manageable with screening, early detection and treatment, and yet action has been lacking for years, said Joan Benson. There are unfortunate trade-offs in the system, and a sense of urgency is lacking in global health agenda setting.

Channelising existing and emerging sources of financing for the development of health systems is a major part of the solution, argued Jean-Pierre Le Calvez. There is scope for both South-South and South-North collaborations going forward; but there is a need for the developing world to improve local manufacturing capacity, and establish self-sufficiency at the regional level. The Indian vaccination experience showed that enabling regulatory systems, and developing meaningful collaboration between the industry, academia, government, and multilateral agencies can ensure health equity at the population level. We have seen in the past that once a health solution is available in India, it is available for the world.

—Oommen C. Kurian

Watch this session here
Several ‘unicorns’ have emerged in the Indo-Pacific during the pandemic, with India alone birthing over 40 new unicorns in 2021. The rise of these startups can be attributed to several factors including the supply and availability of capital, the advancements in technology, and the demand in the market. In this session, the panel discussed the startup ecosystem, entrepreneurship, the regulatory framework around startups, and the new economy.

Tan Kiat How explained that startups are drivers for change and innovation, and are important for every economy in the world. He added that since startups challenge the status quo, they are a catalyst for change and that it is integral to harness the potential of startups and innovation. On the role of government, he expressed that rules and regulations need to be clear, consistent, and transparent to create an ecosystem where startups and innovation can succeed. He also stated the need to bring different innovation ecosystems across the world together to allow information sharing.

Rajeev Chandrasekhar explained how India’s startups have diversified the nature of the country’s private sector and that Indian businesses are no longer limited to a few groups or families. He added that the conventional perspective that India is a difficult place to do business has been flipped by the success of so many startups. He also explained how the government is measuring the ease of doing business by benchmarking it with the startup ecosystem, adding that the government is looking to open up more areas to create ecosystems allowing the growth of startups through its digitisation efforts.

Gwendoline Abunaw explained how startups have existed in Africa but were not formalised. She explained that several women were opening small businesses, trying to provide services and catering to needs on the informal front. The fintech revolution has changed the startup ecosystem and a lot of fintech companies are turning into aggregators. She threw light on the issues faced by a
It is important to have shared platforms, such as UPI and Aadhaar, which allow for a healthier ecosystem. Such platforms provide multiple benefits and opportunities, and it is essential to develop similar platforms.

lot of women entrepreneurs, primarily the lack of finance and education, and how programmes such as Elevate are trying to reduce these barriers.

Ajit Mohan expressed that there is a need to focus on the growth of small businesses in addition to large startups. He discussed how different enablers, such as the access to high-quality affordable internet, facilitate the growth of startups and that India has a systemic advantage over other countries due to the volume of internet users. He further explained that Metaverse is the next version of the internet which is 3D and more immersive. India, noted Mohan, will have the opportunity to frame the next version of the internet due to its depth of tech capacity, the number of people using the internet, and the proven success records of the entrepreneurs.

Jeremy Jurgens discussed three points: the first is that the implementation of technology and innovation must be human-centric. He added that the needs of different countries vary, and it is important to adapt to such differences. Second, he explained how different domains will be the focus in developing and developed countries. While the focus of the West would be crypto, metaverses, and so on, the focus of developing countries would be areas such as agriculture, healthcare, energy access, and basic financial access. Third, he dwelled upon the importance of having shared platforms, such as the UPI and Aadhaar, which allow for a healthier ecosystem. He added that such platforms provide multiple benefits and opportunities, and it is essential to develop similar platforms. He also added that opening up data to the ecosystem plays an important role and discussed the importance of the public sector and public-private partnerships.

Sanskriti Dawle discussed the importance of inclusion within education and the need to include all underrepresented groups. She explained how technology can be used to make education more inclusive and that the disruption of mass schooling by online education has the potential to make inclusive education scalable. She also discussed how a mindset for entrepreneurship develops at home and that projects such as Startup India help start these conversations at home.

—Basu Chandola
Global trade and supply chains have become collateral damage in recent years to fractured geopolitics. Starting with the US-China trade war, which offered the first glimpse at vulnerabilities in supply chains, to the COVID-19 pandemic which laid them entirely bare. These vulnerabilities have now been further exacerbated by the Ukraine crisis jeopardising the still fragile economic gains post the pandemic. It is in this context that the panel discussed the importance of decentralised and resilient supply chains. The question driving this discussion was the future of global trade. Would international trade become another geopolitical flashpoint or would a new trading order emerge in the aftermath of the pandemic?

A common concern that the panellists flagged was the weaponisation of trade and the problem of economic sanctions becoming economic weapons or geopolitical instruments. As Anthony Abbott put it, countries have begun to use sanctions as a form of political punishment in response to even domestic policies. He gave the example of China’s trade boycotts of Australian products when the latter passed a law regarding political interference in their domestic system.

Both he and Shamika Ravi emphasised that countries must define for themselves what products are so critical to them that they would rather be self-sufficient than depend on capricious trade partners—who could potentially block the supply of these essential commodities. Jeffrey Nadaner expressed similar concern over the dependence on China for essential items. He explained this using his experience with syringe acquisitions during the COVID-19 response in the US. Almost 5 billion dollars’ worth of syringes were acquired for hospitals and vaccine administration, all from China. He cautioned against depending on uncertain partners in sectors which are essential to our economies like rare earths, automobiles, and components for networking parts of batteries.

Ravi pointed out that while India may look slow on trade negotiations, it is simply doing it in a more sustainable way by responding to the voices of domestic industries. There has been a push for self-reliance, or ‘Atmanirbhar Bharat’, from the perspectives of food and energy security. The reliance on outside energy sources is a real concern with 37 percent of our energy needs being imported.

As observers, we must note that this approach to self-reliance has come into question in recent times. Take the example of India’s recent ban on wheat exports in the...
In the short term, the vulnerabilities caused by economic interdependency with countries such as Russia and China have caused resiliency issues in democratic countries.

hopes of curbing domestic inflation. This has resulted in stressing already limited supplies globally due to the ongoing war in Ukraine. The irony is that the surge in prices was also caused by the war. In a situation like this, India has had to choose between its domestic food security versus maintaining international supplies. It brings us back to the question of trade becoming a geopolitical flashpoint and the need for a new international order.

All of the panellists reiterated the importance of and the need to revive a rules-based free trade system. Stormy-Annika Mildner pointed out that in the short term, the vulnerabilities caused by economic interdependency with countries such as Russia and China have caused resiliency issues in democratic countries. Europe’s dependence on Russia for energy is a case in point. However, she cautioned against focusing only on diversifying supply chains but also to discuss the need for domestic reserves. In the long run, issues of subsidising the development of alternate materials for green transitions for instance will become a World Trade Organisation (WTO) issue. Returning to the discussion on a new trade order, she noted that the problem-solving needs to happen within the WTO, and more effort needs to be put into reforming the WTO.

Christophe Penot spoke of the EU strategy on the Indo-Pacific, and the need to reduce dependencies, and work on economic sovereignty in some sectors. The EU is stepping up negotiations on free trade agreements (FTAs) with partners such as India, Australia, New Zealand, and others in the Indo-Pacific. However, as Penot noted, it is important not to lose sight of how important multilateralism is.

Kaush Arha pointed out the rising trend of plurilateralism, as countries—aware of the institutional failings of the WTO—moved towards regional blocks. This has coincided with countries feeling the need to be self-sufficient in critical sectors from food to semi-conductors. What is clear is that supply chains, which were of general interest even before the pandemic and the Ukraine crisis, have become a matter of discussion for our basic existence.

Overall, the panellists concurred that countries would have to come up with their own answers to what they define as an essential sector. The main imperative is to ensure that no single supplier should be able to hold countries to ransom over things that have become essential to modern life and survival.

—Jhanvi Tripathi

Watch this session here
As the Taliban is nearing a year in power, its inadequacies and inefficiencies to govern are growing more evident. Currently, Afghanistan faces three kinds of crises: A humanitarian and economic crisis, a crisis of human rights, and a security crisis. These challenges trace back to the collapse of the Afghan government on the 15th of August, 2021.

A variety of endogenous and exogenous factors contributed to the collapse of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. Internally, it was corruption, low morale, dependence on external players, and over-centralisation of the administration in Kabul—that distanced the capital from the rest of the provinces, and contributed to the collapse of the government. Externally, Pakistan’s support for the Taliban and NATO’s limitations further facilitated this failure.

But most importantly, it was the divergence in interests and moral values that finally led to the collapse of the Afghan state. Values don’t set the guidelines for a country’s foreign policy—they are promoted abroad only when they coincide and co-exist with a state’s interests. In 2001, when the West and the US committed themselves to nation-building in Afghanistan, their interests in limiting terror threats from Afghanistan corresponded with the moral values of ‘peace,’ ‘human rights,’ and ‘freedom’. But two decades later, as terror threats emanating from Afghanistan reduced, their interests changed and transformed too.

This doesn’t mean that the West had no interest in the country. The US’s interest in a stable Afghanistan was for the following reasons: To ensure a stable and secure South Asia, to mitigate threats of terrorism emanating from Afghanistan, to promote values and human rights, to limit China’s expansion and restrict human and drug trafficking. But these interests, despite being important, were overshadowed by other interests of priority, namely, maintaining value-based order in the Indo-Pacific and focusing on China’s increasing assertiveness and influence.

This divergence of interests and values persuaded the West to ‘abandon’ Afghanistan and shelve its moral values. Consistent US governments had shown their interest to withdraw from Afghanistan—contributing to a badly negotiated and implemented Peace Deal. With the Doha Peace Deal, the US excluded the Afghan government from the negotiations and legitimised the terrorists who had shown no signs of reforms.

With the withdrawal of the US and the collapse of the Afghan state, the progress made in the past two decades also disappeared. The Taliban have continued to restrict women from education and employment opportunities, sideline other sections and ethnicities, and are even...
The international community needs to better cooperate with themselves and with the Taliban, albeit with continuing sanctions and without any diplomatic recognition for the organisation.

struggling to reach an intra-Taliban agreement. On the other hand, the religious clerics are enjoying a significant role in the government’s decisions and policies, and are exerting abundant pressure on the re-Islamising of Afghanistan.

There also seems to be no alternative to the Taliban government as of now. Afghans and the Afghan diaspora continue to be divided, while the nation lacks the leadership to bridge the divisions and unify all the factions and groups against the Taliban. Even the much-talked-about National Resistance Front has not been able to create a national movement. It continues to be dominated by one ethnic group without much appeal to the broader spectre of society. Similarly, none of the Western or regional powers have shown interest in strengthening or re-energising these organisations either. Overall, the future of Afghanistan seems very bleak with the Taliban continuing to govern the country.

The international community needs to better cooperate with themselves and with the Taliban, albeit with continuing sanctions and without any diplomatic recognition for the organisation. The international community should also put pressure on the Taliban to promote and sustain human rights. They can engage with Afghanistan on three levels: Humanitarian assistance, security engagements, and engagement to sustain human rights. The Central Asian powers could come in handy to tackle the IS-K and other terrorist groups in Afghanistan. Meanwhile, the US should increase interaction with the EU and Germany to develop a roadmap for further engagements with Afghanistan. Although their values, interests, and capability to deliver might vary, the West shouldn’t shy away from asking Russia, China, and Pakistan to closely cooperate with the rest of the international community when dealing with the Taliban.

Simultaneously, it should also be noted that Pakistan has hindered and will continue to hinder progress and developments in Afghanistan. Afghanistan will continue being vulnerable to radicalisation and terrorism unless Pakistan stops sponsoring terror and militancy in the region. The Taliban’s incapability to govern and the ungoverned spaces in the country will be used by Pakistan to launch terror attacks against India. These ungoverned spaces might also shelter and strengthen other terror outfits, including the IS-K and Al-Qaeda. Central and South Asia will thus be prone to more danger unless there is a change in power dynamics of Pakistan—and the democracy would enjoy more power than the army. This change, however, can only happen from within and with consistent dedication to strengthening Pakistan’s democracy and no amount of external pressure or sanctions could change Pakistan’s internal power dynamics.

—Aditya Gowdara Shivamurthy

Watch this session here
In the modern world, weaponisation of information is enacted by state and non-state actors alike. The pandemic has hampered the world’s ability to come together meaningfully. Under this context, the information sphere has played two distinct roles. The information sphere has served as both an enabler and a disabler for sustaining the fragile trust amongst and within states and societies.

The rapid pace of digitalisation in recent decades has distinguished the leveraging of the info-sphere by state and non-state actors in the contemporary era. Through highly sophisticated information, perpetrators are able to demoralise and degrade the moral element of an adversary. Support and sympathy can also be garnered on a global scale for one’s causes. Further, views in the domestic realm can be suppressed. The scale, breadth, and pace of change exhibited by the modern information environment distinguishes the sphere from its historical predecessors. Lessons from the past are critical for solving the issue of disinformation. However, the playbook governing the conduct of disinformation operations is now being revised.

In this context, the panel discussed methods to reduce the impact of nefarious online informational activity. To constructively pursue this objective, it is critical to assess the vulnerabilities presented in any information ecosystem—prior to which, it is prudent to define an information ecosystem. Defined as an adaptive and complex system, an information ecosystem is constituted by various components. Constituents of modern information ecosystems include infrastructure, tools, media, producers, consumers, curators, and sharers.

Lt. Gen. Pant (Retd.) noted that the cost-benefit afforded by digital transmission has led to a variety of disinformation actors leveraging the medium for dissemination. Malicious actors exploit vulnerabilities in every constituent of the information ecosystem. Lack of verification measures at the network level is one such vulnerability. Likewise, the lack of attribution at the platform level, coupled with the lack of technical awareness at consumer level, are other such vulnerabilities. The asymmetry bestowed upon perpetrators through such technologies is a concern for policymakers. The situation is exacerbated by a dearth in international rules and regulations. Such measures are critical for imposing punitive measures upon perpetrators. The lack of political consensus on cyber issues inhibits international bodies from enacting measures to that effect. The policy sphere is thus forced to engage in a game of catch-up vis-à-vis emerging technologies. This is especially concerning, considering the recent blossoming of new technologies such as crypto and the Metaverse.

While technology has accelerated the issue of disinformation, faith in democratic system should not be
questioned as a result. The progression of technology has resulted in the threats of misuse by bad actors. Such actors couple and leverage technologies to propagate their disinformation. Deep fakes, social engineering, big data, and behaviour analysis are utilised towards such objectives. Amb. Verdier argued that the design and contemporary dominant business models for social networks “create a space of vulnerability”. The filter bubbles created by such platforms, in addition to the subsequent echo chamber effect result in the isolation of people.

Some panellists disagreed with this sentiment. Erin Saltman argued the variety and quantum of apps and platforms used by modern users inhibits the institution of echo chamber effects. The distinction between platforms designed for private communication and platforms designed for public engagement further restricts the creation of such echo chambers. The call for transparency vis-a-vis tech companies has resulted in distinct responses. Tech firms from democratic states seem open to collaboration on initiatives to limit disinformation. The same cannot be said of tech firms hailing from authoritarian states, which are subject to different legal frameworks. While a myriad of tools are available to identify, review, and remove malicious content, the lack of national-level definitions of bad actors, harms, and disinformation impede the enactment of solutions.

Unlike utopian conceptions at the cusp of the internet revolution, the internet today is routinely abused by malicious actors. Minister Quin noted that the process of classifying disinformation as such is the first step to an adequate response. Swift responses are critical in this pursuit. Further, curbing disinformation operations at the planning stage is necessary for instituting an appropriate response. The preservation of disinformation is also paramount to leverage the content as evidence.

Janka Oertel took this sentiment forward. It was argued that a clear red line must be drawn when disinformation results in physical harm. Disinformation during the COVID-19 pandemic thus must be treated at par with other “act(s) of contribution” in war-like scenarios.

The panel proposed the following recommendations:

1. Accelerate adoption of modern network technologies/protocols such as IPV6 to ensure verification at the network level.
2. Institute national legislation to facilitate attribution of disinformation actors, akin to the European Union’s Digital Security Act.
3. Institute/accelerate technical awareness/digital literacy programmes.
4. Institute national-level definitions of bad actors, harms, and disinformation.
5. Call out disinformation as it occurs through collaborations with civil authorities and academia in a swift manner.
6. Declassify intelligence about false-flag information operation prior to their execution.
7. Transparency through exposes and press coverage should be preferred over counter disinformation operations.
8. Institute strong accountability frameworks for companies akin to the UK’s Digital Service Act. Under such frameworks, companies must be subject to an independent authority with audit powers.
9. Promote, within governments and corporations, the use of emerging technologies such as Artificial Intelligence (AI) and machine learning to detect and curb activities by bots and disinformation campaigns.
11. Integrate coursework on online harms in early childhood education.

The panel emphasised the distinction between misinformation and disinformation. The argumentative characteristics of a democratic society must be preserved, even when debate turns a bit ugly. Any counter-disinformation measures must not weaken democracy. Measures such as counter-disinformation and counter-censorship, may assist in attaining intermediate victories. However, the result of such measures would constitute a loss of democracy.

New models must be devised by democratic systems which are subject to the procedures established by law, rule of law, and due process of law. Transparency, therefore, serves as a weapon in this battle.

—Samyak Rai Leekha
In his Welcome Address, V. Muraleedharan stated that as India celebrates 75 years of independence, its foreign policy has assumed greater significance. It is perhaps clichéd to say that “foreign policy begins at home”, but that continues to be a core tenet of India’s foreign policy.

The domestic, political, economic and social decisions are increasingly finding their complementary cause or effect at the foreign policy level. This is because foreign policy cannot be detached from the domestic landscape and ground realities. They are part of a people-policy continuum. Gone are the days when foreign policy was decided in board rooms. Now citizens in remote corners are interested in diplomatic developments.

In India’s villages and streets, issues of foreign policy are being debated. We have been able to offer the global to the local. People’s choices, views and aspirations are being heard today. In other words, foreign policy is being driven by a bottom-up approach. Local communities are making interventions and policy-makers are reshaping their traditional approach to foreign policy. From climate change to economics, from health to technology, domestic pulls and demands are driving policy responses in ways that were unimaginable a few years back. The principles of accommodation, inclusion and representation have become key to any state’s decision-making. In this people-centric process, we are finding newer trajectories that allow India to respond better to noble ideas and institutions. For a democracy like India, this rootedness only strengthens our character and makes the external engagements more viable and sustainable.

The world is going through one of the biggest health and economic crisis of modern times. We have been facing unprecedented challenges due to the COVID-19 pandemic. India, today, is at the forefront of the global fight against the pandemic through our successful indigenous vaccine programmes that have benefited the entire world. As a
result of geopolitical developments, most nation states are increasingly turning inwards and responding to the demands of their domestic populace. In contrast, India’s guiding principle of ‘Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam’ (world is one family) has only strengthened its innate globalism.

Even at the height of the global COVID-19 crisis, India never shied away from its original and global responsibilities. The ‘Atmanirbhar Bharat’ or ‘Self-Reliant India’ vision is geared towards strengthening domestic resilience and reducing external dependence in critical sectors. It is very much in tune with the changing global order and makes us no less responsible a stakeholder in catering to the global commons. ‘Atmanirbhatta’ or ‘Self-Reliance’ is not just an economic policy, it is a clear vision of our leadership which looks after its citizen and that of the wider world with care and responsibility.

If the COVID-19 pandemic has taught us anything, it is that disruptions do not respect geographical boundaries. Vulnerabilities can be felt thousands of miles away from the epicentre. It is in recognising this interconnectedness and identifying the need to strengthen supply chains that our self-reliance mantra is grounded on.

The 13-million strong Indian diaspora plays a significant role in shaping our foreign policy under the aegis of Prime
At 75, India is entering a dynamic phase in its foreign policy making—striving to keep its political, socioeconomic and technological dimensions tightly fastened to domestic values and aspirations.

Minister Narendra Modi. His international ministerial trips, engagements with world leaders and interactions with the Indian diaspora are not just news to the common citizen back home. It is an emotional connection that he makes with his fellow brethren abroad who are also interested in shaping a new India.

It is this strong connect that common citizen feel proud of. It reinstates the idea of an aspirational India that the country and the countrymen have grown in the world arena. During the initial days of the Ukraine crisis, Prime Minister Narendra Modi sent four ministers to Ukraine’s bordering countries to oversee the evacuation of Indians under Operation Ganga, which reiterated our commitment to our citizens to ensure the safety and security of Indians across the world.

Operations Ganga and Vande Bharat are testimonies for Indians in distress abroad who know that they can count on their government. The success of the Indian communities overseas has dramatically changed the world’s perception of India and its people. The priority is to build everlasting links with the Indian diaspora across the globe and create appropriate channels and mechanisms for these talented and resourceful minds to effectively contribute in shaping a new India.

Today, the interests of the Indian diaspora, their safety, and social capital in different parts of the world are all being increasingly factored in while framing foreign policy at home. The line between domestic and foreign policy is increasingly getting blurred as India moves towards assuming greater regional and global responsibilities. Its vision will continue to be shaped by its developmental priorities at home.

At 75, India is entering a dynamic phase in its foreign policymaking—striving to keep its political, socioeconomic, and technological dimensions tightly fastened to domestic values and aspirations. This new India is willing more than ever to engage with the wider international community with a self-confidence rooted in its unique civilisational ethos. Taking everyone along this journey, India remains committed to shaping a global order that is equitable, inclusive and just.

—Sohini Bose
Sixty years ago, Daniel Bell theorised that modern and prosperous societies were exhausted of defending or opposing the grand ideologies that arose in the 19th century and flourished through early decades of 20th century. Therefore, he argued, radicalism was dead and a “rough consensus” on a liberal political order had emerged. Sixty years later, the world is richer than Bell’s. However, it is also far more at odds, and often finds itself teetering between the virtual and real. Ideologies, often veering to the extreme, proliferate by the day, constantly contesting what were considered settled political arrangements for societies, communities and nations.

In a rapidly polarising world, whether on the streets or on virtual platforms, the fate of the liberal order lies at stake. The session sought to answer several questions: Is a liberal order an oxymoron when liberalism itself has no modern-day variant? Is a democratic political regime the secret sauce to bind collectives in the future, or will it be the preferences of the dominant citizenry?

We live in extremely dynamic times, noted Teodoro L. Locsin Jr., and autocratic and subversive regimes will eventually be under immense strain and crisis. History has shown that open, responsible, and adaptive systems of governance have the best chance of success. What is important is to remember that the democratic process via the conduct of elections is not jeopardised by the actions and threats of extreme politics. Democracies unite not simply because they are democratic but because their national interests align.

There is a need for a new generation of leadership to address the stress that governments find themselves under. The future of the liberal order, however, is not as bleak as it is often made out to be, argued Stephen Harper. Over time, global alliances have developed shared value systems and governance frameworks which have enabled nations to face unilateral threats—such as the invasion of Ukraine by Russia.

In a similar vein, Carl Bildt spoke of the strength of liberal societies, as evidenced by the fact that we have open debates on the nature of governance—a conversation that is entirely absent in countries like Russia and China.

The narrative of the ‘End of History’ over 30 years ago was presumptive in its belief that the whole world would subscribe to the liberal order. Several countries have gone against the grain—the most notable of them all? China.
There has never been any evidence that China is moving towards a liberal system.

On the Ukraine crisis, Bildt presented strong views on the respect for the territorial sovereignty of states. Calling it a “fundamental component of preserving a peaceful and functional world order”, Bildt asserted that the supreme international crime is the crime of war.

Liberalism is not what it used to be, argued Baijayant Panda. The debate on the contours of free speech, the moderation of content on internet-based platforms, etc. are just some instances of how the concept and its functioning have changed in modern times.

In India, those who call themselves liberal, said Panda, stand for certain principles that are similar to no other country in the world, particularly those on the left-of-centre spectrum of politics. This political stance is greatly distinct from classical western liberal values. Modern India has transitioned away from an era of diffidence during the colonial period to one of confidence today, as it looks to actively engage with the world. India, in particular, is viewed as a collaborative nation by the whole world.

Jane Holl Lute averred that democracy is thriving via liberal values of freedom and equality under the rule of law. “I don’t think there is anyone in this world who does not yearn to be free”, said Lute. But what we see around us today is a redefining of the “we” or the otherisation which is leading to the trampling of liberal values—a phenomenon that, as per Lute, is taking us back to the 1930s. Politics, the world over, has shown that winners need to be generous in the context of not only democracies but also liberalism. It is not democracy that is under strain—but rather liberalism.

With such dynamic shifts in the global system and ever-changing geopolitical developments, the question remains: Whose rules are we talking about when we discuss a rules-based order? It is time that the world—and the West in particular—admits that to live in a rules-based world, the rules must be adapted to the needs of the 21st-century world order.

—Noyontara Gupta
A broad consensus has emerged that the world is undergoing a profound change. At the turn of this decade, the world was confronted with multiple global shocks; the cascading effects of the pandemic, the Afghanistan crisis, the Ukraine war, and the intensification of the great power rivalry between the West and Russia and the United States and China that have undermined the international order.

Against this backdrop, Dr S. Jaishankar explained how India had developed its operational metric in response to such changing dynamics. India had devised its grand strategy that divided the world into three concentric circles: immediate neighbourhood, extended neighbourhood, and the entire global stage—therefore, gaining clarity on how it wanted to engage with the world. This strategy needs to be bolstered by developing its capabilities through self-reliance to shoulder greater responsibilities and to develop a narrative of a new India.

As the world is reeling under the most recent shock—the Ukraine war—many of the questions during the AMA dealt with India’s response to the aggression of Russia in Ukraine. In response to the Foreign Minister of Norway, Anniken Huitfeldt’s question on the crisis, Jaishankar reiterated India’s stance that called for an urgent cessation of fighting, the need to return to diplomacy and dialogue, and to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of nations. But the larger expectation for India to support the votaries of the international system as expected from the largest democracy seems to be a tall order, simply because different countries have different priorities and how they tackle a conflict is shaped by their history, values, and interests.
The Ukraine crisis is a dominant crisis but the world continues to be weighed down by other equally important challenges such as climate and the energy crisis.

The constant rhetoric that the Ukraine crisis is “threatening” the world order and is not a regional conflict by a revisionist state, and that it will embolden other countries in Asia to follow suit creates the narrative that no such challenges have emerged in Asia. In fact, conflicts that are damaging to the so-called ‘rules-based order’ have long been taking place in Asia, and thus indicates that it is high time that Europe refocus its attention on Asia. The Ukraine crisis is a dominant crisis but the world continues to be weighed down by other equally important challenges such as climate and the energy crisis.

The climate issue is an existential question for the small islands nations. As rightfully stated by Aminath Shauna, the Minister of Environment, Climate Change and Technology of Maldives, “We can’t wait till the world is comfortable to talk about such issues”. In a world that continues to be afflicted by the energy crisis and climate crisis, she asked: “How do you think climate politics will evolve given the urgency, especially for small island countries?”

Providing an Indian perspective to the question, Jaishankar answered, “Climate change is governed by two factors: Climate Action and Climate Justice”. Everyone needs to do their best, while simultaneously extending support to more vulnerable nations in their quest for climate mitigation. All countries need to be trying to the best of their abilities, irrespective of climate finance and promises made in every COP meeting. This is the policy followed by India, as it remains one of the few countries that managed to achieve the Paris commitments. Many of the initiatives that India has undertaken such as the International Solar Alliance initiative and the Coalition For Disaster Resilient Infrastructure Initiative were tabled keeping the small island nations in mind.

Moving from the Maldives to Madagascar, the Foreign Minister of Madagascar, Richard Randriamandrato posed the question if the definition of Indo-Pacific “Hollywood to Bollywood” continues to be accepted and where do the island nations of the West Pacific Ocean figure in India’s Indo-Pacific strategy. The Indian Ocean and the Pacific Ocean, stated Jaishankar, have become seamless—as overlapping national security concerns of countries on both sides of the imaginary line emerge. It was necessary to establish an Indian Ocean community, with the core objective to reclaim our history by cooperating closely and finding solutions amongst ourselves rather than through intermediaries. Prime Minister Modi’s Security and Growth for all in the Region (SAGAR) initiative was referred to as a template to enhance cooperation in the region. More initiatives and maritime cooperation need to be undertaken to further consolidate the wider Indo-Pacific region.

While concluding the AMA session, Jaishankar spoke about how India is ready to play a more substantive role and enhance its cooperation on a global scale. India can make a difference and this is best exemplified by India’s initiative to tackle the food shortages caused by the Ukraine crisis. For India, self-reliance is not about expanding its capabilities domestically but bringing that capability to play in terms of larger global requirements and developments. India has to project itself as a confident and dynamic country that is a responsible international actor which can shape the changing world order.

—Stelin Paul

Watch this session here
Despite the numerous commitments made by policymakers and governments to advance the decarbonisation agenda, the past year has demonstrated just how many countries are still dependent on a secure supply of fossil fuels. It is imperative that the world move towards a total overhaul of its energy infrastructure—however, the energy transition is not that straightforward. Such a transition could very well amplify the varied domestic socio-political fissures, as well as introduce new geopolitical tensions in the global arena. For developing countries, the energy transition is multifaceted.

On one hand, as the countries that are perhaps the most vulnerable to the effects of climate change whilst simultaneously being the most ill-equipped to deal with it—it is critical to find climate mitigation solutions, and come up with energy alternatives that are not only sustainable and cost-efficient but also have the potential to be profitable. On the other hand, rigid decarbonisation measures could also thwart the evolution of a robust domestic industry—while developed countries have already fully industrialised, many developing nations are still in the process of doing so. And
It is imperative that the world moves towards a total overhaul of its energy infrastructure—however, the energy transition is not that straightforward.

here, lies a unique dilemma for the world.

The next industrial revolution cannot be based on fossil fuels, asserted Ila Patnaik. But it is important to keep in mind, that in shifting to a greener economic system, we must attempt to also meet the Sustainable Development Goals.

Anniken Huitfeldt spoke of Norway’s future ambitions as a large producer of oil and gas. She explained the country’s intention to develop their fossil fuel industry, and then invest the revenues from these sources to finance renewable energy. In this way, said Huitfeldt, Norway will help developing economies increase their uptake of green technologies. Norwegian companies, which are already in India, alongside other joint projects with Indian companies, and development assistance will pave the way for future Norway-India partnership in the green transition.

We need a globally coordinated and coherent approach to financing the transition, argued Mathias Cormann. He stressed the importance of greatly scaling up investments in clean energy, and the need to leverage both public and private sector investment to achieve the US$ 4 trillion target by 2030. There needs to be greater consistency and integrity from the private sector in financing the green transition—with clear objectives on what investments are actually green.

Through diversified financial instruments, a whole gamut of investment opportunities can be tapped into. Investors are constantly seeking consistency to assess what constitutes as green investments, and thus, there needs to be an urgent implementation of standards. There is also a significant need for investment in innovation and R&D, and a faster transfer of technology and knowledge from the Global North to the Global South.

Aminath Shauna identified the biggest hindrance to the green movement as being the lack of political will in countries to come together. The world has repeatedly failed in treating the climate crisis as what it is—a critical emergency that must be tackled at a global scale. The COVID-19 pandemic showed us that resources can be brought to bear—and results can be produced—when the political will is focused on solving a crisis. Even so, climate finance and technologies have not reached the most vulnerable countries like the Maldives and other small island nations, and there remains a clear gap between countries investing in green energy and the needs of the most vulnerable countries.

Agreeing with Shauna, Amitabh Kant said, “There is no shortage of finance in the world, it’s the lack of political will that hinders action. Developed nations have to step up their efforts to solve this crisis”. India, he argued, has the size and scale to become a leader in green technologies. Despite developed countries not living up to their promise of low-cost finance, India has emerged as a leader in the energy transition.

As the only G20 country which was NDC compliant, India’s renewable energy story has been inspiring. The future of decarbonisation depends on green hydrogen, the question is, asked Kant, how do you make it cheaper? What India needs is a quantum jump in technologies to reduce the cost of renewable energy needed to produce green hydrogen. The growth of renewables in India has been driven by the private sector and new entrepreneurs, said Kant. This entrepreneurial spirit will be a driving force of the energy transition in India.

—Noyontara Gupta
Countries across the world are grappling with the challenge of shifting from fossil fuel-based economies to one dependent on green technologies. India has set out an ambitious roadmap for its energy transition but faces the challenges of meeting its developmental goals while moving away from fossil fuels—which constitute the major part of India’s energy basket today.

Gadkari stressed that the dependence on fossil fuel imports creates crucial economic challenges for India as well as contributing to air pollution and carbon emissions. The renewable transition provides a unique opportunity to increase self-reliance and improve energy security by facilitating a shift away from fossil fuel imports. Many alternate green technology solutions already exist and the government is working on making these viable for all consumers.

In particular, the demand for electric vehicles has grown rapidly. Many of the challenges related to high purchase price, range anxiety, and concerns with charging have already been resolved. Electric scooters, auto-rickshaws, and cars have already entered the market successfully and even e-trucks are increasingly becoming viable. India is also developing capacity to produce lithium-ion batteries and exploring newer battery chemistries. Green hydrogen is also being explored and there is already a green hydrogen roadmap in place—being well poised to become the clean fuel for the future.

It is also crucial for the green mobility transition to spur industrial growth as well to boost GDP and create jobs for an ever-expanding workforce. The central government has implemented a Production Linked Incentive (PLI) scheme worth INR 57,000 crore to boost auto sector manufacturing and create 5 crore new jobs by 2025. The vehicle scrappage policy will also help promote a circular economy and reduce the cost of production making leading to Indian vehicles becoming more competitive in the global market. The automotive mission plan aims to make India the largest manufacturer of two-wheeler, three-wheelers and heavy vehicles across the world.

Speaking about the role of foreign manufacturers in the EV space, Gadkari highlighted the need to localise manufacture and the role of custom duties on imported vehicles. India already has the needed infrastructure to manufacture vehicles locally. Given the size of the Indian market, foreign manufacturers will want to tap into this market. However, the focus should be on manufacturing within the country and selling to domestic consumers and exporting from India. Manufacturing in a different country and selling in India is not an attractive proposition since it does not provide much benefit to the Indian economy. Indian manufacturers are already producing high quality vehicles, and there is no reason why newer manufacturers cannot do the same. In fact, local manufacturing provides a win-win situation for the manufacturers and the Indian economy.

While the EV sector has been growing, there have been some recent concerns regarding the safety issues associated with EVs—highlighted by a recent spate of fires in electric two-wheelers. The high temperatures in India present a challenge for EV battery cells. The government has already appointed a committee to explore the reasons for the EV fires and is focused on setting strict safety standards and regulations for batteries. However, the manufacturers will also have to take responsibility and incorporate strict safety checks on imported batteries and recall any vehicles with manufacturing issues. Working together, the industry, government and the scientific community can ensure that safety aspects are dealt with efficiently without putting the manufacturers in any kind of disadvantage.

One of the biggest constraints to enable a rapid transition has been the lack of financial flows to green sectors. Gadkari took a different view on this problem,
stressing that as long as economic viability, raw materials, and technology are available there is no problem with attracting investors—particularly in the automobile sector. The challenge is that increased inflation has led to increase cost of material and energy inputs, affecting economic viability. Innovative solutions need to be found to overcome these problems, preventing monopolisation in all sectors is particularly important to promote innovation and reduce costs. There is a need to promote cost effective, pollution free, and indigenous power solutions for the country.

Ending the session, Gadkari highlighted India’s unique position in ensuring a green transition. India continues to depend heavily on coal for power. Ensuring accessible and affordable power is essential to meet India’s development goals in terms of poverty, employment, and industrialisation. While India has some of the strongest green energy targets, the sheer extent of energy needed to power India’s development means a shift away from coal may take longer than more developed nations. The developed world must understand India’s limitations and do all it can to enable India to chart its own unique path.

—Promit Mookherjee

Watch this session here
The “Brussels Effect” is the talk of the town in global capitals. From its response to the Ukraine conflict, to unveiling the multi-billion dollar Global Gateway Project, to announcing a strategy for the Indo-Pacific, to the Strategic Compass, the EU’s actions are being keenly watched. In recent times, the role of the EU countries in the region has been largely discussed in terms of the future of the EU’s defense and security inclinations as well as how the objectives of national militaries will shape converging interests and objectives. Countries like Poland, according to Zbigniew Rau, have opened their borders and hearts to Ukrainian refugees. The social compensation of the Ukraine crisis points to women and children having been impacted the hardest. One of the key challenges faced has been accommodating large numbers of refugees and creating safe conditions for them. Poland has taken initiatives to provide them opportunities in labour markets and entrepreneurial ventures as well as extend social securities and medical services.
European nations have shown solidarity with Ukraine and imposed harsh sanctions against Russia. However, the effectiveness of these sanctions has been brought into question. Jean Asselborn noted that the efficiency of financial sanctions can only be gauged over the course of a few months. Furthermore, it was crucial for European nations to impose sanctions to alert Moscow of the consequences of such aggressions. Sanctions have allowed for nations to put forth the message that actions such as that of Russia will lead to exclusion from the international community. Additionally, there has been discussion on the issue of weapons and the role of bilateral relations of countries such as Germany in providing weapons assistance to Ukraine. The Ukraine issue has presented monumental challenges for European countries—still, the nations have reasserted their solidarity and pursuit for consensus to move towards peace in the region.

Gabrielius Landsbergis reiterated the concern on whether sanctions could make Kremlin change its course and argued that there is little to no impact on Russia’s decision-making process in the immediate aftermath. The common sentiment in Europe has been that Ukraine’s response to Russia’s aggressions represents the concerns of several nations about Russia’s motivations. Minister Landsbergis argued that if Vladimir Putin could manage to change the borders of a sovereign country like Ukraine, the intention to do so is present elsewhere in the region as well. Therefore, it is critical for Ukraine to win this war.

Leslie Vinjamuri Wright (Director, US and Americas, Chatham House, United Kingdom) pointed out the importance of unity in the face of adversity in case of the Ukraine war. Wright posited that it was necessary for the West to reaffirm its commitment to a united front and stand up for the basic cause of protecting sovereignty in case of a prolonged war. As countries push for strategic sovereignty, it means that European nations must not rely on Russia for energy, the United States for security and China for money.

Rachel Rizzo highlighted that Europe has shown immense solidarity with Ukraine through enforcing sanctions. For example, Germany extended a US$100 billion fund for military investment. However, the longer the war wages on, an important question emerges on how political capital is truly spent by other nations on fighting the war. Rizzo contended that the US consistency must also reflect on its role in Europe where it finds itself which is heavily reliant on the security guarantees.

The predominant consensus amongst European politicians is that there is a high level of unity and understanding on what must be done to achieve peace in the region and the European Union is trying to do what is best based on its own assessment of the stakes and the situation in the Ukraine war. The primary dilemma faced by European leaders, as the Ukraine war wages on, has been on how to protect and provide human rights and reconcile with international humanitarian law while also trying to preserve the economic well-being of the society. Minister Rau argued that if in the quest to preserve one’s own economic well-being, a country must not overlook the other’s protection of human rights as it will lead to a higher price for the former in the long-term.

Furthermore, it is important to acknowledge that Putin is the product of a non-democratic country. As a result, it is important for international organisations like the UN Security Council and European countries to realise that there is a need to invest in mechanisms and approaches that do not foster political figures that support or push for war. The Ukraine war has added to a series of events such as the COVID-19 pandemic and Afghanistan that point towards the need to move beyond the current world order and for the US and European nations to come together and move beyond the confines of NATO to come up with concrete solutions to the most pressing problems.

It is important to highlight that the rules-based order may not be the primary problem, but rather whose rules they are constitutes a larger problem. To get to a more inclusive rules-based order, the immediate solution to the Ukraine crisis has to include rigorous, serious and concrete mechanisms such that the sanctions and the geo-economic and broader economic impacts of such a war as badly as they have historically and continue to do so in Ukraine.

—Pulkit Mohan
According to the IRENA’s Global Renewables Outlook, achieving full carbon neutrality would require cumulative energy investments of US$130 trillion by 2050. Annual investments of US$5.7 trillion until 2030 is considered necessary including the imperative to redirect US$0.7 trillion annually away from fossil fuels to avoid stranded assets. Green investments are becoming increasingly critical to not only avoid a climate disaster but also for providing nations with the opportunity to decouple from the costs of fossil fuels, reduce energy imports while driving economic growth and new jobs.

There is a broad consensus today that given the limited financial capacity of the public sector, particularly constrained since the pandemic, the energy transition will be driven by private capital and financial markets. However, the recent global climate financial flows lay bare a financial architecture which is grossly mis-aligned with the internationally agreed climate objectives as well as intrinsically skewed against a fair and inclusive energy transition in developing nations. While the total climate finance has steadily increased over the last decade, an increase of at least 590 percent in annual climate finance is required to meet climate targets by 2030. Adaptation finance continues to lag, majority of climate finance mobilised remains in its country of origin and the bulk of the climate finance is often raised as debt of which low-
cost concessional finance is a meagre percentage.

While banking institutions acknowledge that climate change-related physical and transition risks can cause potentially large negative shocks in their portfolio, many shy away from making conscious and concerted efforts to steer their investments away from carbon intensive projects and supply chains. Gwendoline Abunaw shed light on the various challenges banking institutions face when getting on the green bandwagon, which range from regulatory bottlenecks, lack of sector knowledge, information asymmetry to the very inherent characteristic of banks as risk-averse entities. She further added that the capital adequacy constraints and policies imposed by regulators and governments of recipient nations are not always conducive to encourage green investments. This is particularly the case in developing countries, where the problem is often compounded by political and currency related risk perceptions, which escalate the cost of borrowing and diminish the financial viability of green investments.

Amitabh Kant offered a promising approach to the climate finance gridlock, championing the role of multilateral development banks to channelise greater private capital by providing risk mitigation services. MDBs which were initially designed for the post WW-II era will have to be reconfigured to accommodate the desideratum of current global challenges, particularly climate change. He argued that an effective MDB reform can unlock large pools of private capital via first loss guarantees, credit enhancement and blended finance mechanisms. The importance of concessional finance was underscored for both incentivising private capital investments as well as accelerating the decarbonisation process. The argument was furthered by Christian Kettel Thomsen who added that MDBs can be instrumental in enhancing the capacity of private capital to invest in nascent and risk prone green technologies as well as under-served geographies. To this end, he emphasised the importance of imparting the right financial and technical skills to investors so they can understand and effectively engage in the landscape.

Green investments are particularly more complex and difficult to induce in emerging economies. Given Abunaw’s vast experience in mobilising capital for developing nations, she underscored the importance of micro-finance for SMEs which account for majority of businesses in the geography and are important contributors to job creation and economic development. This should be complemented with efforts on capacity building and knowledge sharing to embed green and sustainable practices in the business approach. She further emphasised the critical role of digital platforms and technology to improve and extend financial services to the underbanked and un-banked demographics, particularly relevant from the lens of climate justice and equity.

The panel unanimously agreed on the importance and urgency to establish a well-defined and structured green taxonomy which can support better-informed and more efficient decision making and response to investment opportunities. Currently, there exists massive ambiguity over what constitutes green and has often lead to greenwashing concerns amidst varying terminologies and guiding standards applied globally. While commendable efforts have been achieved by the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) to improve and increase transparent, reliable and comparable reporting of climate-related financial information by companies, adoption and implementation of TCFD guidelines remain weak. Alluding to the EU Green Taxonomy, Thomson opined on the importance of building standardised investment frameworks to guide climate-centric capital allocation decision making.

There is no denying that capital and opportunities will flow to countries and companies that embrace the green agenda. Hence, it is imperative that we build an effective global financial architecture as well as domestic regulatory policies that support green growth. Promoting standardisation of frameworks, transparency in disclosures, and innovation of financial instruments and local institutions will be critical. Cooperation and collaboration on climate action and finance is key to achieving our set climate goals and platforms such as the G20—particularly with the troika formed by Indonesia, India, and Brazil—should be leveraged to push forward the agenda of green finance as well as an inclusive climate transition.

— Mannat Jaspal

Watch this session here
There is an unprecedented opportunity today with digital technologies to accelerate progress on the Sustainable Development Goals. From delivering specialised health care in rural areas to tailoring nutritional interventions for mothers, data and Artificial Intelligence hold the key to 21st century healthcare.

In the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic, resilient and effective healthcare systems matter more than ever for developing nations. In leveraging these new technologies for health, developing countries must contend with inadequate infrastructure and foreign players seeking to hoover local data. The AI-based drug discovery and vaccine rollout has been a boon in light of COVID-19. Technology has enhanced productivity, accelerated economic growth and information sharing, however it has also caused inequalities in outcomes, opportunities and impact. Digital technologies have immense potential in addressing health inequalities and bridging the digital divide in healthcare.

Preeti Sudan, in her keynote address, highlighted how pandemic has shown the world that digital doses work and how digital technology have been leveraged with varying degrees across the continuum of pandemic phases. She offered several examples from India on surveillance alert and contact-tracing apps, bluetooth proximity technology, IT-enabled integrated Hotspot Analysis System using AI algorithms and analytics, GIS mapping used for pandemic management and post pandemic economy. From tackling the infodemic, clinical management helplines, Centre for Excellence to get advice from health experts, war rooms have been aided by digital technology—making it faster and affordable. CoWIN (COVID 19 Vaccine Intelligence Network), a repurposed version of eVIN (Electronic Vaccine Intelligence Network), made it easier to track vaccination. Digital technology-based telemedicine has been effective in providing healthcare across distance, thus improving quality of care and preserving healthcare resources.

Data and AI have set the stage for the digital revolution but it comes at a high cost of implementation. The pandemic has exposed the inequality of resources, information sharing, essential supplies and hoarding by the West, and the digital divide—that also exists in a gendered layer—and calls for consent framework and grievance redressal at the heart of any policy and interventions. Digital health is global good and there are opportunities like the G20, Global Digital Health Partnership, and international bodies like IDAIR, the private sector, academia, and startups to form a ‘Coalition of Willing Equals’. The question remains: Can regional formations show the way?

With the upcoming G20, there needs to be three broad priorities—bolstering the global health architecture; widespread digital transformation and sustainable energy
transitions to help the world recover together. With India taking over the presidency next, can it consolidate the initiative and make health—digital health in particular—a true global good?

Acceleration in the development of medical interventions have been a profound and life-changing aspect of the COVID-19 response. COVID-19 vaccines have been the fastest vaccine developed in history and can change the future of vaccine science. Medical consultations aided by digital technology have transformed basic healthcare, whilst advanced mRNA technology is promising for the development of vaccines and medicines. However, access to technology requires a concerted policy intervention. A broad conception of technological innovation can bring benefits with increased productivity, improved health and well-being. AI technology and the revolution in ‘Big Data’ complement each other and helped in fighting the COVID-19 outbreak. It is unlikely that AI will ever replace the traditional doctor, but it may change the way of working.

Kwati Candith Mashego-Dlamini mentioned how South Africa has adopted the legislation on National Health Insurance for the public funding on healthcare services, medicines, and health needs of the population. Funding is pivotal for technology and infrastructure to optimise the use of technology to improve communication, efficiencies and productivity. Telemedicine can be an opportunity in reaching out to 60 percent of rural population where health infrastructure is largely absent. Platforms like G20 provide an opportunity for the digital agenda, and under the Indonesian presidency, can push for the harmonisation of systems on COVID-19 vaccine certificate, along with diversifying manufacturing and production of vaccines by creating regional hubs.

The situation calls for patient-centric solutions. Technology can improve and transform healthcare for a more resilient health system. Technology can assist with last mile connectivity, so no one is left behind. There is a need for innovation on products, access and policy making, with a vision of new technology fitting into the global health structure. There is a need for universality in healthcare, with all people having equal access to health services—from prevention to treatment. Lastly, the potential of technology continues to evolve and it seems inevitable that emerging technologies will move the world forward.

—Shoba Suri

Watch this session here
The session on ‘Trading Security or Trade in Security: Europe in the Indo-Pacific’ addressed some key questions and issues that the Indo-Pacific region is facing currently and how the European Union as an entity can deal with these key challenges. The EU has recently released its Indo-Pacific Strategy so with the ongoing crisis in Ukraine, will the EU be in a position to deliver all the commitments that have been laid out in this bold strategy? The Russian invasion has brought in tectonic shifts in the geopolitical landscape. Will this ongoing crisis affect the Trans-Atlantic unity—or the European unity? Will it have an impact on Europe emerging as a global actor, especially in the Indo-Pacific?

Europe is more united now as it finds common purpose in defending democracy. The Ukraine crisis has evolved into a crisis-multiplier, amplifying the already cumbersome energy crisis and the food crisis, and as a result—impacting the people of the developing world even more significantly.

An attack on a country’s territorial integrity is an attack on a country’s democracy and also the international order. The Indo-Pacific is going through profound changes with old and new partnerships like the Quad and AUKUS emerging. While there were doubts that the EU might not act decisively, it did adopt a common position on the crisis. In the international order, the EU, understandably, plays an important role.

The EU’s Indo-Pacific Strategy comes as a bold statement, but historically, the EU has struggled to deal with a number of strategic issues together, and so the question remains: Is the EU now capable of walking the talk, especially with regard to its commitments towards the Indo-Pacific and its partners?

The EU benefited significantly from the rules-based international order that evolved after the Second World War. This rules-based order now faces multi-layered pressures in not just Europe or the Indo-Pacific, but also the rest of the world. The EU, as a global actor, needs to show that the preservation of this rules-based order is not just a regional concern, or a concern of a few countries like the US, but also specifically of the EU. Thus, Germany and the EU have come up with their strategies for the Indo-Pacific, as this is a key platform for cooperation for the EU and its partners. This cooperation can be seen especially in the context of supply chains (the diversification of economic partnerships for both the EU and also its partners in Asia) and the maritime domain. On the latter, the EU needs to bolster its maritime domain in order to preserve the rules-based order in the Indo-Pacific.

The emerging Moscow-Beijing axis is also a cause of concern. Beijing is observing the developments in Ukraine
The EU’s Indo-Pacific Strategy comes as a bold statement, but historically, the EU has struggled to deal with a number of strategic issues together, and so the question remains: Is the EU now capable of walking the talk, especially with regard to its commitments towards the Indo-Pacific and its partners?

carefully, a fact that serves as an important reminder—China needs to be dealt with very carefully.

There have been times that China has flouted the rules and has been a disproportionate beneficiary of the liberal trading order. With the EU repeatedly stressing that China is both a challenge and an economic partner of the EU, one must ask—is this a sustainable dynamic?

Can such an equation really exist?

The EU cannot compromise on its fundamental principles and values. For instance, the EU has adopted human rights sanctions on China. Europe is also working to adopt the Due Diligence law. So, the EU is committed to upholding the rules-based order and its foundational principles in the Indo-Pacific. Meanwhile, China uses its economic dependencies to achieve its political goals. And thus, there needs to be clear direction in the EU’s economic policies—therefore, diversification is important to preserve the sovereignty. In this context, India is a valuable partner. This will reduce the over-dependency on China.

From 1962 onwards, for about three decades, India’s relations with China were at a record low. But then it seemed plausible to concentrate on the positives—like the commercial and economic aspects of the relationship. So, the focus was to benefit from these aspects with the hope that this might take care of the other issues in the relationship. But after the Galwan Valley clash, it seems that the clock has turned back to 1962 once again. Therefore trade, security and political acceptability of behaviour remain in different silos and one needs to be careful about it.

India, needless to say, is an important player in the Indo-Pacific. It has longstanding relations with Russia, but it has also developed strong ties with the US and the EU as well. No other country is better suited to replace China in critical supply chains than India—given India’s sophisticated manufacturing base and its potential to do much more. Over the last few months, there have been significant positive changes in India-Europe relations. Time has brought about a shift in dynamics.

There is a need to ensure a secure environment—once accomplished, trade will automatically flourish. India’s external engagement is critical for India’s economic growth. There is a need to revitalise multilateralism and to do so, we must take another crack at multilateral establishments like the UN. Trade can be weaponised and thus, we need to establish prudent policies and diversify supply chains to ensure sovereignty.

—Premesha Saha

Watch this session here
Speaking at the Raisina Dialogue, Wopke Hoekstra addressed the impact of the ongoing Ukrainian War on the European Union and its role in the global order at large. Identifying that multilateral institutions, territorial integrity and democratic values are under threat, the minister advocated for European countries to undertake a geopolitical role along with their economic might. The conversation also underlined the importance of ties between India and the Netherlands.

In a conversation with Harsh V Pant, Hoekstra encapsulated the Netherlands' approach to the crisis engulfing Europe. He pointed out that individual countries were providing Ukraine with weapons to help Ukraine at the negotiation table, since it needs to be as strong as possible on the battlefield. In addition to endorsing the significant package of sanctions against Russia by Canada, the EU, the United Kingdom and the United States, the Netherlands aims to bring those responsible for the atrocities to justice and ensure humanitarian aid to thousands of Ukrainians fleeing from conflict.

Hoekstra acknowledged that the war had brought about a change in the rules-based order in Europe, and recreated its importance not only as an economic superpower but also as a geopolitical player. Pant furthered the conversation on the EU's growing global role vis-à-vis the Indo-Pacific to counter the rise of China. The Netherlands was one of the first countries to have an Indo-Pacific strategy, given the increasing threat from trade wars, espionage and cyberattacks. A safe, secure and stable Indo-Pacific is in the interest of all countries in the region and beyond. Therefore, European states must take up a geopolitical role alongside an economic one. Rule of law has to be applied and the Netherlands, along with the EU, has embarked on this with its partners in the region and India.

Contextualising the current challenges, and the changing balance of power in the Indo-Pacific and the Europe-Asia region, the minister remarked that it is very clear to him that peace-loving and democratic nations seeking stability have a clear incentive to uphold multilateral institutions. Working together and having trade relations is beneficial for everyone. Over the years, these ideas have been undermined—therefore it is necessary to “push back against the pushback”. These institutions are not without fault, but they are the best we have. And so, when required, they should be defended and become fit for the 21st century.

Addressing the role of institutions like the EU and North Atlantic Treaty Organisation in the Ukrainian invasion, the Dutch minister noted that the establishments have different functions, and yet managed to work seamlessly together in times of crisis. Russia has prompted a new lease of life for NATO and there is debate on its expansion pushing Vladimir Putin to undertake the so-called ‘military operation’. In this debate, Hoekstra assessed that the Russian actions are “unjustifiable” and “counterproductive”, as they have brought to the table the membership of Finland and Sweden.

In the concluding segment, about the rise of economic decoupling and the restructuring of existing supply chains, the foreign minister concurred on the need to redefine them. However, he stated that trade will only increase, giving the example of the robust relationship between India and the Netherlands. Apart from the Indo-Pacific being a point of convergence between India and the Netherlands, Hoekstra encouraged bolstering the decades-old relations with India, especially considering their shared values and geopolitical threats. The overarching trend is a positive one and there remains ample opportunity to collaborate on innovation, water and agriculture.

—Rhea Sinha
“Multilateralism has come under attack in the last few years but we need to push back the pushback against multilateralism and make sure institutions like the World Bank, UN, etc. continue to play the vital role that they have been entrusted with.”
The panel discussed the role and relevance of the UN, particularly in the backdrop of a series of recent global crises—the COVID-19 pandemic, the Afghanistan crisis and finally, the Ukraine crisis.

Lakshmi Puri noted that the UN is often criticised for its lack of ambition, scale and teeth, and that where the institution has teeth, there is no appetite to bite. While defending the UN's role, she argued that it is just a little more than the sum of the power dynamics of the most influential member states—and how they act or not will determine the effectiveness of the UN. She further added that although the UN's role in the Russia-Ukraine war has been criticised globally, it must be noted that short of the UNSC adopting resolution for action in this crisis, various UN bodies have taken important steps to address political, humanitarian and weapons of mass destruction-related issues emerging out of the crisis. In other words, the whole UN ecosystem has come together to weigh in on this crisis and support the pivotal role of the UN in providing humanitarian assistance and acting as a brake on some of the concerns arising from the crisis.

Daniel Carmon argued that the UN is not one entity with one message—rather, it has at least two big players or sets of players under its umbrella: the Secretariat and the membership. Each member state holds their respective national flag strongly and sets policies according to their national interest, thereby limiting the role of the Secretariat. He further added that the UN is comprised of many kinds of tensions—tensions between the developed and developing; between the Secretariat and member states; between those who fund the budget of the UN (8 percent of countries), and those who make resolutions (80 percent of member states in the General Assembly). Such sets of tensions need to be understood and analysed first, before one can judge the activity or inactivity of the UN.

Jane Holl Lute highlighted the relevance of the principles and values of the UN. She argued that all global forums where people have come together on the basis of shared principle, every treaty organisation—be it the organisation of American States, African Union, European union, or NATO—the very first Article of every treaty that founded these organisations is shaped from the UN Charter, and the principles embodied in it. And there lies the continued relevance of the UN.

Charles Kupchan observed that the world is heading towards a period of history where there is a distinct mismatch between the demand and supply of global governance. How to creatively address this mismatch, he asked, is the key task before the UN. He further observed that the Ukraine War has apparently divided the world into two big blocks—liberal international; order on one side and autocratic, capitalist powers, dominated by China.
In this dynamic political landscape, there is a distinct lack of political readiness among countries to build multilateral institutions or provide public goods. However, the demand for multilateral solutions and public goods across the world is greater than ever before.

However, there are also many nations who do not want to join either block and are sitting on the fence. This further diffuses power into multiple blocks. Meanwhile, the liberal international order is also facing various challenges and is increasingly becoming more polarised and dysfunctional.

The United States is unable to play the leadership role that it used to in the last century. In this dynamic political landscape, there is a distinct lack of political readiness among countries to build multilateral institutions or provide public goods. However, the demand for multilateral solutions and public goods across the world is greater than ever before. In this context, the focus should not just be on reforming the UN, but also on UN+ solutions. He emphasised the need for more modalities/institutions to fill the gap—forming small concerts or groups of countries that cut across ideological lines to tackle global problems.

In his intervention, Ararat Mirzoyan argued that the UN has not outlived its purpose. At a time when the world faces huge challenges, from COVID-19 to climate change to military clashes, it is vital to maintain multilateralism as a platform for dialogue. However, at the same time, the UN system cannot act in a business-as-usual mode—it requires reforms. It is time to reimagine the operational structure of the UN system so that it can effectively counter the emerging challenges. He also drew attention to the fact that different conflicts are treated differently in the UN. Some conflicts are blown out of proportion—as they involve the interest of the Great Powers—while others are given less attention. For instance, the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict zone generated little interest at the United Nations, as compared to the Ukraine crisis, he observed.

Shashi Tharoor concluded that the UN is the mirror of the world—it reflects the imperfections, inequalities, agreements and disagreements prevailing in the world. The UN is imperfect but indispensable. The best it can do is to prevent the crisis from getting worse, but it cannot necessarily wave a magic wand and solve all global problems. Presently, there is no alternative to the UN, and that, he argued, is the best defence for the UN.

—Antara Ghosal Singh
The post-pandemic recovery in South and East Asia amid positive indications of remittance inflows has been uneven. While projected regional growth was 7.4 percent and 6.7 percent in 2021, it is estimated to rise to only 5.9 percent and 4.9 percent in 2022, respectively. Nonetheless, a thriving internet economy and start-up ecosystem continue to play a prominent role in backing this recovery. Digitalisation offers a unique opportunity for governments and societies to facilitate sustainable economic growth by expanding access to public services, stimulating innovation, generating jobs and improving the overall quality of life.

From enabling access to education services, hospital beds, medicines, and vaccines during the pandemic to monitoring long-term impacts of climate change like coastal erosions, increased flooding, and unpredictable weather, technology has played a pivotal role in making data-driven decisions in South Asian economies.

However, Biswo Nath Poudel laid bare the challenge of accessible and affordable broadband and digital devices in Nepal due to the high costs of importing broadband that limit the usability of such services. The panellists agreed that regional cooperation is central to spurring development in the South Asian region by addressing local challenges through technological solutions and digital platforms.

Existing collaborative models between economies around the Bay of Bengal like Bangladesh, Bhutan, India and Nepal (BBIN), and SAARC have begun expanding the scope of physical infrastructure and connectivity to include digital infrastructure. Shahidul Haque stressed that market forces have shaped the narrative of digital connectivity in recent years such that it has become a core part of the development agendas. Bringing the Bangladesh perspective, he stated that the country had embarked on its digital journey as early as 2009 and has expanded its work on bridging the digital divide in recent years.

Aminath Shauna stressed the gradual shift “from a Whole-of-Country to a Whole-of-South Asia” approach to facilitate inter-regional cooperation on digitalisation as South Asia has demonstrated a significant appetite for advanced technologies. This shift would entail peer-to-peer knowledge sharing on the utility and implementation of advanced technological solutions essential to
Existing collaborative models between economies around the Bay of Bengal like Bangladesh, Bhutan, India and Nepal (BBIN), and SAARC have begun expanding the scope of physical infrastructure and connectivity to include digital infrastructure.

developmental priorities, including, reducing the cost of digital connectivity and internet services.

Expanding on a few potential areas to strengthen inter-regional collaboration, Vinay Mohan Kwatra proposed two modes: a) platform-based digital cooperation, for instance, one interoperable platform for the South Asian region to market its product and services, like financial services, and b) Rupay cards to enhance multilateral payment systems and facilitate inclusion of marginalised communities in the digital economy. In addition to making digital trade efficient, technology can also enhance system efficiencies of manufacturing processes. He expanded on the need for collaborative initiatives to be financially responsible, economically viable and respect the territorial concerns of countries to benefit the economy and gain wider acceptance from people on the ground. Tshering Cigay Dorji also expanded on utilising regional partnerships, like the Bay of Bengal Initiative for Multi-Sectoral Technical and Economic Cooperation (BIMSTEC), SAARC, and BBIN to host events like India-Bhutan Startup Summit held in 2020 to foster innovation and technical skills that can be utilised to address local problems.

The panellists also exemplified the need for regional collaboration on standard-setting as technology is not value-neutral. Tshering Cigay Dorji exemplified that Bhutan’s approach toward emerging technologies is rooted in its Gross National Happiness and balancing the rapid technological adoption with age-old values. Under the leadership of King Jigme Khesar Namgyel Wangchuck, technology has reaped enormous dividends for the youth by fostering creativity, creating employment opportunities and enabling digital entrepreneurship despite the small market size. Despite the positive impact of technological adoption, in the absence of aligned rules and standards to guide the production and use of technology, risks to privacy, safety and security loom large. Internationally, deliberations around technology standards to address such challenges are happening at World Intellectual Property Organisation, International Telecommunication Union and World Trade Organisation—but South Asia remains underrepresented on such international platforms.

Haque and Kwatra emphasised the need for South Asian economies to develop a platform to identify regional needs to influence international technological standards and rules to ensure the prospect, speed and direction of digital cooperation are extremely promising in South Asia. Such technical standards have to consider software and hardware requirements: especially as the regions pick up the pace on 5G. These standards could be further branched out to the Indo-Pacific region to ensure broader adoption.

—Antara Ghosal Singh
The last few months—since Russia invaded Ukraine in February 2022—have drastically transformed notions about the ‘New Cold War’. The invasion has made the world understand that conventional warfare is not a thing of the past; that economic sanctioning is not a fool-proof deterrent; that the western powers were caught unaware; and today’s cold war is about the tussle between multilateral rules-based order and big power politics. In this context, a panel of academics and strategic thought leaders deliberated on issues like the implications of Russian aggression, Ukraine’s expectations from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the security situation in Europe and Asia, and the actions of China.

Commenting on the European theatre of conflict, Admiral Tony Radakin said that Russia’s actions in Ukraine are a catastrophic error as it breached international law, but its consequences have been that the global community has demonstrated that the ‘rules-based international order’ matters. He added that the global response has set the tone for the implications of militaries using force, since the global community is more powerful than individual nations.

Further analysing outcomes of the conflict, Radakin stated that NATO is more united than before, Ukraine will look to the West for succour, and Russia is losing credibility in the Slavic region.

Europe is learning some lessons. For long, wisdom lay in the principle that economic interdependence brought stability in international relations and deterred countries from opting for the path of conflict. This belief has been turned on its head and EU nations dependent on Russian oil and gas are recalibrating their economic policies. Reinhard Büttikofer termed this as a ‘geopolitical awakening’ and observed that EU is developing instruments to reduce dependency.

The topic of discussion then veered to Asia where China has been minutely observing events in Ukraine. As an aspiring global power on the other side of the US in this new cold war, it seeks to establish its hegemony in the Indo-Pacific region. Recent developments related to Taiwan and the Solomons Islands shed light on its ambitions. China too has created dependencies for other economies through its Belt and Road Initiative. Andrew Shearer revealed that China aims to surpass the US as a global power—for which it needs to establish dominance in Indo-Pacific. He added that it is leveraging its trade, cyber capabilities, economic and military might to establish a network of dual-use facilities from the west coast of Africa to the Pacific.

On the question of China’s recent security pact with the Solomons Islands, Shearer stated that it is a matter of concern for Australia as it shall lead to greater Chinese military presence in its backyard. The intelligence expert added that China used the pandemic to its advantage,
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marshalling instruments like Chinese companies, state-owned enterprises and its diplomatic corps to reel in small and vulnerable countries.

The role of narrative-building in conflicts is important. Gudrun Wacker observed that Russia is promoting the story that the NATO expansion left it with no alternative, thus pinning the blame on the security alliance. The security expert added that China is following in the footsteps of Russia, and spreading a similar narrative that the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue is playing the same role that NATO played in fuelling the crisis in Europe, which may come in handy over its designs on Taiwan. Shearer said China’s current actions like economic coercion, cyber-attacks and incursions into Taiwanese airspace, indicate that it intends to pile pressure on the island to arrive at the negotiating table on Beijing’s terms. The intelligence expert also warned that given the protracted nature of the Ukraine conflict, China will see merit in development of sophisticated weapon systems in its bid to subdue the island nation quickly.

The spotlight also shifted to the impending response of other countries to China’s ambitions in Asia. Nations like South Korea have preferred to do a balancing act between China and the US. Major General Jung Hae-Il said that with a new presidential administration in South Korea there may be a move to join the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue. Thus, as the crisis on the Old Continent rages on and the new Cold War gets a lot hotter, it has managed to cast a long shadow on Asia—and in its wake, bolstered existing alliances and created new ones.

—Kalpit A Mankikar and Aditya Pandey

Watch this session here
The Indian media and entertainment (M&E) ecosystem is booming and is expected to start generating over US$55 billion annually by 2025. As the ‘Asian Century’ progresses, there is much anticipation about the possible emergence of the Indian subcontinent as the world’s new “Content Subcontinent”.

Given India’s rich cultural heritage and traditions of storytelling, coupled with its advanced digital capabilities for content creation and distribution, Indian narratives are well poised to make a global impact. The Indian government has noted that it aims to make the country a global hub of content creation, thereby generating a large volume of new domestic jobs as well as meeting the growing international demand for content. Moreover, the rapid growth of OTT platforms and other Internet-based platforms in India is pushing up both the supply and demand for quality content.

In this context, the panel deliberated upon the importance of soft power and the growing global interest in Indian content; digital transformations; the need for powerful storytelling; and the creation of a local content base that is authentic, diverse and inclusive.

The panellists agreed that while hard power helps nations assert their presence, “soft power” is essential for them to “exist beyond boundaries”. Soft power touches the imagination and helps shape perceptions. As such, India’s M&E content will play an increasingly important role in showcasing India to foreign audiences and building bridges with other countries and communities. The panellists pointed out that the world was now sufficiently open to consuming Indian stories in their own idiom, and there is in fact greater interest in a much wider range of storytelling techniques than ever before. Indian films and television shows sometimes use a “mythic” mode of storytelling, for instance, that may differ from certain Western narrative techniques but which nonetheless resonates with Western audiences. Besides, the Indian diaspora too provides a major target audience for Indian programming, as evidenced by the success of Netflix shows such as *The Fame Game* (2022).

Tech has transformed the production and consumption of content in profound ways. First, IT-enabled services for the film industry have emerged as a high-growth and highly innovative sector. India continues to produce visual effects for leading Hollywood films, and more recently some of its own films—such as *Baahubali* (2015)—have begun to demonstrate unprecedented levels of digital sophistication. Second, if one were to envision a story like the Mahabharata as a narrative universe, removing intellectual property rights from adapted productions of such a work could allow technology to enable the creation of countless derivatives, thus generating a new “culture” of stories and content. Third, technological advances have allowed content producers of all kinds to overcome the
As the ‘Asian Century’ progresses, there is much anticipation about the possible emergence of the Indian subcontinent as the world’s new ‘Content Subcontinent’. Given India’s rich cultural heritage and traditions of storytelling, coupled with its advanced digital capabilities for content creation and distribution, Indian narratives are well-poised to make a global impact.

earlier barriers to distribution. Not only are a wide spectrum of digital platforms available for hosting and disseminating content, content itself is becoming more platform-agnostic. Moreover, tech has allowed ordinary individuals to become content producers, distributors, and also influencers on a scale hitherto unimaginable.

Great storytelling is crucial for content to succeed. Irrespective of the format, a story that grips one’s imagination has the power to bridge cultures and geographies. A panellist observed that content from India, Pakistan, Turkey, South Korea and Ethiopia has been enthusiastically received in Afghanistan. Digital platforms have had to cut back on their content offerings because of the Taliban regime, but sections of liberal and aspirational Afghan citizens continue to watch selections of international content on OTT platforms, YouTube and other channels. A perceived challenge increasingly being debated around the world is the “attention deficiency” of millennials. The panellists observed though that young people are remarkable multitaskers, and are not necessarily attention-deficient. Powerful storytelling and attractively packaged content will be critical if young people’s attention is to be engaged.

The notion that OTT platforms have fared better in “India” than in “Bharat” is erroneous, felt the panellists. A significant proportion of the first generation of Indian directors came from smaller cities and towns. And today, a widening pool of content creators from different regions is enabling the production and acquisition of authentic content. Netflix, for example, has partnered with the Indian government to help build the skill sets of filmmakers and writers from across India to build a more inclusive, diverse base of talent and content. Importantly, Indian content is also steadily driving interest in Indian locales and boosting tourism, much as Yash Chopra’s films had once spurred interest in Switzerland as a travel destination for Indians. Recognising the potential and multiple benefits of India as a content hub, the Centre’s Film Facilitation Office as well as state governments are actively supporting filmmaking efforts across the country.

—Anirban Sarma
Wile ‘gig economy’ is a fairly new term coined by the digital platform, the concept has been around for ages. People have had more than one source of income and multiple hustles—but the coming of the new age asks for more dynamic regulations.

The panel noted that challenges to the gig economy operating in a digital world have been quite similar across geographies. The Artificial Intelligence (AI)-led fourth revolution has created a host of challenges, where governments are struggling to catch up with daily technological changes. This only makes the task of formalising the gig economy trickier. Broadly, the panel agreed on the following solutions to bargain in a digital world:

1. **Self-Declaration System:** To understand the size and needs of this economy, relevant information needs to be collected to start with the policy formulation process. This can be used to develop policies—such as a dynamic tax collection system using AI, cohesive social security programmes for availing insurance policies, etc.

2. **Responsibilities of the platforms:** Digital platforms that employ these workers across sectors need to understand their responsibility towards their earners. Apart from engaging in social dialogue and working with the government to develop social security programmes, they can educate gig workers (drivers in their case) regarding existing policies. Drivers at Uber were able to avail such policies during the COVID-19 pandemic once they had been educated regarding them.

3. **Psychological Assurance:** A more assured worker takes up more risk; they diversify livelihood portfolios and become more innovative—and as a result, benefit more workers and the economy.

There has been a shift in what kind of jobs people are taking up and what jobs they are not willing to do. In the words of the Keynesian Economist Joan Robinson, “A job is not just an instrument to economic growth, it is a sense of meaning, a sense of purpose, a sense of identity”. Today, it is important to look at the labour market as not a set of transactions but meaning that is being negotiated.

For the development of a global social protection system, the answer starts with national. Works of the economists Abhijeet Banerjee and Esther Duflo suggest that when workers feel psychologically assured, they take up more risk, diversify livelihood portfolios and become more innovative. While developing national assurance with social protection system for all, it is vital to tackle three fluidities—mobile labour market, energy transition and shocks.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, both international and national migration of workers took place in surges, with migrant workers in cities returned to the rural informal
A big shift has also been experienced in the kind of communities for which the policies are being made. Countries such as India are no longer in extreme poverty but in precarity. Thus, policies need to evolve simultaneously.

work setup of India. This calls for a more portable system. A cohesive social protection system is required to tackle questions of climate change and energy transition and provide core assurance mechanism that is tailor-made for each market. Lessons can be drawn from Brazil and Mexico to devise a system that is adaptable, portable, dynamic, and responds immediately with carbon commitment in place in times of precarity.

The Indian economy is one of the few markets which comprises 80 percent or more people employed in an informal set-up. The formalisation of this extremely high percentage of GDP and total labour force poses a unique challenge. A pre-requisite for deploying technological tools is internet penetration in the 575,000 village panchayats.

Today, digital platforms generate millions of employment opportunities across the globe—which makes it all the more important for them to realise their responsibility and take adequate social security measures. The Indian government is the first-ever government to formulate the Code for Social Security 2020 during the pandemic when it was perhaps required the most. Among other things, it suggests that platforms should contribute a percentage of their yearly revenue to the social security fund that will be accessible to gig workers for a variety of insurance covers and other benefits.

Uber has worked with the government, the National Health Authority, to partner on Ayushman Bharat Yojana where Uber drivers’ families receive over 5 lakhs worth of health insurance coverage. Uber had educated drivers regarding this scheme and drivers were able to access it during the COVID-19 crisis. With the growing number of gig workers and platforms it is important that platforms acknowledge social protection and work together with government and other platforms so that the change reaches the workers.

A big shift has also been experienced in the kind of communities for which the policies are being made. Countries like India are no longer in extreme poverty but in precarity. Hence, policies need to evolve simultaneously.

With evolving societal dynamics and a shift in the nature and appeal of jobs, better laws also mean an increase in workforce. Thus, platform-based gig work requires a regulatory framework to draw boundaries for this economy to play in. The gig economy represents the fractionalisation of the workforce and in order to address them, stronger unification of labour policies is required. Psychological safety, rights and responsibilities of workers lie at the heart of this. There is a fundamental need to create a happy, healthy and productive labour force while addressing the responsibilities of the gig workers to have a balanced economy.

—Ananyashree Gupta

Watch this session here
With the advance of innovation in the online world and emerging tech, information sharing has reached an unfathomable pace. But with this pace of advancement, users are also gripped with cases of biases, especially machine and algorithmic biases. Along with this, there has been a rise in the number of cases where bad actors have been reappropriating new and emerging tech like Artificial Intelligence (AI) that consumers benefit from. Against this backdrop, the panel discusses what can be collectively done to ensure online safety, to address security concerns, accommodate for ethical and political concerns, and how much regulation is enough regulation for tech firms. The panel also discusses the existential question about the relationship between man and the machine.

The discussion began with Stéphane Duguin talking about the impact of modern technology like AI and the interplay of algorithms with societal structures. He added that context and momentum are the two underpinning factors that make tech advancements leapfrog. Additionally, widely available resources like free images, inexpensive processing power, free servers, and free libraries like TensorFlow have made it possible for people to misuse technology. From an act of jest in 2017 to the present-day Ukrainian war, deep fakes have misled and violated the rights of many people around the world. Therefore, it has become critical that regulation and ethics are thought through now.

Lydia Kostopoulos asserted that the way algorithms are coded decides how humans interact with them. The quintessential dilemma around algorithm-based advertising, that is, does one like a product because it is shown to them, or do they like a product and that is shown to them, is yet to be resolved. She also added that algorithms are incentivised to keep the user hooked to the platform, be it YouTube, Instagram or TikTok. Big Tech firms are aware that while a person’s likings may not keep them on the platform for long, extreme content which is based on their liking will. She quoted an investigative study conducted by the Wall Street Journal to validate her views.

Erin then shifted the focus on responsibility: how does one draw a line between algorithmic vs. platform vs. user responsibility? Vikram Sharma asserted that as technologies rewrite social contracts, we need to ensure that it is done in an ethical way and for the greater good. Further, he stated that humans are willingly giving away their agency in return for the convenience that these technologies provide. His thoughts echoed Lydia’s observations, like—is a piece of music recommended for a person his liking or is it somehow planted in his subconscious? He further added that these issues are common with most of the emerging transformative technologies and that as a collective, the
Big Tech firms are aware that while a person’s likings may not keep them on the platform for long, extreme content which is based on their liking will.

world has an opportunity to think of preemptive measures.

Further, the crucial questions around regulating machines to restrict violations of privacy and human rights were discussed. Eamon Gilmore answered these from an EU perspective. He started off by saying that the real challenge ahead of the policymakers is the pace of development of these new technological developments. Policymakers have a lot to catch up on. These have led to widespread issues related to privacy, using AI for surveillance, and social control that operates in a way that makes tech very discriminatory. He further detailed on the measures that the EU has undertaken to tackle these issues, like human rights-based policymaking and involving industry voices in policy formation. His views resonated with those of the other panellists apropos of matters like AI’s subliminal interference and why that needs to be curbed using legislation.

A key point discussed by the panel was the ways in which nation states should collaborate globally to have uniformity in legislation. Eamon Gilmore elucidated that the EU has been striving to have pacts with countries like the United States and India and that laws framed in the EU are in sync with the EU Convention on Human Rights and others. A lot of work is being carried out through the UN as well, like the UN Secretary General’s Roadmap for Digital Cooperation launched in 2020. Organisations like the Human Rights Commission and the OECD have also been doing significant work on framing legislations that accommodate transnational uniformity in these laws.

On the technical side of things, Vikram Sharma addressed how governments can start investing in infrastructure to catch up with tech regulations in the coming times. He asserted that systems should be able to identify issues, figure out an appropriate response, and then implement them. There is a need to go from reactive to proactive for organisations when dealing with such problems at hand. At the core of these systems, trust should be built by design. Other important factors that need attention are credibility and authenticity of the information that is shared online. This led Stéphane Duguin to talk about the deployment of emerging technologies and the concerns related to it. First and foremost, the issue of widening digital divide staves at the world. He raised a fundamental concern that if the working of tech like AI is a blackbox then framing ethics and regulations around that would be indeed very difficult. This has led to malignant actors and adversaries misusing these technologies. The way out is to educate the masses and allow them to practice self-discretion about the technologies they are using. He reiterated Gilmore’s views that the pace of development of these technologies has leapfrogged.

Stéphane Duguin’s remarks steered the discussion in a new direction; do we need to put limitations on innovation or impose risk mitigation measures around it? Lydia Kostopoulos firmly stated that putting curbs to innovation is not the way to go but to accommodate for inclusivity in design that allows for people from diverse backgrounds to use technology. The need for inculcation of critical thinking and digital literacy in all forms of educational paradigms becomes paramount here. From the policy and legislative perspective, Eamon Gilmore highlighted the need for new tech to comply with globally accepted human rights legislations. In this scenario, it is imperative that businesses of all sizes and industry should work in tandem while shaping tech regulations.

—Prachi Mishra
Where is Russia and where will it be heading in the context of the ongoing war against Ukraine? Why did Russia choose to invade Ukraine in February 2022 rather than earlier?

Russia’s decision to invade was, in part, due to the West’s inability to take Russian concerns seriously. Andrei Bystritsky observed that policies undertaken by the West to erect a wall between the latter and Russia is unlikely to succeed and more collective efforts are needed to solve mutual problems. There is no precise answer as to why the leadership of Russia made this fateful decision to invade Ukraine.

Critics of the Kremlin, such as Carl Bildt, noted that Russian actions constituted aggression and likened President Putin’s action to Hitler’s invasion of Poland. The situation right now is extremely dire and will have serious consequences especially for Russia. The humanitarian catastrophe is still unfolding and even if fighting stopped today is unlikely to abate. Fighting will not stop any time soon, because the Russians will believe mistakenly that they can escalate the conflict to win.

Moscow will have to withdraw from Ukraine. If Russian aggression is tolerated, it will have serious consequences for all countries around the world. Therefore, restoring the pre-invasion status quo is absolutely essential. Ultimately, the EU and the West have not been isolating Russia, rather, it is Russia that is responsible for isolating itself. Viktoria Zhuravleva, a Russian panellist, noted that although the war is between Russia and Ukraine, it will be decided by Russia and United States of America (USA). The war may set the stage for a new Russia. It was Russia’s decision to invade Ukraine and the USA had very little to do with it. The nature of the Russia-America rivalry is being played out on Ukrainian soil. As a consequence, the model of engagement between Russia and USA needs to change.

Francois Godement averred that Russia is an authoritarian state—making it too insular to understand the consequences of its action in Ukraine. The Russians, just as they did in Afghanistan in the 1980s, underestimated how resolute Ukrainian resistance would be. The ongoing conflict cannot be stopped without Ukraine’s consent. Although, the Zelensky-led government in Ukraine has formulated some terms as a possible way to end the conflict—such as Ukrainian neutrality between the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) and Russia. Beyond Russia, Ukraine and the NATO, the question is: Will China become a beneficiary of the ongoing war?

On this issue, a panellist observed that China will not be a significant beneficiary—simply because a weakened and potentially broken Russia can at best be a source of energy-related benefits, and China is likely to incur costs...
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in the form of secondary sanctions because its economy is more integrated with the global economy.

China’s leadership will try to justify its own rule over the Chinese people by pointing to what NATO has done to Russia. There are only rhetorical benefits for China in siding with Russia. However, Chinese President Xi Jinping is not as much of a risk-taker as President Putin. Consequently, President Xi is likely to be more cautious in his actions—regardless of the current Sino-Indian boundary crisis.

What about the Ukraine-Russia war serving as a distraction for the Americans, allowing the Chinese to make gains in the Indo-Pacific? To this, the panel contended that the American position is terribly hurt in the Indo-Pacific and the Chinese are very realistic about not crossing red lines.

There are nevertheless divisions between European countries over the war. For instance, Milena Lazarevic observed that Serbia has been somewhat of a holdout. Serbia did not impose sanctions against Russia in line with the European Union, but it supported the United Nations resolution condemning the Russian invasion of Ukraine.

The Serbian state’s official positions need to align more with Europe. Both the media and the government have taken a more pro-Russian stance which is shaping public opinion. As of now, it is generally tilted towards Russia. But Serbia is also a divided country.

Ukraine, however, has to emerge as a free country from the current war, notwithstanding Ukraine’s promise of neutrality between Russia and the EU, the latter must be open to accepting Ukraine’s membership. Conversely, for Ukraine to not join the EU could be damaging to the Ukrainian economy. Therefore, Kyiv must retain the possibility of joining the EU.

In conclusion, ending the war is still distant at this stage. Neither side is ready to make concessions holding the belief that they can win. Any negotiated out must come from the belligerents.

—Kartik Bommakanti
The Russian invasion of Ukraine is seen as a major threat to European security, and has wreaked havoc on the global economy. In response to that, the West has used the medium of imposing sanctions on Russia, which has led to substantial collateral damage. International trading regimes, mechanisms like SWIFT and even agricultural exports are finding themselves condemned to death by these sanctions, as Russia is heavily interconnected with the global markets, a G20 member and a leading energy supplier.

The panel emphasised the consequences that come along with these sanctions. Ambassador Navdeep Suri began the discussion by explaining how these sanctions have affected India, namely the oil trade noting that every dollar increase in oil prices adds up to a billion dollars to India’s import bills. Unfortunately, this impacts import duties as well as the trade deficits negatively, which further worsens the pandemic recovery efforts.

According to Ambassador Kenneth Juster, sanctions are to be viewed as a spectrum of actions that are helpful when focused on a specific scenario, such as counter-terrorism, counter-narcotics, and non-proliferation, among others. When these penalties are applied extensively to a country, such as Russia in this case, they become a more cumbersome tool that causes collateral harm to the world economy. Although these punishments have repercussions, and we must assess how severe the consequences can be, no government wants to engage in armed conflict when these sanctions serve as a policy tool. In the context of the current crisis, Ambassador Juster felt that these sanctions are only a reaction to the invasion of Ukraine, and that engaging in nuclear war will only end up harming more people’s lives.

Manuel Lafont Rapnouil advanced the discussion by stating that these sanctions do not target the food trade specifically, but that the conflict has deteriorated trade in this domain. Ambassador Suri added that these unintended repercussions have caused collateral damage and have only made the situation worse in terms of a variety of issues ranging from food security to oil prices. Rapnouil argued that the primary goal of the sanctions was to stifle Putin’s war machine and its capacity to spend on military equipment, and therefore, while the sanctions may appear invalid at the moment, they will impact the Russian economy in the long run.

Alena Kudzko felt that Western countries are thought to have been too easy on Russia for the longest time and people are now concerned not with what these sanctions will lead to but with why they had not been implemented earlier. The sanctions have, of course, not delivered the final results, but have considerably reduced the resources on which Putin may rely on to remain in Ukraine and perhaps go farther. Although, the most critical point to consider here
When these penalties are applied extensively to a country, such as Russia in this case, they become a more cumbersome tool that causes collateral harm to the world economy. Although these punishments have repercussions, and we must assess how severe the consequences can be, no government wants to engage in armed conflict when these sanctions serve as a policy tool.

is if these punishments will produce the desired results or not, but the cost of doing nothing can be far more harmful for the world order.

Heribert Dieter emphasised a few essential points in the context of the ongoing Ukraine-Russia crisis, and how he thought that the sanctions were not planned out well. First, looking back on the history of sanctions, they have mostly failed. When the sanctions were imposed on Russia in 2014 with similar objectives to weaken the Russian economy, the plan did not work out. Second, from a geopolitical standpoint, this battle has prompted China to extend an invitation. Dieter added that these sanctions have done nothing but drive Russia into China’s arms and this is more significant since China is a systematic competitor, while Russia is not. Additionally, the sanctions to Russia will also stimulate demand for alternative strategies and non-Western systems, where India could come into play.

Following up on the last argument, Navdeep Suri responded that only UN-mandated sanctions are obeyed in a country like India, and penalties implemented without UN authorisation puts the country in an uncomfortable position. Ambassador Juster noted that punishments in the form of sanctions may seem attractive, but are mostly ineffective. This round of penalties on Russia does not appear to have widespread international backing by looking at the UN voting patterns, and as the sanctions are overused, they have considerable geoeconomic impact because of economic coercion. This leads to the broader question of having some sort of international mechanism that sets the rules about when, who and how these sanctions can be implemented.

Alena Kudzko concluded that we need better systems and better answers than sanctions, which serve as constructive alternatives. The dread of which country will be targeted next, or how the sanctions will have repercussions causing economic insecurity is something we must consider. As a result, an awakening is necessary to sustain global order and security in contemporary times.

—Soumya Bhowmick
The Address by Meenakashi Lekhi was an acknowledgement of India’s pivotal role in the post COVID-19 new world order. India has been praised worldwide for quickly administering its vaccine diplomacy in the face of the second wave of the pandemic—along with reinstating its years long dominance in equitable supply of critical drugs all over the globe. Extending different varieties of medical and non-medical emergency facilities along with responding to various man-made and natural crises to almost 150 countries, India’s diplomatic fervour has been diligently catering to the wellbeing of mankind—and was keenly watched by the world at large.

Such a gesture is evident in the several interventions it has offered—not only in its immediate neighbourhood during the pandemic, but also through greater institutional capacities. India cemented its role as a stakeholder in global augmentation for relief and reinforcement of economic and medical aids. The attempt of breathing new life into the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) is
example enough of this aim, which functioned as a cue for other organisations like the G20, of which it was also at the helm for the recovery process.

India has been aiming to move hand in hand with other major powers manifesting its vision of ‘Atmanirbhar Bharat’. In this regard, several sustainable projects to enhance infrastructure and continue its much-lauded curve of development, growth and influence have been undertaken. To implement this, India has been weighing upon its fundamental cornerstones of integral humanism or ‘Ekaatma Maanavvaad’ and ‘Antyodaya’ or integration of every citizen into one holistic amalgamation.

What reflects is an adherence to ‘Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam’ with peace, mutual trust and respect—values that India desires as well as directs towards others in the global arena. As a foundational methodology of existence and co-existence, India has always chosen non-violence and non-aggression, moulding its actions and reactions to the several bilateral and multilateral dialogues and partnerships as well as challenges that has come its way. Consequently, India is endorsing the pillars of its outreach in the recent present, some of them detailed by Lekhi throughout her address.

India has been predominantly exploring the ocean front as a global common heritage and specifically the Indo-Pacific region as a domain of global pre-eminence. As deliberated by Lekhi, this century shall be sculpted by what happens in this particular strategic theatre. India’s participation in this seascape has been concreted with a division in the Ministry of External Affairs dedicated primarily to delineate policies and programs for India’s presence and interaction with other countries who have equally substantial ambitions here.

As Prime Minister Narendra Modi outlined this idea at the Shangri La Dialogue in 2018, in Singapore, a free, open and inclusive rules-based order has been agreed upon for peaceful resolution of disputes and also collaborative efforts for mutual areas of interest. This has been tied together with SAGAR (Security and Growth for All in the Region), SAGARMALA and the Indo-Pacific Regional Dialogue (2019), helping to curate India’s own maritime and naval blueprint.

Synonymously, the purview of interests also prioritises the small island nations of this region, not only just an extension but also suitable partners in collaboration. In this perspective, India’s involvement in Seychelles may be noted with importance, where a ship was gifted to the coast guard for patrolling the nation’s Exclusive Economic Zone and also combatting piracy and poaching, together with rescue operations. Here comes the importance of the non-traditional security threats that the world has been grappling with, and is also in need of collaborative initiatives at the Track I and the Track II levels of diplomacy.

Cooperation is imperative for the management of supply chains so that there is no shortage of critical goods—as has been witnessed during the pandemic. For this, India has been bringing forth integral and equitable management of resources through digital technology. India was already on the digital-first trajectory, with one of the highest volumes of digital transactions in the world, right when the pandemic struck.

Now, with contactless transactions, the country has seen 100 million digital transactions a day with a volume of 5 trillion rupees (US$67 billion), resulting in a five times progress since 2016. This digital reset of the Indian economy has been extremely crucial in helping India bounce back from the pandemic-led economic disruptions. As Lekhi noted, India will provide the diversification of the global supply chains with a balanced approach—an equilibrium between economy and ecology.

Despite the advancements, the challenges of the past centuries exist even today—leading to propaganda-based warfare. What is required is a science and technology-based solution with a cooperative framework. Until and unless the global economic and strategic architectures are redesigned—with inclusivity in mind—the world will continue to lag behind. The time is ripe to identify and unite the international community for humanism and global value system, with freedom, alleviation of poverty, and the achievement of the sustainable goals of development. Only then would it be a new world order in the truest sense.

—Sohini Nayak
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In the 21st century, threats to the global order exist in the open and in the shadows. As a result, the global threat landscape is evolved—ranging from the ever-present menace of terrorism to the emerging threats fielding asymmetric capabilities and military and economic competition. The challenges posed by this complex global risk scenario are manifold. How can democracies bring stability to the global order and ensure that emerging technologies are harnessed to bring peace and prosperity? This exclusive defence panel tackled this central question in the panel discussion “Sabres of Silicon: (Re)Assessing a 21st-Century Global Risk Landscape,” held at Raisina Dialogue 2022.

In examining this question, the panel debated the implications of emerging technologies for democracies, alliances, and the global order. The panellists emphasised that like-minded partners must nurture habits of cooperation to develop resilience. This collaboration has to be innovative and showcase the strength of the democratic values to expose the belligerent authoritarians.

Discussing the challenge of this threat landscape and setting the scene for discussion, Tim Cahill remarked that while the world has been preoccupied with the global health emergency of the COVID-19 pandemic, adversarial states have grown stronger and expanded their capabilities. He added that emerging technologies like directed energy, hypersonic weapons, unmanned systems, and artificial intelligence are changing the character of conflict. He underlined that we need to develop a response anchored on interoperable platforms and advanced networks to deal with the threat scenario. In addition, this initiative will need the support of agile business models and partnerships between the government and the industry. For this, he made a case for finding the convergence of national needs for national security, national economics, and business case for the industry is critically important.

Carrying forward this thread to the panel discussion, Admiral Hari Kumar noted that we are in a contested present and moving towards an uncertain future. A combination of the conflict and emerging technologies has caused this state of affairs. However, he cautioned that this is not a zero-sum game, and there are opportunities for like-minded states to collaborate, as witnessed by the cooperation during the COVID-19 pandemic. International Solar Alliance
is another example where countries have come together to tackle climate change.

Air Marshal Luc De Rancourt echoed his co-panellists’ sentiment when he said that only a close partnership between the like-minded democracies would determine whether we can maintain an equilibrium in the world order or end up with a zero-sum game global order which aggravates the security dilemma. For instance, in the maritime domain, Admiral John C. Aquilino emphasised that like-minded nations in the Indo-Pacific have been working together for over eight decades, bound by the objective of achieving peace and prosperity. He added that the US is working with its allies and partners to ensure a free and open Indo-Pacific. India’s SAGAR (Security and Growth for all in the Region) embodies a similar approach to developing trust and interoperability with other partners and maintaining maritime domain awareness. France’s approach to pursuing an Indo-Pacific engagement is identical. It is also aligned with the European Union’s Indo-Pacific strategy.

Lisa Singh remarked that, in a sense, the breakdown of the current global order is intimately linked to these disruptive technologies. Ultimately, the implications of technological development are determined by how a nation envisages its use. Democratic countries have always exercised restraint in the way technology is used. But as Gen. Angus Campbell noted authoritarians have misused these technologies to engage in grey zone tactics against the democracies.

Another important issue discussed by the panel was the Ukraine conflict and the threat that it posed to international security. The conflict has also shown the changing nature of warfare. Are our militaries equipped to adapt to this new reality dominated by advanced technologies, or are they still wedded to the legacy equipment? Answering this question, General Koji Yamazaki stated that new threats emerged not just in the conventional domain but also in the domains of outer space, cyber, and information during the Ukraine conflict. Therefore, countries must acquire military and technological capabilities to prevent the recurrence of events such as the Ukraine conflict.

Harnessing capabilities for cross-domain operations will be the key. Air Marshal Rancourt also highlighted that the EU’s maritime initiative, CRIMARIO, with its focus on information-sharing, interoperability, and domain awareness, demonstrated that militaries are well-positioned to anticipate hostile manoeuvre from other countries.

To sum up, democracies must demonstrate their will and capability to deal with the emerging threats and evolve a synergised approach—what Admiral Aquilino described as ‘integrated deterrence.’ Working multilaterally allows like-minded partners to foster interoperability on command and control, battlespace awareness, etc. Proper utilisation of emerging technologies will complement this effort and contribute to maintaining a stable and rule-based order.

—Sameer Patil
At 75, India has evolved as a significant global actor. From responding to climate change and humanitarian crises, to global peace and security, to technology and digital frontiers, India’s actions and its crucial role in shaping the 21st century world cannot be ignored. This panel sought to engage with the roads India has travelled, and the pathways that lie ahead. It discussed global expectations from India and how its transformation would contribute to global well-being.

The panel opened by discussing what India at 75 evoked, to which Jeff M. Smith stated that he saw the nation as a responsible and stabilising international actor. Comparing India’s growth to China, he said that unlike the dragon nation, that had been acting more belligerently, especially in its territorial disputes, India, had not aggressively sought to redress historical grievances, reclaim lost territory, or bully its neighbours. Instead, what he found remarkable was how India was “settling its disputes responsibly” and being “more magnanimous in its neighbourhood.” Apart from actively defending the rules-based order and being a “good partner to the West,” Smith applauded India’s significant contribution to regional and global stability.

On being questioned about the Western criticism of India, Smith highlighted the need to distinguish between criticism in the free press and government policy. He argued that the United States’ government policy, for the last two decades, had consistently pursued stronger ties with India and the latter was, in fact, being “courted by a wider number of capitals than perhaps any other country”.

On a similar vein, Velina Tchakarova noted that Europe’s perception towards India was also undergoing a positive shift. Calling it a watershed moment, she said that the European Union had realised how important India was for the global rules-based order. Given the deepening systematic competition between the US and China, she suggested that both Europe and India could build their “own centre of trading power” due to their shared view of not getting “caught in a binary world.” According to her, the West needed India more in its effort to repair the imperilled global order.

Stephen Harper took the discussion forward by assessing India’s current role in the global order and its contributions over the years. He stated that India’s definition in the world was increasingly being shaped by India’s nature itself. Over time, not only had the country displayed a remarkable economic transformation, but it had also become a significant player in global trade. Of all the countries that had emerged from colonialism in the post-war period, India was one of the few that had demonstrated high levels of governance and democracy, advancement of human rights, eradication of hunger, and growth in technology. João Gomes Cravinho agreed by adding that one of the major differences between India of a decade back and now was its availability to shape the world, and its consciousness about the need to do so.

S. Jaishankar spoke about the pathways that lay ahead for India. He declared that in the next 25 years, India should focus on capacity building, delivering outcomes,
Of all the countries that had emerged from colonialism in the post-war period, India was one of the few that had demonstrated high levels of governance and democracy, advancement of human rights, eradication of hunger, and growth in technology.

and leveraging the international environment to the best of their abilities. He hoped for India to be at the forefront of globalisation—one that is more fair, decentralised, and not weaponised. He was of the opinion that in the coming future, India should stay true to its identity, rather than try to “please the world as a pale imitation of who they are.” He remarked: “The idea that others define us and we need approval, is an era that we need to put behind us.”

For the concluding remarks, the general opinion that prevailed amongst the panellists was that the next few decades would not necessarily be reduced to a story of bipolarity between the US and China. Instead, India would have an enormous role to play in contributing to the world order.

—Anahita Khanna
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In the context of United Nation Convention on Climate Change’s 26th Conference of Parties (COP26) held in Glasgow, Scotland, leaders across the globe have been acknowledging the concerns surrounding climate change. Be it greenhouse gas emissions, economic inequalities or financial requirements which confine the capacity of the developing countries to move towards post-carbon economies, developmental agendas globally are being centred around climate action.

COP26 was a landmark event which paved the way for accepting harsh realities and charting out a way forward for achieving the envisaged sustainable development outcomes. One of the key issues which occupied centre-stage during the summit was the inequity between developed and developing world and the need for climate justice to prevail in such a scenario. In this context, India, along with other countries, highlighted the requirement of defining ‘climate finance’ and boosting up allocation of financial support for the developing countries especially for adaptation measures to be implemented.

Shedding light particularly on the Panchamrita concoction proposed by the Prime Minister of India, the session with Bhupender Yadav aimed to clarify the challenges that developing countries face and the measures that India will be taking for COP27.

Several themes emerged from the lively and enriching session which reflect India’s stance on the concerns around climate change and climate action. The Union Minister expressed concerns over the lack of decisive efforts by the developed world in doing their bit to address the climate crisis. He highlighted that although every year policymakers assemble with the commitment of securing the future of this planet, not much has changed in the way developed world is addressing the concerns of climate justice.

COP26 witnessed developing countries draw attention towards a pertinent need: that of laying down a definition of ‘climate finance’. In the particular context of India’s role, appreciation is due for the substantial achievement of its Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC). He further elaborated that India has also succinctly articulated its future plans.

Nonetheless, what is concerning is the climate finance
and mitigation efforts which are widely at odds with each other. For adaptation to be implemented at the ground level, technology-transfer is inevitable. However, thus far, the support received from the developed countries (in accordance to their commitment in COP15 in Copenhagen), has been rather bleak. Therefore, India hopes for a convincing change in financial support for the developing countries in general.

Upon being asked about the thinking behind the Panchamrita concoction of efforts announced by the Indian PM at Glasgow, the Minister highlighted that India believes the ongoing climate crisis to be a result of the unsustainable lifestyle and wasteful consumption patterns followed mainly in developed countries. This implies that India is not a part of the ‘problem’. Despite that, India is dedicated to performing on the climate action front and do its bit in navigating solutions—since climate change is not the problem of just one country or region. It is a collective concern of the entire world.

He further explained the ‘Panchamrita’ (or five-nectar elements) as a weapon to fight climate change. The commitment seeks to raise non-fossil fuel-based energy capacity to 500GW by 2030. Further, it seeks to meet 50 percent of its energy requirements with renewable energy by the same year. India also seeks to reduce its total projected carbon emissions by 1 billion tonnes from now and reduce the carbon intensity of its economy to less than 45 percent by 2030. And finally, by 2070, India aims to achieve the target of net-zero emissions.

Additionally, besides Panchamrita, India also became a part of the following three major forums:
1. Partnership with the UK for disaster resilient infrastructure;
2. Partnership with LeadIT, Sweden for green energy; and,
3. Partnership in International Solar Alliance (ISA) with France, under a new initiative called ‘One Sun, One Grid, One World’.

It is reassuring to note that India has taken several steps for ease of business in the country and several nations have displayed interest in investing in India.

In response to the challenges of climate finance, the minister stated that although climate finance is a crucial factor for the success of such projects, it is challenging for developing nations with dismal support to pay for infrastructure and technology. This means that unless the economically developed nations extend financial support, the developing world may not be able to keep the climate commitments it made.

With regards to India, given that it managed to fulfil its previous commitments, the ambitious plan of 500 GW non-fossil fuel-based energy capacity is something that the country looks up to. However, it should be noted that to achieve the net-zero promises, ‘climate justice’ is equally important—which was highlighted by Prime Minister Narendra Modi. This refers to the access of more energy to more people. This requires reaching out to the rural part of the country also—which cannot be done without the support of anything less than 1 trillion dollars.

With respect to private finance, the minister articulated that the efforts towards combating the adverse effects of climate change by the developing countries is contingent upon the adequate delivery of climate finance and support for technology transfer. As far as India is concerned, with its rich experience of doing business, and the several steps taken by the government—for instance, sustainable habitats, creation of carbon sinks, transition to sustainable transport, etc.—there is willingness and scope of investment in the country. In the face of vulnerability that developing countries suffer from, they bear the brunt of greenhouse gas emissions pumped in from the developed world. Keeping in view the principle of ‘common but differentiated responsibilities’, the developing countries should be provided with support by the developed countries—a point highlighted across several climate sessions at Raisina Dialogue 2022.

The session concluded with the notion of collaborative efforts which are being undertaken from ‘Panchayats to the Parliament’, keeping the spirit of cooperative federalism alive while collectively marching on the path to advance the Indian economy to a low-carbon scenario and eventually a net-zero economy by 2070.

—Aparna Roy

---
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Each iteration of the World Wide Web has reshaped our worlds and worldviews, replacing old assumptions with new paradigms. The move from analogue to digital broke the then-paradigm of distance equals cost, enabling instant communication, (almost) anywhere in the world. Then the emergence of the sharing economy challenged the notion that control is the only source of value. The new decade has forced us to reconsider another assumption: that the digital sphere can be treated as something distinct from our social, economic, or political spheres. In this vein, the question posed to this panel was, “Will digital territories shape the 21st century as the Westphalian political model defined the past?”

The panel approached this question through different lenses: responsibility, accountability, and balance. In other words, panellists posited different responses to the immense power and therefore responsibility of Big Tech companies; the assertion of state power in digital spaces.
as a way of holding these companies accountable; and the appropriate balance between the two.

The shadow of the ongoing Ukraine crisis, of course, loomed large on the discussions. It became abundantly clear early in the conflict that technology companies are not neutral, with the exodus of not just ‘Big’ tech from Russian markets, but other large online service providers like PayPal, Netflix, Coursera, Ubisoft and Blizzard. The implications of this crisis are many.

One, as moderator Kanchan Gupta posed, is that the exit of ‘global’ social media platforms from Russia limited ordinary Russians’ access to information outside of their state’s propaganda machinery. The second, raised by both Ministers Rajeev Chandrasekhar and Zunaid Ahmed Palak, is the urgency of smaller and emerging markets to band together to create consistent rules and standards to hold tech companies accountable. The third, hinted at by Anne Neuberger, is that how the US reins in Big Tech domestically will be of immense global consequence, and is therefore not just a domestic regulatory issue, but a foreign policy one.

Concurrently, a phenomenon that emerged long before the crisis, but strengthened by it, was that of a unified democratic response to authoritarian digital threats. Neuberger contended that American social media companies, having learned from the recent past, have been proactive in stemming the flow of “incendiary content that influences the information balance”. A similar issue of “balance”, not deliberated in detail by the panel, but relevant to the discussion nevertheless is the issue of reciprocal access to the public sphere: should the governments and citizens of countries that close their online ‘public’ spaces to foreign access be allowed to access and use platforms in other countries?

While the idea of a democratic internet has appeal, it is besieged by wicked problems. The primary one is conceptual clarity, a criticism levelled at the inaugural Summit of Democracies as well. Sweeping frameworks are not new in American foreign policy, yet history rhymes. A 1949 congressional report noted, “One factor in the weakness of morale in the non-Communist world, and in the strength of morale in the Communist world, is the clarity of their ideas and the vagueness of ours... [Our government] seems to take for granted that what has been said has been said once and for all, that the Congress and the people have memories of infinite capacity.”

A product of the present lack of clarity is, as Nanjira Sambuli pointed out, that it becomes anathema to state that the problem is not just “us vs. them”. Democratic tech can and has been used in undemocratic ways. In fact, the securitisation of new and emerging technologies that accompanies “us vs. them” narratives, Sambuli elaborated, is precisely what creates the justification and demand for undemocratic uses of technology.

Finally, the discussion came down to balance and choice: how can we empower people to make informed choices about the content they consume? Has “light touch regulation”, as Rajeev Chandrasekhar stated, led us to “where we are today”? Is trust and responsibility enough in the world of Big Tech, especially when they are not accountable to their end users but to shareholders, and their duty is to increase profits?

—Trisha Ray
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The increasing pace of digital transformation has reaffirmed the need for policies that create an enabling, open, inclusive, fair, and non-discriminatory digital economy. Moreover, with the rise in digitalisation, the cross-border flow of data, data storage and data use has become vital for trade and production. As the need for cross-border flow of data is becoming ubiquitous, several policy issues have surfaced, including data flows, data localisation, data protection and cybersecurity. While the global economy stands on the brink of a technological revolution—it is crucial to explore how countries can coordinate their approach toward emerging technologies and whether there is a need to rewrite the rules of trade in the Indo-Pacific region.

In this context, the panel discussed whether countries need to focus on new digital trade and investment partnerships. The session also explored how digital institutions, digital interoperability and digital infrastructure can be combined to create a digital new deal.

Over the last decade, India has witnessed a major overhaul in its digital infrastructure development. In 2021, India had 592 million active internet users aged 12 years and above—as compared to 2019, the active internet user base has increased by 37 percent. Sumit Seth recalled India’s tremendous digital transformation story, which is built on the backbone of public digital infrastructure. India has shown extensive trust in the fintech ecosystem by embracing digital payments and such technologies.

This has been reiterated by the fact that in 2020, mobile payments exceeded ATM withdrawals in India for the first time and recorded 300-crore UPI transactions in July.
Technology and digitisation also played a central role in enabling government response to the disruption of livelihoods and economies by COVID-19. Technologies and public digital platforms such as Direct Benefit Transfer and AADHAAR (digital identity) have been crucial in ensuring social and economic empowerment.

India has seen tremendous development based on its approach of providing extensive public standards and infrastructure as a public good through the India Stack and Modular Open Source Identity Platform (MOSIP). India has created three basic layers of infrastructure that allow interoperability and user-authorised data portability—the identity layer (Aadhaar ID), the payments layer (Aadhaar Enabled Payments System) and the data layer. The identity layer provides every resident with a unique id, the payments layer allows interoperable, fast and affordable transactions (even for those without a smartphone) and the data layer enables secure data sharing.

Sharad Sharma highlighted that India’s digital success story is by virtue of its ability to not only draw the government as an enabler and regulator but also crowd-in market players in a big way. He further underscored India’s important role in bringing back internet openness in the form of an open payment system, open data system, open credit enablement network, open system for digital commerce and a unified health interface.

There is a general distrust amongst governments and corporations that their data may be exploited without their consent. This can lead to data ‘territorialisation’ and conflicts amongst countries. Cybersecurity is another major area of concern that directly relates to a country’s national security interests. Growing cross-border cyber attacks can pose a great threat to the growth of the digital economy and cross-border trade. Thus, there is an urgent need to address these areas of concern through international cooperation on regulations.

Romana Vlahutin noted that the rules of the game are now being defined and they are likely to determine the resilience of our democracies in decades to come. Hiroyuki Akita noted that digital competition is a core part of the geostrategic competition and we cannot separate the two. Additionally, Medha Girotra highlighted that the rising geopolitical tensions and data nationalism are fracturing the traditional channels of digital cooperation. She underscored the importance of countries engaging in hard discussions around the cross-border transfer of data, data interoperability, harmonisation of standards and data privacy.

Today, technology companies have assumed the role of nation-states in being arbitrators of democracy, free speech and liberalism. However, there are growing concerns regarding monopolistic practices and unfair competition being used by a few big technology firms. Therefore, together, the countries should build global frameworks that can facilitate shared experience and best practices for data policy and build on existing instruments to enable data to flow across borders such that benefits accrue to the owners of the data. Furthermore, multistakeholder discussions—involving the civil society and private sector—can be encouraged to ensure that the evolution and adoption of regulations can keep pace with the growing digital transformation.

—Shruti Jain
Humans of the Indo-Pacific: Reclaiming Development

The Indo-Pacific is home to more than half of the world’s population and nearly two-thirds of the world’s economy. This region faces challenges like climate change, conflict and combating the economic and social crises brought by the pandemic.” This brings forth the urgent need to place sustainable development as the most crucial priority of the region, and innovative public financing models could be the means to do that.

Bosle introduced the report “Reclaiming Development: Pathways for Public Development Finance in the Indo-Pacific” on the development of the Indo-Pacific region, which was the result of the conference on sustainable finance in the Indo-Pacific held in Paris in February 2022.

Bosle explained the need for a different agenda in the Indo-Pacific, which required the support of financial institutions to achieve it. Indo-Pacific is referred to only when topics such as security, sovereignty, and strategy are discussed, which need to change, and the challenges that plague the region need to be addressed.

A central theme that emerged from the conversation was long-term sustainable investments by domestic public finance institutions, followed by collaborative work and learning from one another for development to occur. The discussion began with Thackeray, who was asked about Mumbai’s (Maharashtra, India) vulnerability to climate change and his outlook on building sustainable cities using the Indo-Pacific framework. He emphasised maintaining stability in the region by bringing out an equally crucial aspect of peace and prosperity—the environment. He cited the frequent cyclones and storms, especially since COVID-19, which resulted in mass migrations within and around the region. This instability is detrimental to the region’s development and brings about socio-economic disruptions. Hence, he reiterated the dire need to make alliances to mitigate climate disasters and create partnerships for our regions’ resilience.

Orliange then pointed out that it would be essential to scale and bring domestic public finance institutions to do what Thackeray mentioned. These public institutions can mobilise direct public investments and receive support from international institutions. Public finance represents 10-15 percent of the global investment, and a portion of this could be directed towards a sustainable development agenda.

Bohannon was then brought in to share the UK’s perspective on their FCD Office’s development priorities and public financing gaps. She started with how the UK Government re-strategised its international development
policy with the fundamental focus on the integrated offering of finance to complement their development objectives. The Indo-Pacific is vital, as it gives us the exciting opportunity to deliver on the SDGs while tackling the region’s poverty, humanitarian, and governance challenges. The region helps shape the world in several ways, so its development must be kept in mind its global importance.

Ortiz spoke about how the war in Ukraine is an essential point in history not just because of the dangerous precedent it set or the violation of human rights but also because it has development repercussions in the Indo-Pacific as well. Migration of refugees, rise in the prices of food, commodities and fuel, along with an increase in inflation and interest rates will have lasting impacts on the global South’s developing world. He stressed that the best short-term policy for growth not just in the region but worldwide would be to put an end to the war.

Amimo was asked to share her views on utilising the Indo-Pacific framework to enhance the politics of development in Africa. She insisted on strengthening African-Asian cooperation by broadening the actors participating in these collaborations. “We don’t see enough civil society exchanges. We don’t see enough cross-pollination”.

All the panellists agreed on regional cooperation and the need for investments that focus on sustainable, long-term goals. Thackeray further talked about the importance of state and local governments holding bilateral talks with one another, focusing on a shared future. Development should be derived from learnings of the shared past to devise future sustainable initiatives. The regional and local governments will be at the forefront, for they will be the ones implementing it in their respective states. Orliange emphasised that the cooperation between local governments is essential for the majority of investments to take place at the local level, particularly citing examples of the OECD countries. Bohannon explained the importance of a good development model by first stating that any investment is good for growth. However, she also stressed that it must be sustainable in order to support good governance, sound economic transparency, and more, something lending models such as the Chinese do not fully offer. Share risk pooling, guarantee mechanisms are vital for innovative financing.

Ortiz used Spain’s example within the European Union to illustrate the importance of peer learning from each other, quoting its notable shift from non-renewable to renewable energy, creating a significant opportunity for economic growth as well. The role of influential players is key in holding dialogues and harmonising development goals. Amimo believes that while advancements are being made in several fields, there is room for more. African countries such as Kenya and Rwanda have emerged as the continent’s start-up hubs and technology centres. While investments and cooperation have been more prominent with the western countries like Europe and the US, technological support is still lacking from Asia despite tremendous opportunities. Exchanges that occur geopolitically do not necessarily reflect ordinary people’s interests on the ground. The exchanges could be more “vibrant”.

All the panellists agreed that investments by public finance institutions focusing on long-term goals, keeping in mind multiple aspects of development, regional cooperation, public-private sector partnerships, and sustainability, were key in reclaiming the development of the Indo-Pacific region.

—Mona and Yash Shroff
The word ‘feminist’ “incites, excites, and alarms”. Ever since Resolution 1325, which set the stage for the Women Peace and Security agenda in 2000, the world has engaged with the idea of gendered governance through conflicts, financial crises, and the pandemic, with a growing number of seats now being occupied by women.

Through a focus on rights, representation, and resources, came the Swedish idea of a “Feminist Foreign Policy” which made gender equality and women’s rights the centre of the nation’s diplomatic engagement. Since 2014, several transatlantic countries have adopted the FFP agenda, and as the agenda makes inroads into Asia, Africa, and the Pacific in the post-pandemic world, it looks to meet both its greatest challenge, and greatest opportunity.

It is in this context that Feminist Foreign Policy must be written anew. From idea to process, process to product, and product to action.

As an idea, FFP can no longer be limited to the original space in which it was conceived. It must engage with the intersections of identities and lived experiences that differ from country to country, and region to region. It must broaden the idea of feminism from merely equality between the sexes, to equality between races, castes, tribes, and other differentiators in its new homes. This inclusivity must be driven by both a leadership and economic imperative as well as political will, as highlighted by Nancy Ziuzin, and shaped by a process as representative as the intended product.

But, Aleksandra Dier warned, bringing in diverse voices is only part of the solution. The challenge must extend to bringing in those that are on the receiving end of the policy and ensuring that the content itself no longer reflects the often western-centric and western-driven ideas of diplomacy, security, and foreign policy. As the pandemic and the existential crises presented to the multilateral system have taught us, policy can no longer be drafted and executed top down—it must be engaged with from the smallest node of the world order we live in today. Perhaps, there needs to be a change in approach. Perhaps we need to zoom away from the woman to her larger structural and spatial reality. As the FFP engages with countries earlier harrowed by colonialism and imperialism, there is perhaps an opportunity to learn from the past in drafting a more resilient framework. Additionally, it must complement—and not contradict—the other debates taking place today. As Sarah Bressan noted, it must become a part of other conversations being held.

It is perhaps in the translation from product to action that FFP faces its greatest challenge—the risk of being reduced to a buzzword. Indeed, there is an opportunity to
As an idea, Feminist Foreign Policy can no longer be limited to the original space in which it was conceived. It must engage with the intersections of identities and lived experiences that differ from country to country, and region to region. It must broaden the idea of feminism from merely equality between the sexes, to equality between races, castes, tribes, and other differentiators in its new homes.

learn from its home, Sweden, where in the words of Hans Christian Hagman: “It is not just one policy, but perhaps the policy”. It must also be backed, not just by intent but also by resources, argued Dora Szucs.

Its application is its greatest test. From the crises in Afghanistan and Ukraine, to the equitable distribution of vaccines, in spaces directly contending with the effects of climate change, and in the boardrooms that decide who will or won’t receive development aid. As Aleksandra Dier put it, “the difference between FFP being just a buzzword to something with teeth is if governments have actually changed how they approach a certain situation” because of their new FFP lens.

But, back at its source, it must complement the domestic priorities and policies of the government for it to reach its optimal success. Today, there is both a challenge of countries shifting away from feminist priorities (as is the case of South Korea), and countries advocating for FFP but providing aid or selling arms to those who would use it in direct violation of women and human rights. It must bridge the gap between these priorities, and if possible, offer lessons to leaders of mutual coexistence.

Simply put, FFP could be easily understood through the reference of a table (as suggested by several panellists). It is no longer about token representation of women on the table, adding a few seats to the table, or even waiting for a seat at the table. It is about rethinking the table and how it is set, expecting a seat at the table, and demanding that seat at the table. The more diverse the table, the better the decisions.

—Sitara Srinivas
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Over the last few decades, the role of women in our society has been completely transformed. They have become increasingly active agents in exercising agency in the key aspects of their lives. The impacts of the pandemic have been far-reaching as the existing socio-economic inequalities of the society have been exposed and exacerbated. In this context, women have steered effective and inclusive solutions for managing crises for a care-led recovery of the economy. Across the world, there are only a handful of women who are able to stand at an equal footing with men in terms of opportunities and skills.

The glaring gender gaps in arenas of technology, financial inclusion, access to health and livelihood opportunities are testimony to the fact that the pandemic has been especially hard on women. Nonetheless, we have witnessed Indian women who have risen to the challenge and have led their communities through the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic. These women did not only put-up nets against tremendous odds to make sure their communities did not fall through the cracks; they filled those cracks.

Despite the challenges that complicate female leadership and participation across different realms, it is critical to achieve gender equity to enable and accelerate the Sustainable Development Goals. Women in leadership positions have inspired urgent innovations and interventions as first responders in both policy chambers and on the frontlines.

The pandemic has provided us with a unique opportunity to pause, reflect, rethink, and reprioritise, unlocking women’s potential to accelerate development. Carrying forward lessons from the pandemic is imperative to understand how we can make spaces like political spheres, boardrooms, and financial systems more sustainable and inclusive for women under female leadership. In this panel discussion, we try to delve into ways of rethinking female leadership for crafting a more just and inclusive society that is sustainable for even the most marginalised.

Kwati Candith Mashego-Dlamini pointed to the role of women in peace-building and peace-keeping by stating an example from South Africa. Leadership in South Africa has emphasised the power of peaceful negotiation in the process of transition from an Apartheid to a Democratic Regime—a transition that has been spearheaded by women. Affirmative Action and targeted policy responses have aided this just transformation for South Africa. Providing women with adequate exposure, opportunities, and space is crucial for highlighting their role in leading societies to sustainable development. Mashego-Dlamini noted that training women for peacebuilding, negotiating, and mediating in conflict zones would be an essential investment in the current
scenario considering it is an imperative to build back developing economies in an equitable fashion. Reducing gender gaps in STEM education would be a way for women to forge ahead in their careers and build personal resilience and that of their communities.

Waseqa Ayesha Khan highlighted the importance of an inclusive ecosystem of political will and policy action to accelerate women's participation in the labour force, politics and education. Empowered women empower more women is an echoing sentiment with which Bangladesh seems to be forging forward.

Smriti Irani commented on the strides India has been making with respect to women's socio-economic empowerment. The thrust from those in leadership positions in making discussions of gender justice central to policymaking, politics and administration have definitely been paving way for a more sustainable, gender-just future. She emphasised on the digital empowerment and skill building as pioneering initiatives for transforming the educational, political and socio-economic scenario in India with regards to women. As years of gains in gender parity seem to be taking a backseat, Shombi Sharp strongly advocated for having more and more women in politically affluent benches to accelerate progress on not only gender justice but climate justice as well. At a time of a triple global crisis, it is essential for women to lead the way to peaceful negotiations alongside equal participation in rebuilding economies. SDG-5—Gender Equality—is the highest return investment promising gains in all areas of sustainable development.

Stories chronicled in the First Responders articulate leadership journeys of women from the last mile communities and explore how they crafted an appropriate pandemic response—through giving governance a human face, promoting entrepreneurship and livelihoods, ensuring access to food and water, strengthening public health systems, and galvanising vaccination campaigns. Women, in the pandemic, emerged as the true agents of change. It raises awareness about these women's exemplary work, and seeks to serve as a catalyst for efforts to invest in empowerment of women and leadership at every level of governance.

—Avni Arora
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We are all witnesses to the ‘global halt’ brought about by the pandemic and the disruptions caused by it. In the aftermath of the pandemic and the myriad of inefficiencies it exposed in the modern world, two poignant concerns towards the post-pandemic world are underlined—the heating up of competition for infrastructure finance and a conundrum between self-reliance and diversified supply chains.

Addressing the former, Jayant Sinha highlighted the pressing need for global capital to power growth in India in a responsible and sustainable fashion, which not only generates employment for the youth but also aids in accomplishing the commitments of COP26. Geoffrey Onyeama noted that the investment brought by foreign countries in Nigeria is crucial in addressing the development needs of the country such as poverty, housing, sustainability, and meaningful jobs for its citizens that cannot be met just by public finance. It was also highlighted that the competing finance has worked well for Nigeria where many countries such as China, India and countries in Europe are bringing in capital for their economic and strategic goals.

The panel noted that while the pandemic was a disruptor, it was also a great catalyst. Romana Vlahutin pointed out that post the pandemic, the European Union is sharpening the
ways in which it makes its strategic choices. Presently, the EU has contributed 75 billion euros in Official Development Assistance (ODA) and 45 billion euros in export credit. Furthermore, to deliver on the promise of the Global Gateway, the EU is focusing on enhanced private sector participations and is working alongside like-minded countries such as the G7 grouping to pool resources in the right direction. In the same context, Philippe Orliange underlined that when a country’s domestic policies and commitments are synergised with global agendas, it attracts more foreign investments. It was highlighted that closer association with national public development banks can help us leverage the volume of investment needed by the country.

Furthermore, in the context of the constant pull and push between self-reliance and diversified supply chains, Tadashi Maeda highlighted the pandemic-induced disruption of semiconductor supply chains. It has damaged the manufacturing sector—specifically automobiles. Resource-scarce countries, like Japan, are increasingly endorsing global cooperation and free trade to secure important minerals. He emphasised the role of risk sharing, data sharing and information sharing to build resilient supply chains. In that context, he called for greater cooperation of India in the QUAD and other international multilateral and plurilateral groupings.

With the advent of endeavours towards post-pandemic recovery, infrastructure finance and international cooperation have inadvertently become the cornerstones of development. It has become evident that supply chain disruptions affect all countries big or small, developed or less-developed alike. Historically, we have seen that global chaos is the precursor to stable growth. The pandemic has shaken the entire world—bringing with it the opportunity for countries to leapfrog the stages of development. Thus, it is imperative that global initiatives and commitments of infrastructure financing in the third world step up to reimagine, redesign and rebuild a more equitable and resilient world. Moreover, they must enhance cooperation and foster increased mutual trust between countries to mitigate and share risks from future shocks.

—Apoorna Lalwani
The US under the Biden administration has faced both growing domestic discord at home and increasing compulsions abroad. Internationally, although it failed to effectively handle its exit from Afghanistan, its management of the Russian invasion of Ukraine has received international and domestic support. This could also be attributed to its longstanding cooperation with Europe. In spite of the Trans-Atlantic bond being one borne out of necessity, the US and Europe have been ‘flying together’ to handle the ongoing full-scale conventional war in Eastern Europe. In this regard, Carl Bildt noted: “The birds are flying in the right direction”.

Meanwhile, India’s principled position on the Russia-Ukraine crisis, in line with the tenets in the UN Charter pertaining to international law and resolution of international disputes, has allowed it to communicate a distinct position on the issue. It is essential to understand that the Indian and the US stances arise from their respective geopolitical, historical and strategic concerns. Nevertheless, it has raised concerns about the cost of neutrality.

The first issue concerned the significance of the Indo-Pacific. The Indo-Pacific region is a key theatre for the West, and India plays a significant role as the central pillar of this strategy. Increasing European engagement with India, most recently through the EU-India Trade and Technology Council and other platforms, is being witnessed. Concerns over a long-drawn war keeping Europe from effectively engaging with the Indo-Pacific have been replaced with concrete developments such as the recent trade agreements and ongoing negotiations between the EU and several Indo-Pacific countries.

There may have been an asymmetric focus by the Indo-Pacific on strategic aspects alone but economic trends in engagement are likely to address it. Since the Indo-Pacific region has equated economics with security, this gap has been concerning. The Indo-Pacific strategy has also proposed the significance of networked deterrence against potential regional aggression. The panelists concurred that the region’s need for infrastructure has been shadowed by unsuccessful US initiatives in this regard. Essentially, the progress in filling the infrastructure gap in the Indo-Pacific has been slow.

The second issue dealt with the strengthening, decline and evolution of democracies. Daniel Twining noted how the US portrayed a story of democratic resilience and strength despite its decline being widely discussed, so much so that it had become the topic of the panel discussion. The panelists noted that several of the US’ South Asian allies were not democracies. Thus, the US attempt to forge
ties with countries that are strategically important yet not democratic, contradicted with the idea of terming the current geopolitical contest as ‘a battle of democracies against authoritarian states’.

Such a framework puts to question India’s ambivalence on the ongoing war in Europe, the possibility of Russia and China growing closer, and the discomfort the non-democratic countries face in light of such a framing. The panel further debated the troublesome ground a dualistic approach would pose. This approach would distinguish states over their need to live in a free and open manner against those choosing to live under authoritarian control. The inevitability of having to choose—given the existence of shades of imperfect democracies—was also expressed.

The third point of discussion was the implied threat to Taiwan under current geopolitical circumstances. The threat of China attacking Taiwan has significantly heightened since the breakout of the war in Europe. Nonetheless, Taiwan has been increasingly observant of how Ukraine has managed to create a setback for Russia so far—a supposed great power. However, Taiwan’s preparedness against a potential Chinese invasion began decades ago, and recent events have renewed the island’s vigour to defend itself. Obtaining weapons systems and implementing defence reforms have been prioritised domestically. Meanwhile, the Ukraine crisis provided China with an opportunity to reassess its capabilities and calculate the likely western response. Learning from Moscow’s mistakes allows Beijing to improvise its strategy to achieve a quick victory over Taiwan. The panel further noted that such an event was not imminent given Xi Jinping being caught up in domestic affairs, leaving him little to no time for Taiwan.

Taiwan’s confidence in the US militarily aiding them in the event of a potential Chinese invasion is based on the Taiwan Relation Act and the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) of the US. Additionally, the island accounts for 92 percent of the world’s semiconductor manufacturing, making it a significant part of the global supply chain. The US is unlikely to leave Taiwan to chance especially when its credibility in Asia is at stake.

The Russia-Ukraine crisis has adversely impacted all aspects of security. However, it has also led to a strengthened Trans-Atlantic security relationship—be it NATO, EU-NATO or the intra-EU relationships. Although the US’ current focus, out of necessity, is the acute war in Ukraine; Washington’s long-term national security concern remains China. The US-China strained relations over the US’ increasing engagement in the Indo-Pacific and China’s support for Russia has not made it any easier for great power competition in the new emerging world order. Meanwhile, India remains significant to the US’ Indo-Pacific strategy and the subtle difference between the US and India over the Russia-Ukraine crisis have not been detrimental to collective interests in the region, particularly the other Quad countries’ ability to cooperate with India. The significance of India in Washington’s Indo-Pacific strategy proves the extent to which the US values ties with India—it is too important to let their differences over Russia affect its long-term regional strategy.

—Vivek Mishra & Joeana Cera Matthews
The African continent has defined global trade since time immemorial. From fostering the Graeco-Roman spice trade with India to hosting the mighty Suez Canal, Africa has helped connect the world. As we enter the digital age, young Africa—boasting a rich demographic dividend—is poised to shape our common future. In this quest, its partnership with a dynamic Asia will be critical to solving our common challenges.

India-Africa relations are truly deep-rooted and go back into the deep recesses of history. Connections with societies on Africa’s eastern coast were nurtured by the monsoon-driven ecosystem of the Indian Ocean. The era of western imperialism strengthened mutual contact and the shared experiences of oppression generated a common desire for freedom and independence. India constantly supported anti-colonial and anti-racist liberation struggles in Africa. One of the countries that India enjoys close bilateral relations with is Nigeria. It was way back in November 1958 when India established its Diplomatic House in Lagos, two years before Nigerian independence. Nigeria, an economic powerhouse in Africa, is India’s largest trading partner, and a significant portion of Indian investment is also directed towards the West African country.

Geoffrey Onyeama alluded to this special relationship. He noted India’s comparative advantage in the healthcare and pharmaceutical sector, and the enormous potential that exists in strengthening cooperation in the Information and Communication Technology (ICT) sector, steel industry, cultural cooperation, and in the education and defence sector. India is at a stage where it can transfer technological know-how to African countries, including Nigeria. The Minister further spoke about the central role that Asia would play in facilitating Africa’s entry into the global value chains—promoting and diversifying supply chains in the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Development partnership and capacity building remains at the core of the India-Africa partnership. Dammu Ravi highlighted the vitality and vigour that has been injected into our partnership through the “The Ten Guiding Principles for India-Africa Engagement”—presented by Prime Minister Narendra Modi during his address to the Ugandan parliament in July 2018. He emphasised that India’s developmental assistance seeks to respond to Africa’s priorities and to Africa’s demand and needs, rather than bring a unilateral agenda or impose conditions. There is a need for Indian capacity building to evolve into institutional setting in Africa, including in medical, healthcare and agricultural institutions.

India has also helped bridge the digital divide through successful projects like the Pan-Africa e-network project wherein Indian educational and medical institutions were connected with their African counterparts through satellite-based technology to impart knowledge and train Africans. This project has now evolved into the e-VidyaBharti and e-AarogyaBharti (e-VBAB) project on tele education and tele
medicine. The Russia-Ukraine crisis has in a way awakened the need for Africa and India to look for ways to strengthen alternate supply chains and create win-win situations.

A vital area of collaboration that has emerged is agriculture. A huge 60 percent of uncultivated arable land can be found in Africa. Both regions have abundant natural resources and production potential, and therefore share a central role in ensuring global food security in the near future. Kwaku Ampratwum-Sarpong pointed out that nearly 60 percent of Africa’s labour force is engaged in the agriculture sector.

On its part, India has been a regular supplier of agricultural equipment and machinery to improve agricultural productivity in Africa. The shift from manual labour to mechanisation is critical to improving efficiency and increasing the productivity of the farming enterprises. In addition, India has assisted Ghana in releasing large amounts of line of credit that have facilitated human and development-centric projects.

Usta Kaitesi noted the enormous potential that exists for African women to drive transformation in the continent. She spoke about the Rwandan experience—which in 2013 became the first country in the world with a female majority in the parliament. It is the duty of the leadership to ensure the inclusion of women in the decision-making process. This is vital because any form of development would be sustainable only if it is citizen-centric.

Rwanda is an important partner of India. PM Modi’s historic visit in July 2018 led to a host of MoUs and agreements signed on various sectors of cooperation spanning defence, bilateral trade, dairy and leather cooperation, cultural exchange, agriculture and animal resources, and also for the development of industrial parks and the Kigali Special Economic Zone. Both Rwanda and India have successfully used Information and Communication Technology (ICT) and drone technology to transform urban and rural infrastructure, and improve agricultural productivity. Drones are not just used for surveillance or as weaponised tools for the military but are also used for transporting and delivering emergency medical supplies to rural communities, mapping and surveying rural land, agriculture, and wildlife conservation.

It is useful to note that many African Regional Economic Communities (RECs) are making noticeable progress towards integration. While some are ahead of others like the East African Community (EAC), they are all headed towards greater regional integration, with the ultimate aim of fostering continental integration. This vision is to be realised through the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA) agreement which is the world’s largest free trade area—connecting almost 1.3 billion people across 54 countries. The agreement aims to create a single, unified market for the free movement of goods, services, and people to deepen the economic integration of Africa. The AfCFTA aims to expand intra-African trade through better harmonisation and coordination of trade liberalisation at the sub-regional and continental level by reducing tariffs on goods. African countries started trading under the rules of AfCFTA on 1st January 2021. This provides a golden opportunity for Indian firms and investors to tap into a larger, unified and robust African market in order to improve India-Africa trade.

Today, African countries have a diverse set of external partners and are looking to realign the focus of Africa’s partnerships to the continent’s priorities. African leaders and governments are proactively voicing their interests and concerns rather than being passive bystanders. India, with its long history of association with the African continent, is well placed to co-create innovative solutions to tackle socio-economic challenges that affect the two regions. India could emerge as an important partner to facilitate ‘Make in Africa’ by setting up manufacturing hubs and training locals. The idea is to help African countries make products which could be exported outside while adding value to the products.

Indeed, India-Africa ties may yet redefine the contours of the international order along more egalitarian lines. What African countries could offer India in return is a collective understanding of the approaches that would help both regions solve common developmental challenges.

—Abhishek Mishra
The role of maritime nations, particularly the Small Island States (SIDS), which are heavily dependent on the ecosystem services of the marine and coastal states, is extremely crucial in global trade for security and also for meeting the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Concomitant to this is also their own development challenges set by the priorities of biodiversity preservation, managing the costs of adaptation and dealing with the debt burdens that have been worsened by the pandemic. In the mammoth task that lies ahead, global coalitions and international partnerships will play a pivotal role. Further, balancing infrastructural development while protecting fragile ecosystems and their endowments remains a missing puzzle piece.

Underscoring the dependence of SIDS on ecosystems, Mohamed Nasheed mentioned, “When the corals die, we die with it. And, this is a huge challenge on us as we have done nothing to create the situation at all”. It highlights a certain equity concern. It underscores the just division, fair sharing and equitable distribution of the burdens of climate change and the responsibility to deal with it—something that must be made a part of the global agenda for development and cooperation.

Further, in recent times, debt has emerged as a key strategy of control by the Beijing-sponsored model of lending to countries in need of development finance. Most of the countries vulnerable to global warming and climate change are the ones which are dependent on such financial models. Thus, even as the burgeoning costs of adapting to sea-level rise, global warming and climate change become disproportionately greater for the SIDS. Nasheed emphasised that in the case of the Maldives, “...they came with the money, they came with the people, they came with the material and they gave us a bill and this bill is far higher than we can pay from the asset”.

Even though the vulnerable island nations had very little to do with the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions that have contributed to the rise in global surface temperature, SIDS have emerged as the champion of climate action. Emphasising this, Hugh Hilton Todd noted, “Our standing forest, the size of England, is sequestering more than 19.5 million gigatons of CO2. We introduced a low carbon development strategy back in 2009 which was meant to preserve this standing forest and contribute to the mitigation of the effects of fossil fuel use”.

As the world has become increasingly globalised in the last few decades, much of the benefits from the expansion of the global economy have been drawn by the G20 group of nations. They have been the ones to set the agenda and the rules of deliberation without considering the interest of the global community. The private sector has further played a catalyst in the concentration of wealth. Therefore,
Even though the vulnerable island nations had very little to do with the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions that have contributed to the rise in global surface temperature, SIDS have emerged as the champion of climate action.

the developing states and SIDS are focused on resilience and adaptation as any global financial meltdown or natural disaster can affect them and disrupt their economies.

Asserting that SIDS indeed stand vulnerable in a myriad of ways, Malshini Senaratne also raised a caution that one should not attribute this situation to their helplessness. By citing the example of Seychelles and how it has served as a model for other vulnerable states, Senaratne said: “Seychelles was the first country to launch a Blue Bond in 2015, and following that, it was taken up by Belize and six other countries around the world.”

Senaratne also pointed out that the island nation has been championing debt-for-nature swaps and expanding the Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) as a long-term plan to safeguard fish stocks and conserve the biodiversity of oceans. However, Seychelles, just like other SIDS, is well aware that ‘tourism and tuna’ will not be sufficient for its people in the face of mounting challenges aggravated by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Changing the perspective to that of a large economy that has been engaging in development partnerships with SIDS, Ausaf Sayeed outlined the enabling role played by India. From providing safe drinking water, investments in renewables and other climate-friendly technologies to scientific surveys and countering piracy in the oceans, India has been a proactive partner to many of the SIDS in the process of their development. Underscoring India’s worldview in this regard, Sayeed said, “We, as a nation, believe that we should share our knowledge and resources since we belong to one world—in line with Mahatma Gandhi’s idea of Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam.” He further noted that the inherent difference between the ‘Indian model’ and other models is that India engages with other countries as equal partners and recipients of aid. Further, infrastructure that can lead to high debt is not funded by India, and transparency remains the key ingredient of Indian diplomacy for development cooperation.

—Sayanangshu Modak
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Closing Remarks

For me, the Raisina dialogue has been an exciting and engaging event and it is my privilege to deliver the closing remarks in the presence of distinguished panellists and audience members.

At 75, India is no longer merely an emerging power—it is now a global power. In the decades following independence the country has steadily built upon its engagements and with the turn of the millennium, the country has widened its extensive network of bilateral and multilateral partnerships building upon across diverse sectors of cooperation. Over the last few decades, India has been the first respondent in extending assistance to neighbouring countries in times of need, be it in the form of resource, finance or governance. Our ‘Neighbourhood First’ and ‘Act East’ policies continue to expand our historical bonds whilst also expanding the geographical extent of what is traditionally understood as our neighbourhood. we have engaged in a multitude of undertakings in the Indo-Pacific region including infrastructure and information sharing with our partners. Our initiatives in the maritime domain have drawn inspiration from the SAGAR doctrine where we aim to provide security and growth for all in the region.

Today, we are recognised by nations in its immediate neighbourhood as well as those across the world as a capable, willing and reliable partner and also one that is dedicated to protecting a free, open and democratic world order. It has indeed been a transformational journey for India as a nation.

Our world is today marked by great power contestation, geopolitical fragmentation and economic uncertainties. The 21st century’s realpolitik in most cases is all about striking a fine balance between cooperation and competition within the same set order. The COVID-19 pandemic has thrown into relief fault lines and vulnerabilities in terms of socio-economic, health, and human safety on the one hand and global supply chains on the other. These challenges notwithstanding, India has demonstrated its intent and ability to lead, assist, and support nations through bilateral and multilateral platforms and initiatives. India’s association with the world has been consultative, response-based and human-centric.

In commemorating 75 years of its independence, the country celebrates ‘Azadi ka Amrit Mahotsav,’ its achievements, its teachings and values as a society. We also use this opportunity to ponder upon the winning strategies for a new India on the global stage. Our imperative in the third decade of the millennium includes the building of resilient partnerships. India at 75 is committed to this twin goal as it expands upon its aspirations and moulds it approaches for the future. As we shake our inhibitions of the past and step into a brighter future, I am reminded of the words of great Nobel Laureate Rabindranath Tagore—“Where the mind is without fear, and the head is held high.... into that heaven of freedom, my father, let my country awake.”

Friends, at Raisina 2022, we have covered a plethora of issues that truly matter to the world today. To summarise, we have broadly divided conversations around six pillars: rethinking the idea of democracy from the intermingled angles of technology, trade and evolving ideologies; the urgent need to bring about reforms; the Indo-Pacific and the partnerships we continue to build around it to settle our challenges; the idea of global communities and the crucial role they play in times of crisis. We also look at some of the challenges humankind has been fighting to towards green transitions and finally, we the overarching issues taking place around the globe.

Ladies and gentlemen, it has been a pleasure to learn and imbibe these conversations. Therefore, please allow me to thank all the distinguished speakers and participants who joined us from different parts of the world. The Raisina Dialogue is a sum total of your individual contributions and engagement. On behalf of the Government of India and

RAJKUMAR RANJAN SINGH
Minister of State, Ministry of External Affairs, India
The 21st century’s realpolitik in most cases is all about striking a fine balance between cooperation and competition within the same set order.
Many fear that the dream that was globalisation, is dead. Over the last four decades, globalisation hoped to level the divide in resources, technology, and education between countries and peoples. The events of years past have undercut those hopes as everything from global financial systems and domestic markets to energy supplies have been weaponised as nations have scrambled to exploit dependencies for geopolitical advantage.

The panellists began by acknowledging the sheer scale of the challenge facing globalisation. In Minister Tobias Lindner’s view, the world order faces threats from both the weaponisation of economic dependencies and from weapons of war. Reinforcing the multilateral order and rules-based governance is the surest way to combat the weaponisation of everything. Upholding rules will not only help hold rogue states accountable but will also prove the bedrock of future globalisation. Even as his home country of Germany moves to wean itself off its dependence on Russian oil and gas, Lindner stressed that the goal was to diversify without triggering deglobalisation.

As the conversation shifted to the threats posed by the weaponisation of emerging technologies, America’s Anne Neuberger highlighted the threats posed by cyberwarfare to critical national infrastructure. As nations focus on denying malicious actors access to increasingly digital sectors like healthcare and energy supplies, the need for an international rules-based response has become apparent. Countries must actively work together to frame new norms surrounding weaponisation and enforce the consequences when those norms are breached. Diversification emerged as the watchword of the discussion as Neuberger spoke of the American experience in building trusted cyber networks that prevent the weaponisation of supply chains and dependencies.

Harsh Vardhan Shringla added to the discussion by arguing that self-sufficiency, seen through India’s drive to build ‘Atmanirbhar Bharat’, would be the key to countering weaponisation. Even as countries work to construct an international response to coercion, self-reliance can help nations build capacities that can serve national and international needs without ring-fencing productive potential. India’s robust diplomatic engagement with the Supply Chain Resilience Initiative and the Quad towards identifying and reducing risks in the supply of critical minerals and technologies served as an instructive example in this regard. Ultimately, national efforts must dovetail with a concerted international drive to foster greater multilateralism and new frameworks that will define the future of global economic and political engagement.

Péter Sztáray struck a different note and called for a balanced view of weaponisation. As competition heats up and the possibility of destructive weaponisation looms,
Even as countries work to construct an international response to coercion, self-reliance can help nations build capacities that can serve national and international needs without ring-fencing productive potential. India’s robust diplomatic engagement with the Supply Chain Resilience Initiative and the Quad towards identifying and reducing risks in the supply of critical minerals and technologies served as an instructive example in this regard.

forging a path to normalisation remains a key concern for the international community. Designating particular areas as “no-go” zones, such as attacks targeting human life or nuclear power plants, needs particular focus. Inclusive decision-making between nations remains the most viable road to creating a new international consensus on the risks posed by weaponisation. However, Sztáray warned that the exclusion and exclusive condemnation of particular nations will make the creation of a renewed international understanding a difficult task.

Finally, it became clear that governments cannot fight the battle against weaponisation alone. As threats multiply and vigilance becomes the order of the day, a new partnership between governments, the private sector and the general public is needed. For example, the use of emerging technologies like crypto-currencies by rogue states like North Korea feeds into that nation’s destabilising nuclear program. Given that many governments do not possess the ability to counter these cutting-edge technological offensives, leveraging the private sector’s access to financial networks and technological prowess is the need of the hour. Similarly, nations have taken to weaponising political discourse as a means of weakening political adversaries. The deluge of fake news and misinformation that threaten modern democratic societies is a manifestation of such malicious weaponisation. The panellists opined that governments must rapidly respond to disinformation even as they improve how they communicate their actions and priorities to the general public. Ultimately, the battle against weaponisation must be waged by all segments of society nationally and by all nations internationally.

—Shashank Mattoo
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The session on ‘Quadrophenia: Rewiring the Indo-Pacific’s Political Economy’ discussed the potential, future and challenges of partnerships in the Indo-Pacific. The Indo-Pacific is the most dynamic region in the world and its partnerships have contributed to prosperity and economic stability.

The region is responsible for two-thirds of global economic growth and the future of the Indo-Pacific affects people everywhere. The Indo-Pacific is not immune to pervasive challenges—supply chains, infrastructure, climate change. For the US, the key to dealing with these challenges is continued partnerships with those who have the same vision. The meaning of the term security is expanding—security from disasters, climate change, and critical services that citizens rely on. Bilateral partnerships alone are not enough, multilateral groupings like the ASEAN are important. The Quad is a pertinent platform which pursues a shared vision of the rules-based international order. The Quad also shows that democracies can deliver by helping make supply chains resilient, climate change, cooperating on critical technologies.

Countries are now coming together to discuss future partnerships. Historically, global partnerships have happened under a multilateral framework. But sometimes these multilateral discussions get bogged down due to different discussions happening at different times and various push and pull factors—and thus create new configurations like the T12, D10, Quad, Climate Summit. Why are these smaller coalitions coming about? There are a number of emerging powers which are growing economically, politically and militarily.

We already have the traditional powers—and then there are rising economic powers. Each wishes to look at its own role in the global order. Some of these powers are getting frustrated at the logjams that happen at these multilateral platforms and make them slow-moving. The Quad is a great example of four countries coming together with common goals, but still there having differences—in the way their economies are structured currently, the difference in terms of culture, and political equations they have within the country.

While the development of these minilaterals/microlateralism are interesting—on one end they can lead to fragmentation of trade and economic standards and on the other end, it could also lead to really great opportunities for partnership for global good.

There is not always a common vision among the Quad members, but it is still an important and useful grouping. India is the main player in the Quad as Australia, US, and Japan already have a number of ways to engage given their growing defence, political, and military relationships. The three countries already have a trilateral framework in place.
Australia looks at it as ‘building webs of alignments in the region’. Australia, the US, and Japan all want India to be more aligned with the goals and vision of the Quad, but the reality is that there will naturally be differing strategic outlooks. India has very distinct strategic interests.

There are still differences on important matters related to technology though it looks to be the most promising area of cooperation as none of the members wants a society dominated by Chinese technology. Here, some key issues arise: What should be the role of multinational tech companies, and internet governance.

On cyber security, the goal is to have an open, interoperable, and reliable and secure internet while coordinating with partners to maintain the integrity of international standard bodies and promote consensus-based technology standards. The US is working to modernise the cyber security of our critical infrastructure.

Even with the Quad making some substantial progress, there are some critical questions that need to be addressed: Will the Quad be able to positively contribute to the Indo-Pacific without it being a formal structure, without being backed by formal rules, structures, laws? The lack of structure could be an asset for the grouping. The lack of formality allows it to be a flexible platform and be able to adapt to the shifts and changes that take place in the Indo-Pacific. There are three factors that allow the Quad to cooperate despite the different structures, and outlooks; and these are—need, agreement, and political will.

The need to cooperate as a group will only going to increase like for instance on technology. Political will underpins everything and explains how the Quad has evolved since its birth. How are Quad members cooperating on issues like emerging technologies? This is an era of the 4IR so there is a lot of opportunity for cooperation.

There is also potential for cooperation on climate change-related technology, as well as agriculture technology, healthcare (telehealth), education, and manufacturing. But there still are challenges around data sovereignty, and transparency. Is there a possibility to include other members in the Quad?

To the latter, yes, there is a possibility to include more members in the Quad as it is a strategic grouping. But there again lies the question: Will more countries complicate the process of decision-making?

For any organisation to survive, it has to show its effectiveness. To accomplish that, it needs to have a narrow focus. For example, many say that the Quad should look into connectivity, but that again is a broad area. The focus needs to be more specific—perhaps, digital connectivity is the area to focus on under the pillar of connectivity. Therefore, what are some potential areas that the Quad can work on in the future?

Some areas like under-sea cables and electrification in the South Pacific, technology to mitigate climate change which can be used for maritime security, communications and also supply chains have potential for discourse. There is a need to better understand what the Quad’s mission is—and the recent US strategy to the Indo-Pacific can help do that.

—Premesha Saha
COVID-19, and the consequent lockdowns, forced countries around the world to speed up their digital transformations. The Rwandan economy became cashless overnight during the three months of the lockdown by building on the existing infrastructure. Similarly, Bangladesh’s digital economic ecosystem was used to develop continuity plans for education, health, connectivity, logistics, and entertainment. While India was already amid digitisation and digital movement at the start of the pandemic, the digital initiatives were scaled up significantly during this period. The panel agreed upon the benefits and the significance of technology in today’s world, especially for financial and societal inclusion. Priyanka Chaturvedi explained extensively how digitisation brings transparency and accountability and prevents leakages in the system.

The panel agreed that there is a need to develop digital transaction and payment platforms that are interoperable which each other. Such platforms need to complement each other and must be neutral. Zunaid Ahmed Palak argued that a successful digital economic ecosystem would include digital identity, a digital payment system, a verification and authentication platform, and national digital architecture.

The panel also agreed that there exist gaps in digital inclusion despite the drastic efforts for digitisation. The panel proposed that steps need to be taken to bridge the inequities in the digital ecosystem. Astha Kapoor explained how significant digital exclusions exist and the
government had to do away with that digital intermediation on many occasions to provide support to people during the pandemic. Chaturvedi pointed out that though there exist digital divides, it is important to create infrastructure and then focus on the inclusion of more people. Amar Patnaik suggested that the efficiencies arising from digitisation can help incentivise people to get included in the digital ecosystem. Usta Kaitesi added that systems must be made user-friendly and that there is a need to incentivise the private sector to onboard the digitisation efforts.

As a note of caution, Kwame Owino explained how exclusively pushing toward digitisation is dangerous and the governments must provide analogue alternatives as well. A relentless push toward all-digital creates a kind of problem that, unless properly designed, all the advantages that have been built into the existing system suddenly collapse. Kapoor added that it is the burden of the state to make sure that everyone on the last mile is included.

On the role of Big Tech, Chaturvedi explained how tech is being controlled by a few people who are concentrated in a particular geography. She noted that these Big Tech companies are not willing to address the challenges faced by the rest of the countries and that such companies need to be sensitive to the local conditions of different geographies.

Patnaik pointed out that digital assets like crypto know no boundaries, and since data flows across geographical borders—regulating such technologies is difficult. Palak explained that while regulating technology, there is a need to issue guidelines followed by policy and then law. Kaitesi suggested that policymakers and regulators need to adapt to the new realities and make regulations that enable rather than constrain. Chaturvedi added that technology will always be ahead of regulations and it is on the regulators to decide how to frame the policies. She added that regulation does not mean control but applying some terms and conditions to bring in accountability. The panellists agreed that attempts for regulation of technology must start from preventing and dealing with any harmful impacts as opposed to regulating the technology itself.

Kapoor explained that while regulating technology, the questions of kind and degree of harm need to be considered. She added that the idea of harm is cultural and therefore agreeing on a single global framework is difficult. Palak expanded on how local cultures differ across countries and different levels and kinds of speech or status are acceptable in different geographies. Owino, in a similar vein, spoke of how different countries decide what rights are granted to their citizens.

Kapoor further elaborated on the importance of privacy and data protection framework, and how data localisation and data sovereignty can impact innovation or social good. Kaitesi also discussed the problems with jurisdiction, since cyber crimes occur in the borderless realm of the internet. The panel agreed that providing internet access is essential to improve digital inclusion. There is a need for capacity building—in terms of both digital skills and financial literacy—in developing countries. There is also a need to provide technology solutions in vernacular languages.

—Basu Chandola
Climate change represents a planetary emergency that demands urgent and decisive action. According to the latest Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s (IPCC) Sixth Assessment Report, titled ‘Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change,’ bending the temperature curve to 1.5°C is very difficult but it is possible. The global greenhouse gas emissions need to peak before 2025, nearly halved by 2030, and reach net zero by 2050.

The global community has been identifying mechanisms to tackle climate change. One such mechanism is the carbon tax. This tax represents a price to be paid for carbon emissions generated in the production of goods and services and seeks to capture the hidden social cost of carbon. This social cost of carbon manifests, for example, in the form of damaged crops and healthcare costs incurred due to disasters arising on account of climate change. A carbon tax is expected to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, drive down the use of carbon-based fuels and incentivise investments into cleaner options. Carbon taxes are generally regressive since lower-income households tend to incur higher expenditure on emissions-intensive commodities as compared to higher-income households. In this context, the discussion by the panel intended to decipher whether a carbon tax is essentially a tax on poverty.

The general opinion that prevailed among the panellists is that existing alternatives, which have not yet been fully explored, need to be prioritised over the implementation of a carbon tax. For example, Waseqa Ayesha Khan argued against the levy of a carbon tax. She pointed out that a large number of climate-vulnerable countries are developing nations making insignificant contributions to global emissions. She emphasised the inconsistency between levying a carbon tax on these climate-vulnerable countries, and the loss and damage incurred by these nations starved of the resources to cope with this phenomenon. She asserted that it would be unreasonable to impose a carbon tax on these poorer developing nations. Khan proposed that the focus has to be on assisting such nations with adequate funding for both climate change mitigation and adaptation.

Jayant Sinha drew attention to the narrow window of opportunity that exists to bend the temperature curve to 1.5°C. According to him, a carbon tax is not a well-considered approach. In his view, the issue of combating climate change needs to be approached differently. He proposes that new institutions need to be established, just as the Bretton Woods institutions were set-up to rehabilitate the post-war economy and promote international economic cooperation in the period after World War II. These new institutions need to be underpinned by the cooperation of...
the Global North and the Global South.

An example of such an institution is an inclusive Climate Club which is expected to be stronger and better than the Paris Agreement. The Climate Club should be conceived in such a way that its membership should accrue benefits, for example, fiscal transfers from the Global North to the Global South. The Climate Club should also address nations indulging in free-riding, whilst failing to adhere to international agreements on reducing emissions. The Climate Club should be characterised by an appropriate incentive structure promoting cooperation between the Global North and the Global South.

Kira Vinke asserted that carbon pricing was an efficient way to decarbonise industries. Nevertheless, the design of the carbon pricing mechanism should ensure that the burden of this price does not fall on the poor. She mentioned that both the architecture of the Climate Club and the design of the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism proposed by the European Union are still at the stage of conception and negotiation. As far as the Climate Club proposed by Germany is concerned, it is expected to be an alliance of states that are more ambitious in terms of climate action than the international community as a whole. Vinke said that the existing proposals for a Climate Club involve the levy of a minimum carbon price. Nevertheless, the nations that cannot afford such a carbon price would be exempt from it. The Club would seek to tackle issues not already addressed by the COP. The Climate Club would cooperate on issues involving climate finance, technology transfer and capacity building. The focus of the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism is to prevent carbon leakage, i.e., discourage industries within the EU from migrating to other geographies so as to avoid the carbon price.

Elizabeth Yee emphasised the role of science-based philanthropy to solve the intractable problems facing the world. It is critical to create opportunities for all, especially the most vulnerable populations around the world. There is a need to support such vulnerable populations with access to energy which is critical for development. The focus should be on green and equitable recovery fuelling the creation of green jobs in a gender-equal manner. There is a need to incentivise the flow of private, government and philanthropic capital into enabling a greener and cleaner world. A carbon market mechanism needs to be developed on the principles of equity and inclusiveness. Such a mechanism should refrain from penalising countries that are not responsible for the climate change problem the world witnesses today.

Shirish Sinha pointed out the need to bridge three critical gaps in relation to tackling climate change: The ambition or the policy gap which refers to the need for ambitious climate targets and translating these targets into policies; the implementation gap which refers to the gaps in implementing climate policy, and the financing gap which refers to the need to finance climate policies.

According to him, any measure that is implemented to fast-track climate action has to be anchored in equity and climate justice—so should the concept of carbon price. While the idea of a uniform carbon price is economically appealing, it is politically highly unviable. Hence, there is a need to look for more realistic solutions to deal with the problem at hand.

In conclusion, the panellists identified if and when a carbon price should be imposed, what should be the architecture of such a mechanism, and what alternatives exist to such a mechanism.

—Renita D’Souza
This session was aimed at deciphering the geopolitics of Eurasia, amidst rapid geopolitical developments that have inevitably impacted and continue to impact the region in many ways. What do the war in Ukraine and a budding Russia-China entente entail for Eurasia? How has the takeover of Afghanistan affected regional dynamics? As geopolitics get massively altered by the aforementioned developments (and more)—how can Eurasian nations and regional institutions stand up to challenges? These were some of the driving questions that anchored this discussion.

Following an important admission regarding the impossibility of accurately defining the concept of Eurasia, the discussion commenced with perspectives on the current war in Ukraine, which has overshadowed most other global occurrences presently. It was interesting to see that although the panellists were talking about the implications of the same war, their insights were tempered by regional interests and their unique understanding of the repercussions of this war.

To begin with, Mousavi stated that the West was responsible for acting in a manner that had threatened Russian security interests—which compelled them to protect themselves. Aripov expressed concerns about the multiple direct and indirect threats that Central Asian countries face due to this war and their multifaceted reliance on Russia. He also highlighted the various economic and
Nicolas pointed out the negative impact that this conflict would have on the Belt and Road Initiative through hindrance on the routes that pass through Russia, Ukraine and Belarus. Sarybay shed light on the constant crisis management that the Kazaks have had to undertake in the last 3 decades. He also expanded on the promise of multilateralism and enhanced connectivity as stepping stones that would bolster other kinds of cooperation and development.

Speaking on the war, Kizeková underlined the incompatibility between Russia and China despite their developing relationship. She elaborated on their difference in approach, with the former clearly preferring force and hard power whereas the latter gravitated towards smart power and a cautious approach to advance its interests.

Although the crisis in Afghanistan continues to ravage the country and its people, the war in Ukraine has diverted attention away from it. Yet, the grave situation in the country and its overarching implications for the Eurasian region ensured extensive deliberation on the situation in Afghanistan over the course of this discussion.

The participants shared their own perspectives on Afghanistan’s current predicament. They came to the consensus that the world needed to pay more attention to alleviating the dire situation in the country. Mousavi highlighted that Afghanistan faces tremendous political, security, economic and social challenges—but it is up to the Taliban to accept the grim reality and engage with the global community to get past these challenges. Aripov advocated for pragmatism with respect to Afghanistan and stated that it would be dangerous for the world to just leave Afghanistan to fester in its own problems. He emphasised the need to engage in constructive dialogue with the government in Afghanistan to resolve the crisis. Sarybay seconded Aripov on the importance of resolving the crises in Afghanistan as swiftly as possible.

A discussion on Eurasia would not have been complete without the experts weighing in on whether Central Asia would be able to weather the challenges that have come its way—first due to the situation in Afghanistan and now the prolonged war in Ukraine. When asked about this, Aripov from Uzbekistan and Sarybay from Kazakhstan shared a similar sense of optimism about the issue. Although the issues remain prevalent, the experts did not deem them to be unnavigable. Aripov highlighted that in the last five years itself, the region as a whole had resolved various complicated internal and developmental issues. Similarly, Sarybay stated that many issues have plagued the region for the last three decades but solutions have always been found.

After a fruitful discussion, where several major issues concerning the Eurasian region were touched upon, the conclusion—as succinctly put by Aripov—was that this is not the time to disengage but to engage further. The preferred tool for this would be through increased connectivity (economic and people-to-people) and inclusivity as emphasised by the panellists. Lastly, Mousavi also iterated the importance of not forgetting the situation in Afghanistan under the shadow of the Ukraine war, given how dangerous this might prove to be for the whole extended region.

—Saaransh Mishra
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**Kwati Candith Mashego-Dlamini**, Deputy Minister of International Relations and Cooperation, South Africa
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**Md. Shahriar Alam**, State Minister for Foreign Affairs, Bangladesh

*Mumtaz Taking the Knee: The Battle Against Vaccine Apartheid*

Two years in, COVID-19’s virulence and resurgence depends essentially on the gaps in vaccination coverage. Within countries, we see a “pandemic of the unvaccinated”; and internationally, countries with large unvaccinated populations have the potential of creating new and dangerous variants. There is a stark divide that the world must reckon with: Before the G20 summit in October 2021, it was found that G20 members had received 15 times more COVID-19 vaccine doses per capita than countries in sub-Saharan Africa.

What can be done to bridge the vaccine divide? How can nations be incentivised to urgently invest in vaccinating the underserved geographies? Are initiatives like COVAX enough, or does an IPR waiver hold the answer? Is it time to rethink investments into global health care systems? What could be the contours of a new global health agenda at the G20?
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**Joan Benson**, Executive Director, Public Health Partnerships, Global Vaccines Public Policy, Merck, United States

**Ayoade Alakija**, Co-Chair, African Union’s African Vaccine Delivery Alliance; Special Envoy and Co-Chair for ACT-Accelerator, World Health Organization

**Jesal Doshi**, Deputy CEO, B Medical Systems, Luxembourg

Moderator: **Anjali Nayyar**, Executive Vice President, Global Health Strategies, India
Roshanara Unicorn Sightings: Energy, Entrepreneurship and the New Economy

Billion-dollar start-ups – “unicorns” – have exploded in the Indo-Pacific during the pandemic, with India alone birthing over forty new unicorns in 2021. These companies marry new technology, climate considerations, and SDG aspirations. They bridge two disparate worlds, standing between formal finance and the vast informal sectors that dominate the economies of the region.

How does the Indo-Pacific become a hub of innovation and not just a consumer of tech and products? What can be done to incentivise entrepreneurs to create businesses that are scalable? Can supporting start-ups and small enterprises lead to sustainable recovery and build resilience? Is there need for new frameworks and institutions that focus on emerging economies, and investing in businesses within underserved communities? How can the new global zeal for start-ups encourage a gender-balanced and inclusive business ecosystem?

Rajeev Chandrasekhar, Minister of State, Electronics and Information Technology, India
Tan Kiat How, Minister of State, Ministry of National Development; Minister of State, Ministry of Communications and Information, Singapore
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Jehangir The Broken Chain: Building Robust, Resilient & Reliable Supply Lines

As clogged ports and massive delivery delays dominate global headlines, and inflation complicates the global recovery, the importance of decentralised and resilient supply chains is evident. Nations across the world seek to reconcile their crucial supply lines – whether for semiconductors or vaccines – to enhance national security and strategic autonomy. Trust has become a crucial ingredient of how groupings like the Quad and actors such as the EU, the US, Japan, Taiwan, and South Korea are redrawing supply chains.

Is global trade fast becoming a geopolitical flashpoint or are we likely to see the emergence of a new trading order in the aftermath of the pandemic? Will this moment of geo-economic contestation give birth to a new and more inclusive architecture? How can these new arrangements and relationships integrate digital and green imperatives? How will energy and industrial materials that will fuel the 4IR be secured? How can we distribute the gains of this transition? Can the Indo-Pacific ensure that supply chains are not turned into weapons of war between great trading powers?
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The dramatic collapse of Kabul in 2021 will have lasting repercussions for the Afghan people and South Asia. The world reeled as visuals of America’s departure and the Taliban’s ascendancy inundated social media feeds and news reels. From terrorism and regional stability to human rights and gender equality, the rise of a new dispensation in Kabul raises a host of stark questions for the international community. America and its allies have suffered irreparably. Has the Afghanistan and Ukraine contrast shown that values defended in the borderlands of Europe will not be fought for elsewhere? How will shocking American actions, questioned by most in the region, impact Brand America? What is the prognosis on the rights and future of the people of Afghanistan and their ability to dream of democracy again? What role, both constructive and malevolent, have Afghanistan’s neighbours played? With the Afghan state in disarray, who is going to hold the proverbial baby and provide for nation building?</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td><strong>Roshanara Strife on the Streets: Responding to Kinetic Info-Wars</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The manipulation of information is being marshalled by state and non-state actors as a weapon of war. As lines between fact and fiction blur, information warfare is set to be the 21st century’s most devastating and consequential digital battleground. What are the significant vulnerabilities and limitations of the information ecosystem that make it susceptible to bad actors? How can states and corporations limit offline harms of online disinformation wars fuelled by bots? Without endangering free speech, how can they address the social divisions and subversion engendered by manipulated content?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td><strong>Moderator: Caitriona Heinl</strong>, Executive Director; Adjunct Research Fellow, The Azure Forum for Contemporary Security Strategy, Ireland</td>
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0900-0910 Welcome Address
V. Muraleedharan, Minister of State, Ministry of External Affairs, India

0910-1000 Panel Discussion
The Revenge of Ideology? Polarisation and the Exhaustion of Liberalism
At the turn of the millennium, modern and prosperous societies were exhausted from defending or opposing grand ideologies that arose in the 19th century. Radicalism was dead, history was over, and a rough consensus on a liberal political order had emerged. Today, the world is even richer, and even more radically polarised, whether on the streets or on virtual platforms. #Ideologies, often extreme, proliferate by the day, constantly contesting what were considered settled political arrangements for societies, communities, and nations.

So, is a liberal order an oxymoron when liberalism itself has no modern-day variant? What is the secret sauce that will bind collectives in the future? Will it be a democratic political regime? Or the preferences of the dominant? Will the views of community mobilisers prevail? Are spontaneous coalitions and irrational political aggregations our destiny? Is economic globalisation more important than commonly-agreed politics?

Teodoro L. Locsin Jr., Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Philippines
Carl Bildt, Former Prime Minister, Sweden; Co-Chair, European Council on Foreign Relations
Stephen Harper, Former Prime Minister, Canada
Jane Holl Lute, Former Deputy Secretary, Department of Homeland Security, United States
Baijayant Panda, National Vice President, Bharatiya Janata Party, India
Moderator: Palki Sharma Upadhyay, Executive Editor, WION, India

1000-1040 Townhall
The Raisina AMA
S. Jaishankar, Minister of External Affairs, India
Moderator: Samir Saran, President, Observer Research Foundation, India

1040-1055 Break

1055-1145 Panel Discussion
New Fuels, Old Aspirations: Moving the Next 5 Billion
Past industrial revolutions were powered by the uncontrolled use of fossil fuels; the Fourth Industrial Revolution must find additional sources of energy. Yet, 2021 provided stark reminders of how many countries still depend on a secure supply of fossil fuels. The energy transition is not straightforward: It could amplify socio-political fissures at home, and introduce dependencies abroad. For developing countries, rigid decarbonisation measures could also thwart the evolution of a robust domestic industry.

How can energy transitions help in rapid industrialisation and at-scale employment generation in the developing world? How can key nations invest in an institutional framework that supports this new energy landscape of the future? Will constructs like the International Solar Alliance be the start of a new era of coalitions for like-minded nations? Will geopolitics serve these energy transitions or complicate them?

Anniken Huitfeldt, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Norway
Mathias Cormann, Secretary-General, OECD
Aminath Shauna, Minister of Environment, Climate Change and Technology, Maldives
Amitabh Kant, CEO, NITI Aayog, India
Moderator: Ila Patnaik, Chief Economist, Aditya Birla Group, India
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1145-1215</td>
<td>In Conversation</td>
<td><strong>Nitin Gadkari</strong>, Minister of Road Transport and Highways, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderator: <strong>Shereen Bhan</strong>, Managing Editor, CNBC TV-18, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1215-1230</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230-1320</td>
<td>Panel Discussion</td>
<td>The Brussels Effect: Compass for a Strategic Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The “Brussels Effect” is the talk of the town in global capitals. From its response to the Ukraine conflict, to unveiling the multi-billion dollar Global Gateway Project, to announcing a strategy for the Indo-Pacific, to the Strategic Compass, the EU’s actions are being keenly watched. Is the EU learning how to use the language of power? Has the standoff in Ukraine catalysed a greater European inclination towards defence and security? How will a future EU project military power – through national militaries with similar shared objectives, a European army, or NATO? Are the continent’s existing political institutions capable of playing a more overtly geopolitical role? Russia united the EU; will China divide it? <strong>Zbigniew Rau</strong>, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Poland <strong>Jean Asselborn</strong>, Minister of Foreign and European Affairs, Luxembourg <strong>Gabrielius Landsbergis</strong>, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lithuania <strong>Leslie Vinjamuri Wright</strong>, Director, US and Americas, Chatham House, United Kingdom <strong>Rachel Rizzo</strong>, Senior Fellow, Atlantic Council Europe Center, United States Moderator: <strong>Ali Aslan</strong>, International TV Presenter and Journalist, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1320-1450</td>
<td>Lunch Conversations</td>
<td>Shahjehan Timid Leadership, Bashful Banks: Who Will Fund the Green Transition? Inadequate flow of global capital to developing countries remains the biggest hurdle to achieving climate targets. Despite US$46 trillion of pension funds and excess savings of nearly US$4 trillion earning negligible returns, the actual flow of capital to developing countries remains well below stated pledges and real requirements. Private finance will have to step in to work with public finance in closing the gaps for sustainable decarbonisation and a just transition. How can the Global North be made to deliver on its green finance commitments? How can risk assessments privilege green investments in emerging economies? Can big players in global financial hubs build capacity to evaluate and deploy capital at scale in the developing world? What innovative financial instruments are needed to accelerate green finance in emerging destinations where large gains for eco-transition are to be had? <strong>Amitabh Kant</strong>, CEO, NITI Aayog, India <strong>Gwendoline Abunaw</strong>, Managing Director, EcoBank Cameroon, Cameroon <strong>Christian Kettel Thomsen</strong>, Vice President, European Investment Bank <strong>Joojin Kim</strong>, Managing Director, Solutions For Our Climate, South Korea Moderator: <strong>Shikha Bhasin</strong>, Senior Programme Lead, Council on Energy, Environment and Water (CEEW), India</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Mumtaz Digital Doses: Healthcare, Technology and a Coalition of the Willing?**

From delivering specialist healthcare in rural areas to tailoring nutritional interventions for mothers, data and AI hold the key to 21st century healthcare. In the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic, resilient and effective healthcare systems matter more than ever for developing nations. In leveraging these new technologies for health, developing countries must contend with inadequate infrastructure and foreign players seeking to hoover local data.

What are the learnings from the pandemic on the role of technology and innovation in our healthcare systems? With know-how and funding concentrated in a few advanced countries, how can capability be transferred to the developing world? Can states conclude a partnership of equals with the private sector to construct digital development-centred societies? How can Indonesia and India leverage their G20 Presidencies to construct a coalition of the willing that will equitably harness Health Tech for the future?

**Kwati Candith Mashego-Dlamini**, Deputy Minister of International Relations and Cooperation, South Africa

**Dino Patti Djalal**, Founder and Chairman, Foreign Policy Community of Indonesia, Indonesia

**Preeti Sudan**, Panel Member, The Independent Panel for Pandemic Preparedness and Response; Former Secretary (Health), India

**Gargee Ghosh**, President, Global Policy and Advocacy, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, India

**Mark Chataway**, Managing Director, Hyderus, United Kingdom

Moderator: **Amandeep Gill**, CEO and Project Director, International Digital Health & AI Research Collaborative (I-DAIR), Switzerland

**Roshanara To The Point: Tech Tides and the Future of Conflict**

This session will feature the Indian Defence Secretary and will host defence chiefs, serving officers, academics and members of the private sector. The session will focus on the implications of emerging technologies and partnerships, and changing geopolitics. Drawing on lessons from recent developments, it will discuss the new threat environment and security landscape that are shaped by emerging technologies, and how democracies can ensure security and prosperity for their people.

**Ajay Kumar**, Defence Secretary, Ministry of Defence, India

Moderator: **Jehangir Interaction with the Young Fellows**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Panel/Conversation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1450-1540</td>
<td>Panel Discussion</td>
<td>Trading Security or Trade in Security: Europe and the Indo-Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In recent times, European nations – individually and collectively – have emerged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as significant geopolitical actors. European capitals and the European Union have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>termed China a strategic competitor; sought to take stronger positions on human</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rights; and set down Indo-Pacific strategies for the 21st century that aim to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>promote a rules-based order and the gaming of trade arrangements. However, there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>are questions about Europe's ability to assert itself against an expansive and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rising China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will Europe trade its security for economic returns? Can the Ukrainian crisis see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the emergence of a European Union more determined to collectively respond to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>authoritarian regimes? Will economic dependencies with China undermine strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>political positions, given Beijing’s “divide and invest” policy? Can collective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>economic actions (sanctions) work against a country much larger than Russia or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>will there need to be different ideas for a different threat?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Anniken Huitfeldt</strong>, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Anže Logar</strong>, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Anthony Abbott</strong>, Former Prime Minister, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sanjay Verma</strong>, Secretary (West), Ministry of External Affairs, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Petra Sigmund</strong>, Director General for Asia and the Pacific, Federal Foreign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Moderator</strong>: <strong>Peter Grk</strong>, Secretary-General, Bled Strategic Forum, Ministry of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign Affairs, Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540</td>
<td>In Conversation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Wopke Hoekstra</strong>, Deputy Prime Minister; Minister of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Moderator</strong>: <strong>Harsh V Pant</strong>, Vice President, Studies and Foreign Policy,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Observer Research Foundation, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540-1640</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640-1730</td>
<td>Panel Discussion</td>
<td>The Doctrine of Lapse: Lessons from the UN Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multilateralism is under attack. The postwar system, with the United Nations and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>related organisations serving as its bedrock, has failed to respond to multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>crises – climate change, the pandemic, trade, or preventing great power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>aggression. Some world leaders have even called for its dissolution in the face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of this impotence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As confrontations brew in the Indo-Pacific and in Old Europe, is the postwar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>model of great power relations still relevant? What place do institutions like the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UN and its founding principles have in an age in which great power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>contestation is multipolar, and overarching narratives are distrusted? In our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>digitalised and corporatised present, sovereign states are weakened – how can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>institutions structured around sovereign states retain relevance? To the point of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>irrelevance? Is it dangerous for inert UN institutions to be regarded as the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>highest supranational arbiters while failing to fulfil their role?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ararat Mirzoyan</strong>, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Armenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Daniel Carmon</strong>, Senior Research Fellow, International Institute for Counter-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terrorism, Israel; Former Ambassador of Israel to India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Lakshmi Puri</strong>, Former Assistant Secretary General, United Nations, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Charles Kupchan</strong>, Senior Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations; Professor of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>International Relations, Georgetown University, United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Jane Holl Lute</strong>, Former Deputy Secretary, Department of Homeland Security,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Moderator</strong>: <strong>Shashi Tharoor</strong>, Member of Parliament, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Panel Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1730-1820| Panel Discussion     | *From Mountain to Ocean: Harnessing Commerce, Connectivity and Creativity in the Subcontinent*  
As data, digitisation, and technology are becoming everyday utilities, South and Southeast Asia will find themselves in a unique position in a rapidly evolving global economic world order. Driven by a rising consumer class, strong start-up ecosystem, growing internet economy, and a demographic dividend, the digital wave is reshaping and redefining almost every aspect of business and society.

How can countries in the region take advantage of their young populations, infrastructure growth, and the digital economy? What is the potential for building trade and digital connectivity projects catering to an aspirational population? How can nations cooperate to enhance digital data flows and cross-border payments, while ensuring solutions are inclusive and equitable, and respect the privacy of citizens? Can debt-traps and unsustainable financing undermine and undercut the promise of, for example, a Bay of Bengal cooperative?

*Aminath Shauna*, Minister of Environment, Climate Change and Technology, Maldives  
*Md. Shahriar Alam*, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, Bangladesh  
*Biswo Nath Poudel*, Vice Chairperson, National Planning Commission, Nepal  
*Vinay Mohan Kwatra*, Ambassador to Nepal; Foreign Secretary (Designate), India  
*Tshering Cigay Dorji*, Former CEO, Thimphu TechPark, Bhutan  
Moderator: *Cécile Fruman*, Director, Regional Integration and Engagement, South Asia, World Bank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Panel Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1820-1840</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1840-1930| Panel Discussion     | *Dragon’s Fire: Deciphering China after Ukraine*  
As the plains of Ukraine turn into a battlefield, few players have more at stake than China. Its “no limits” partner faces stringent Western sanctions and its strategic competitors have found a new resolve. China is faced with a choice between its stated respect for sovereignty and its burgeoning friendship with Moscow.

What lessons will China and the world take from the Ukraine conflict? If deterrence hasn’t worked with Moscow, how will it work with Beijing? With the West largely united over Russian sanctions, is the Chinese economic juggernaut likely to face similar pressure in the event of a crisis? Will China’s lure be able to stand the test of a prolonged association with Moscow?

*Adm. Tony Radakin*, Chief of the Defence Staff, United Kingdom  
*Maj. Gen. Jung Hae-II*, President, Korea National Defense University, South Korea  
*Reinhard Bütikofer*, Member, European Parliament, Germany  
*Andrew Shearer*, Director General, Office of National Intelligence, Australia  
*Gudrun Wacker*, Senior Fellow, German Institute for International and Security Affairs, Germany  
Moderator: *Yalda Hakim*, Chief Presenter-International Correspondent, BBC World News, Australia
Pax Americana was built not only on the US’ industrial dominance, but also on the cultural power of Hollywood; the Asian century will be no different. India’s media and entertainment ecosystem is expected to generate over US$53 billion annually by 2025.

What are the policies and regulatory frameworks needed to fast track the growth of the Indo-Pacific as the “Content Subcontinent”? How can the region’s large and youth-driven demographic be leveraged to make it the world’s content powerhouse and harness the creative economy? How can the stories coming out of the Indo-Pacific be leveraged to promote inclusiveness, pluralism, and diversity? What are the international partnerships that must be invested in?

**Anurag Thakur**, Minister of Information and Broadcasting; Minister of Youth Affairs and Sports, India

**Bela Bajaria**, Head of Global TV, Netflix, India

**Madhuri Dixit**, Actor, Producer, India

**Shekhar Kapur**, Actor, Director, Producer, India

**Saad Mohseni**, CEO, MOBY Group, Australia

**Moderator:** **Amish Tripathi**, Director, The Nehru Centre; Author, India

**Mumtaz Hashtags without Collectives: We Bargain in the Digital Age**

As automation, atomisation, and the gig economy undercut 20th century social protections, three bargains will define the social contract in digital economies. First, governments and citizens must strive to protect privacy rights from data-driven corporate behemoths. Second, businesses and governments must frame an economic and regulatory architecture that promotes innovation while protecting privacy and worker’s rights. Finally, workers and technology platforms need to rethink collective bargaining and reimagine social security nets in the gig economy.

How is the 20th century welfare model impacted by this? What are the global successful models for protecting the informal digital workforce and what is the role of the state in shaping adequate protections? Is it time for welfare to be provided to citizens irrespective of their employment status? Can workers in big tech organise into traditional unions as some US Amazon employees did recently? Who are the Teamsters of the Fourth Industrial Revolution?

**N.K. Singh**, Chairman, 15th Finance Commission, India

**Narek Mkrtchyan**, Minister of Labor and Social Affairs, Armenia

**Kim Heungchong**, President, Korea Institute for International Economic Policy, South Korea

**Athira Menon**, Head, Public Policy, Uber India and South Asia

**Shrayana Bhattacharya**, Economist, Social Protection and Labour Unit for South Asia, World Bank

**Moderator:** **Lucy Corkin**, Business Strategist, Rand Merchant Bank, South Africa
### DAY TWO Tuesday, April 26, 2022

#### Roshanara Conflicts, Pandemic and the Indo-Pacific (Foreign Secretary’s Dinner)

Over the past two years, the countries of the Indo-Pacific have faced new challenges in both economic and strategic domains. The fallout of the pandemic, including the reconfiguration of supply chains, the reassessment of trade and economic linkages, and, indeed reappraisal of political partnerships are all part of the contemporary Indo-Pacific journey. Addressing security concerns, in traditional and emerging domains, has also taken on a fresh urgency. How like-minded countries in the Indo-Pacific partner can decisively address these will form part of this off-the-record dinner conversation featuring the Indian Foreign Secretary (designate).

**Vinay Mohan Kwatra**, Foreign Secretary (Designate), India

#### Jehangir Amoral Machines: Negating Human Agency, Codifying Societal Faultlines?

In pursuit of global AI innovation and pushing the frontiers of AI adoption, we have unwittingly created ‘artificial’ crises — biased automated decision-making systems. AI researchers are working on building moral machines that comprehend human values and are capable of applying them. But is the human race ready to surrender agency to biased machines? These systems have been infamous for wrongly identifying criminals, classifying dark-coloured people as gorillas, and deeming working women less eligible for loans.

Are algorithms and AI surreptitiously rewriting our social contract and society? How will data policies implicate privacy, inclusion, and innovation, and can we limit the capacity of AI and emerging technology to exacerbate societal cleavages? Should we risk access to essential resources for marginalised communities based on decisions made by biased algorithms and database owners? Is banning a viable option for limiting the harms of LAWS, deep fakes, and killer robots?

**Eamon Gilmore**, Special Representative for Human Rights, European Union

**Stéphane Duguin**, CEO, CyberPeace Institute, Switzerland

**Lydia Kostopoulos**, Senior Vice President, Emerging Tech, KnowBe4, United States

**Vikram Sharma**, Founder and CEO, Quintessence Labs, Australia

Moderator: **Erin Saltman**, Director of Programming, Global Internet Forum to Counter Terrorism (GIFCT), United States

#### Nizwan Ministerial Dinner (By Invitation Only)

2100-2130 Break
### DAY TWO  Tuesday, April 26, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2130-2230</th>
<th>Conversations over Kahwa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mumtaz Kremlin at the Crossroads: What Lies Ahead?**

The conflict in Ukraine has focused the world’s eyes on a Russia that it has failed to entirely accommodate or confront. Questions about the new Russian identity and its place in the world have become crucial inputs into long-range planning in global capitals.

Yet, many questions remain unanswered. What is the provocation for the Russian invasion of Ukraine, and why now? What lies at the root of the difficulties of the execution of Russia’s goals? How does the conflict end, and does it end well for Russia? Are we entering a new cold war or hot peace? Will Russia’s role in its international partnerships, from the SCO to the BRICS, be attenuated by its actions in Ukraine? How has the conflict changed the course of Russia; is its tilt towards China now inevitable? Is China’s support for Russia unconditional, or are there tensions in the relationship that will become apparent over time?

- **Carl Bildt**, Former Prime Minister, Sweden; Co-Chair, European Council on Foreign Relations
- **Andrei Bystritsky**, Chairman, Foundation for Development and Support, Valdai Discussion Club, Russia
- **Viktoriia Zhuravleva**, Head, Center for North American Studies, Primakov National Research Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO), Russia
- **François Godement**, Senior Advisor, Institut Montaigne, France
- **Milena Lazarevic**, Programme Director and Co-founder, European Policy Centre, Serbia

**Moderator:** **Nandan Unnikrishnan**, Distinguished Fellow, Observer Research Foundation, India

---

**Roshanara The Sanction Question: Currency of Mass Destruction**

Western sanctions against Russia have wreaked substantial collateral damage. International trading regimes, mechanisms like SWIFT and even agricultural exports find themselves condemned to death by sanction.

Do sanctions work and if so, are they worth their collateral effects? With previously untouchable central bank reserves and food exports under pressure, have sanctions over Ukraine put the world on the path to an economic “total war”? Have quick-start actions, imposed with little global consultation, damaged trust in international financial institutions?

- **Heribert Dieter**, Senior Fellow, German Institute for International and Security Affairs, Germany
- **Manuel Lafont Rapnouil**, Head, Policy Planning, Ministry for Europe and Foreign Affairs, France
- **Alena Kudzko**, Vice President, GLOBSEC, Slovakia
- **Kenneth Juster**, Distinguished Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations, United States; Former Ambassador of United States to India

**Moderator:** **Navdeep Suri**, Distinguished Fellow, Observer Research Foundation, India
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Panel/Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0900-0910</td>
<td>Welcome Address</td>
<td>Meenakashi Lekhi, Minister of State, Ministry of External Affairs, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0910-1010</td>
<td>Panel Discussion</td>
<td><strong>Sabres of Silicon: (Re)Assessing a 21st-Century Global Risk Landscape</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In the 21st century, threats to the global order exist not just in the open,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>but in the shadows: Cyberattacks; supply chain disruptions, and the shortage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of critical minerals; the proliferation of Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and the weaponisation of domestic socio-political cleavages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How are current and emerging technologies shaping our assessments of risks,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>alliances, and national security? Will these shared threats foster cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>between international partners with divergent economic abilities and political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>interests or will we see a new zero-sum game to dominate? How can we stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>attacks on critical digital infrastructure that delivers health, finance, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other existential needs? Given non-state actors can utilise these new threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>much more easily, how can we ensure state actors do not take advantage of this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>additional form of deniability? What new coalitions and arrangements can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rebuild trust in the age of dangerous tech?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Scene Setter:</strong> Tim Cahill, Senior Vice President, Global Business Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; Strategy, Lockheed Martin, United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Adm. R Hari Kumar</strong>, Chief of the Naval Staff, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gen. Angus Campbell</strong>, Chief of the Defence Force, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gen. Koji Yamazaki</strong>, Chief of Staff, Joint Staff, Japan Self-Defense Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Adm. John C. Aquilino</strong>, Commander, U.S. Indo-Pacific Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Air Marshal Luc De Rancourt</strong>, Deputy Director General for International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Affairs and Strategy, Ministry for Armed Forces, France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Moderator:</strong> Lisa Singh, Director and CEO, Australia India Institute,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010-1040</td>
<td>In Conversation</td>
<td>Bhupender Yadav, Minister of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Moderator:</strong> Sunjoy Joshi, Chairman, Observer Research Foundation, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1040-1110</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1110-1200</td>
<td>Panel Discussion</td>
<td><strong>Chasing the Monsoon: Life@75</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>India at 75 has evolved as a significant global actor with commensurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>expectations from the world regarding its choices, actions, and its dynamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>evolution. From responding to climate change and humanitarian crises, to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>global peace and security, to technology and digital frontiers, India's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>actions will shape the 21st century world. This panel seeks to engage with the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>roads India has travelled, and the pathways that lie ahead. What will shape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>India's decisions for the future? What is driving global expectations from a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>resolute India that is increasingly focused on creating favourable outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for its people and the world? How will India's transformation contribute to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>global well-being?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>S. Jaishankar</strong>, Minister of External Affairs, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>João Gomes Cravinho</strong>, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Stephen Harper</strong>, Former Prime Minister, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Jeff M. Smith</strong>, Senior Research Fellow, Asian Studies Center, The Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foundation, United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Velina Tchakarova</strong>, Director, Austrian Institute for European and Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Moderator:</strong> Samir Saran, President, Observer Research Foundation, India</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Diminished Democracies: Big Tech, Red Tech, and Deep Tech

Technology, once presumed to deepen and reinforce democracy, also poses risks to free societies along multiple axes. Large tech companies have gained influence in sectors from financial services to healthcare, while regulators struggle to keep up. Authoritarian states have discovered the use of technology as a method of control. And technology itself has moved into areas such as deep fakes that challenge social reality itself.

Since the digital is our public sphere, is it time to regulate advertisement by perversive political actors and their agents? Should we embrace reciprocity as a principle for de-platforming the Wolf Warriors mandated to spread disinformation, and see free speech as war by other means? Will digital territories shape the 21st century as the Westphalian political model defined the past?

- **Rajeev Chandrasekhar**, Minister of State, Electronics and Information Technology, India
- **Zunaid Ahmed Palak**, Minister of State, Information and Communication Technology, Bangladesh
- **Anne Neuberger**, Deputy National Security Advisor, Cyber and Emerging Technology, United States
- **Vivek Lall**, Chief Executive, General Atomics Global Corporation, United States
- **Nanjira Sambuli**, Fellow, Technology and International Affairs Program, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, United States

**Moderator:** **Kanchan Gupta**, Senior Advisor, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, India

### Shahjehan Connecting Oceans: The Data Economy and Our Digital Future

AI, IoT, and Big Data are rewriting the rules of the trade game in the Indo-Pacific. Digital trade, in the era of intelligence, runs the gamut from cross-border e-commerce and online gaming to digital payments. In the face of these sea changes, nations are scrambling to conclude digital trade agreements like DEPA.

Has the time come for new digital trade and investment partnerships focused on the Indo-Pacific? How can such a deal, defined by interoperability in standards and commonality in values, be constructed with a broad coalition of liberal democracies? How can we expand the Quad dialogue to include financial regulators, central banks, and like-minded nations, in pursuit of digital and financial inclusion? How can these countries coordinate their approach to emerging domains such as cryptocurrencies, digital currencies, and NFTs? Can digital institutions, digital infrastructure, and digital interoperability be combined in a digital new deal for the region?

- **Sumit Seth**, Joint Secretary, Policy Planning and Research, Ministry of External Affairs, India
- **Romana Vlahutin**, Ambassador at Large for Connectivity, European External Action Service
- **Sharad Sharma**, Co-Founder, iSPIRT, India
- **Medha Girotra**, Vice President, Public Policy (South Asia), Mastercard, United States
- **Hiroyuki Akita**, Commentator, Foreign Affairs and International Security, Nikkei, Japan

**Moderator:** **Erin Watson-Lynn**, Public Affairs Consultant and Adjunct Research Fellow, Griffith Asia Institute, Australia
### Humans of the Indo-Pacific: Reclaiming Development

The Indo-Pacific is in the market for a rebrand. Once seen as the key geopolitical construct of our times, the Indo-Pacific must now trade bullets for bread in its quest to address ageing societies, widespread unemployment, food and nutritional insecurity, and a host of socio-economic challenges. Home to two thirds of humanity, the region must leverage advances in technology and its reserve of human capital to deliver sustainable growth before time runs out.

In an increasingly digital and informal global economy, how can regional partnerships rewrite the development agenda on social protection, economic growth, and infrastructure? Can alliances led by the emerging world design solutions to pressing issues like air pollution, liveable urbanism, and biodiversity preservation? If connectivity is key for development in the region, can states resolve the tension between China’s fast-track funding and the West’s promise of slow-moving but high-quality infrastructure? What is the potential of green transitions to catalyse business?

Report Release: **Bruno Bosle**, Country Director, AFD, France

**Aaditya Thackeray**, Minister of Tourism and Environment, Government of Maharashtra, India

**Philippe Orliange**, International Operations Executive Director, AFD, France

**Javier Salido Ortiz**, Director General for North America, Eastern Europe, Asia and the Pacific, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Spain

**Melinda Bohannon**, Director, Strategy, Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office, United Kingdom

**Uduak Amimo**, Acting Executive Director, Uraia Trust, Kenya

**Moderator**: **Sunaina Kumar**, Senior Fellow, Observer Research Foundation, India

### Roundtable: Regaining Leadership: A G20 Agenda For Developing-Nation Presidencies

The G20 remains the most powerful and influential forum for global economic governance; and, for the first time, three successive G20 presidencies will be held by emerging economies. As India takes over the presidency from Indonesia this year, these countries have the opportunities to redesign the global economic architecture and set a new agenda for sustainable finance, digital economy, human capital, infrastructure, health and other G20 priorities.

What are the issues that the members of the Troika should prioritise? Which past G20 initiatives worked and should be taken forward? Amid a new crisis that has disrupted macro-economic stability and slowed the flow of sustainable finance, how can the G20 regain its leadership position?

**Abhay Thakur**, Additional Secretary (G20), Ministry of External Affairs, India

**Dian Triansyah Djani**, G20 Co-Sherpa, Indonesia

**César Augusto Vermiglio Bonamigo**, Head of G20 General Coordination and Brazil’s Sous-Sherpa to G20, Brazil

**Andreas Schaal**, Director, Global Relations, OECD; OECD Sherpa to the G7, the G20 and APEC
### DAY THREE Wednesday, April 27, 2022

#### 1320-1450 Lunch Discussions

**Jehangir Gendered Governance: Women in Peace and Security**

The pandemic underlined the importance of resilient female leadership. Women are reshaping our thinking on power, politics, and peace. Female leaders now command nations, armies, and major corporations – but have the principles of government and machinery of governance shifted to match?

From a buzzword to reality, what constitutes a feminist foreign policy? What is the nature of the stakeholders who will implement and define this foreign policy and how is it different from the past? Does a non-patriarchal approach also democratise international relations and bring in voices from below? How do we invest in a new cadre of proponents of feminist foreign policy?

- **Hans-Christian Hagman**, Chief Analyst and Senior Adviser to the State Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Sweden
- **Aleksandra Dier**, Regional Advisor on Women, Peace and Security in the Middle East and North Africa, UN Women
- **Ambika Viswanath**, Co-Founder and Director, Kubernein Initiative, India
- **Nancy Ziuzin Schlegel**, Vice President, International Government Affairs, Lockheed Martin, United States
- **Dóra Szűcs**, Head, International Relations, Mathias Corvinus Collegium, Hungary

**Moderator:** **Sarah Bressan**, Co-Founder, Better Think Tanking; Research Fellow, Global Public Policy Institute (GPPi), Germany

#### 1450-1540 Panel Discussion

**The First Responder: Women Leadership and the SDGs**

Across the world, women have steered effective and inclusive COVID-19 response programmes, establishing themselves as first responders in both policy chambers and on the frontlines. Despite the challenges that complicate female leadership and participation across different realms, it is critical to achieve gender equity to enable and accelerate the Sustainable Development Goals.

Drawing on lessons from the pandemic, how can women be further empowered and their potential unlocked to accelerate development? How can female leadership be enhanced across the political sphere, boardrooms, and financial systems? What can be done to make technology more inclusive for women and to aid them in crisis response and recovery? How can education be made more accessible, not just for women as students, but for women as educators?

- **Smriti Z. Irani**, Minister of Women and Child Development, India
- **Kwati Candith Mashego-Dlamini**, Deputy Minister of International Relations and Cooperation, South Africa
- **Waseqa Ayesha Khan**, Chairman, Parliamentary Standing Committee on Ministry of Power, Energy and Mineral Resources; Member of Parliament, Bangladesh
- **Vanita Sharma**, Advisor, Strategic Initiatives, Reliance Foundation, India
- **Shombi Sharp**, Resident Coordinator India, United Nations

**Moderator:** **Chandrika Bahadur**, Former Director, SDG Academy, India
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1540-1630</td>
<td>Panel Discussion</td>
<td>Building the Gates of Globalisation: Investment, Infrastructure and Taboos</td>
<td>Geoffrey Onyeama, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jayant Sinha, Member of Parliament, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Romana Vlahutin, Ambassador at Large for Connectivity, European External Action Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tadashi Maeda, Governor, Japan Bank for International Cooperation, Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philippe Orliange, Executive Director, Country Programs, AFD, France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderator: Garima Mohan, Fellow, Asia Programme, German Marshall Fund, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630-1650</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650-1740</td>
<td>Panel Discussion</td>
<td>Domestic Discord, Global Expectations: Will the American Eagle Fly?</td>
<td>Carl Bildt, Former Prime Minister, Sweden; Co-Chair, European Council on Foreign Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashok Malik, Policy Advisor, Ministry of External Affairs, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ming-Shih Shen, Acting Deputy CEO &amp; Director, Division of National Security Research, Institute for National Defence and Security Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Twining, President, International Republican Institute, United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa Curtis, Senior Fellow and Director, Indo-Pacific Security Program, Centre for a New American Security, United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderator: Lynn Kuok, Shangri-La Dialogue Senior Fellow for Asia-Pacific Security, IISS, Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740-1800</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-1850</td>
<td>Panel Discussion</td>
<td>Out of Africa: Leading on Trade and Economic Integration</td>
<td>Geoffrey Onyeama, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kwaku Ampratwum-Sarpong, Deputy Minister Political and Economic, Ministry of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign Affairs and Regional Integration, Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Usta Kaitesi, CEO, Rwanda Governance Board, Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dammu Ravi, Secretary (Economic Relations), Ministry of External Affairs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderator: Omneya Ghamry, Programme Manager, Cairo International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Centre for Conflict Resolution, Peacekeeping and Peacebuilding, Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-1940</td>
<td>Panel Discussion</td>
<td>Beachheads of Globalisation: Investments, Debts and Transitions</td>
<td>Hugh Hilton Todd, Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ausaf Sayeed, Secretary (CPV and OIA), Ministry of External Affairs, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mohamed Nasheed, Speaker of the Parliament; Former President, Maldives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Malshini Senaratne, Asst. Head of Department and Lecturer, University of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seychelles, Seychelles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderator: Preeti Soni, Head, UN Asian and Pacific Centre for Transfer of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1950</td>
<td>Closing Remarks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rajkumar Ranjan Singh, Minister of State, Ministry of External Affairs, India</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1950-2040 | Panel Discussion              | **Showstopper: Weaponisation of Everything**  
The geopolitical developments and the pandemic in the last two years have made us acutely aware of the frailties of global public goods, supply chains, and institutions. The weaponisation of financial systems and prominent symbols of globalisation has rung alarm bells around the world.  
How can global financial flows and mechanisms be ring-fenced from political blockages? Does the weaponisation of popular symbols of globalisation have real-value impact, or is it merely pandering? In such circumstances, what paths do nations have to genuine self-reliance? In an era of geopolitical conflict across kinetic, cyber or ideological arenas, what can be done to prevent the weaponisation of everything? How can the international community ensure that the supply lines essential to health and food security, for instance, are protected from arbitrary political action?  

- **Tobias Lindner**, Minister of State, Federal Foreign Office, Germany
- **Péter Sztáray**, Minister of State for Security Policy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Hungary
- **Anne Neuberger**, Deputy National Security Advisor, Cyber and Emerging Technology, United States
- **Harsh Vardhan Shringla**, Foreign Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India
- Moderator: **Indrani Bagchi**, CEO, Ananta Aspen Centre, India |

| 2040-2200 | Dinner Discussions          | **Shahjehan Quadrophenia: Rewiring the Indo-Pacific’s Political Economy**  
Partnerships in the Indo-Pacific are no longer just about security or economics. They blend the two, seeking to create new linkages of trade, trust, and norms.  
From securing supplies of rare earth minerals and semiconductors to ensuring the spread of sustainable, quality infrastructure, can groupings like the Quad script a new economic architecture for the Indo-Pacific? How can we conceive partnerships that extend beyond traditional security and are inclusive enough to bring in key partners like Korea and ASEAN? Given internal divisions within the Quad on questions from trade norms to data regulation, can a divided house push a unified geo-economic vision?  

- **Keynote:** **Anne Neuberger**, Deputy National Security Advisor, Cyber and Emerging Technology, United States
- **Melissa Conley Tyler**, Program Lead, Asia-Pacific Development, Diplomacy and Defence Dialogue, Australia
- **Kim Heungchong**, President, Korea Institute for International Economic Policy, South Korea
- **Lydia Kostopoulou**, Senior Vice President, Emerging Tech, KnowBe4, United States
- **Satoru Nagao**, Fellow (Non-Resident), Hudson Institute, Japan
- Moderator: **Ashutosh Chadha**, Director and Country Head, Government Affairs and Public Policy, Microsoft, India |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mumtaz Banking the Next 2 Billion: Digital Payments, Currencies and Caution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital technology will transform finance over the 21st century. From blockchain to decentralised finance, digital payments to loans on tab, electronic IDs to digital currencies, will change our assessment of finance and will implicate our financial inclusion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the achievements in terms of financial and social technology thanks to the dissemination of new technology in the sector? How can countries collaborate on shared regimes to address vexed questions such as digital taxation and the regulation of digital assets? How can the regulatory architecture catalyse the service of the underserved and create digital global safety nets? Can the protection and creation of global public goods go along with value creation and entrepreneurial growth? How does any national government create sharp regulations in a borderless digital ecosystem which is both undeciphered and delocalised?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zunaid Ahmed Palak, Minister of State, Information and Communication Technology, Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priyanka Chaturvedi, Member of Parliament, India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astha Kapoor, Co-founder, Aapti Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usta Kaitesi, CEO, Rwanda Governance Board, Rwanda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwame Owino, CEO, IEA, Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator: Amar Patnaik, Member of Parliament, India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040-2200 Dinner Discussions Roshanara Green Battlegrounds: Carbon Tax or Taxing Poverty?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most efficient mechanism to accelerate the transition to low-carbon growth is a carbon price. But how will different approaches to taxing or pricing carbon intersect with each other? A uniform global price for carbon would violate the basic principle that developing nations be treated differently from the developed world, which is responsible for 80 percent of historical emissions. It would undercut emerging nations' development budgets and condemn many to poverty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can we ensure that the developing world’s poverty is not the developed world’s mitigation strategy? Are new trade policies and investment biases seeking to serve the developed world's interests? How can a more equitable carbon pricing arrangement be developed? What role could “climate clubs” play? How can any and all carbon tax collected by the developed world be deployed for development imperatives of the emerging world?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waseqa Ayesha Khan, Chairman, Parliamentary Standing Committee on Ministry of Power, Energy and Mineral Resources; Member of Parliament, Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayant Sinha, Member of Parliament, India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Yee, Executive Vice President, Program Strategy and Chief of Staff, The Rockefeller Foundation, United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirish Sinha, Director, Climate, Children’s Investment Fund Foundation, India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kira Vinke, Head, Centre for Climate and Foreign Policy, German Council on Foreign Relations, Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator: Ulka Kelkar, Director, Climate Program, World Resources Institute, India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2040-2200 Dinner Discussions

Jehangir Guardians of the Caspian: Deciphering the Geopolitics of Eurasia

From the Heartland theory to the Great Game, Eurasia has long been at the core of global politics. The brewing entente cordiale between China and Russia is rewriting the rules of the game; and the return of the Taliban means the script of terrorism stalks Eurasia once again.

How has the fall of Afghanistan changed regional dynamics? How is the Moscow-Beijing entente and the current Ukraine war reshaping the politics and security of the region? Post the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict, how does Erdogan’s Turkey influence regional stability? How can the US and the EU play a shaping role in the region and what partnerships will they need to foster? As the world is altered by technology, pandemics, and climate change, how are Eurasian nations and regional institutions rising to the challenge?

Seyed Rasoul Mousavi, Assistant Minister; Director General (South Asia), Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Iran

Alica Kizeková, Head, Asia Pacific Unit, Institute of International Relations, Czech Republic

Kairat Sarybay, Executive Director, Conference on Interaction and Confidence Building Measures in Asia (CICA), Kazakhstan

Eldor Aripov, Director, Institute of Strategic and Regional Studies, Uzbekistan

Francoise Nicolas, Director, Center For Asian Studies, French Institute of International Relations, France

Moderator: Ali Aslan, International TV Presenter and Journalist, Germany