Our Today, Their Tomorrow

How British leadership can build a better world for children

Save the Children

Our Today, Their Tomorrow

How British leadership can build a better world for children

Contents

Acknowledgements

With enormous thanks and gratitude to the following people for their help in the production of this collection: Flora Alexander, James Dray, George Graham, Claire Leigh, Andrew Mace, Martha Mackenzie, Nick Martlew, Steven McIntosh, Claire O'Meara, Nicola Reindorp, Alastair Russell, Sayyeda Salam, Kevin Steele, Emma Wagner, Lisa Wise.

Contributor Biographies

Sam Barker is Director of the Conservative Environment Network. He has worked in Parliament, think tanks and international development charities. @RepairingLease

Dr John Bew heads the "Britain in the World" Project at the think tank Policy Exchange. He runs the Grand Strategy Programme in the War Studies Department at Kings College London, which is striving to bring more historical and strategic expertise to statecraft, diplomacy and foreign policy. In 2015 Dr Bew was awarded the Philip Leverhulme Prize for excellence in Politics and International Studies. Prior to this, Dr Bew served as the youngest ever Henry A. Kissinger Chair in Foreign Policy at the John W. Kluge Center at the US Library of Congress. @JohnBew

Ben Caldecott is a leading environmentalist and economist. He is Director of the Sustainable Finance Programme at the University of Oxford Smith School of Enterprise and the Environment and is concurrently an Adviser to The Prince of Wales's Accounting for Sustainability Project, an Academic Visitor at the Bank of England and a Visiting Scholar at Stanford University. Ben sits on the board of the Conservative Environment Network and is an Associate Fellow at Bright Blue. @bencaldecott

Joe Cerrell is the Managing Director of Global Policy and Advocacy at the Gates Foundation. Prior to his time at the Foundation, he held a variety of senior roles in government and strategy consulting practices, including positions in the Clinton White House and at APCO World. Joe currently serves on the board of directors for the ONE campaign and Comic Relief. @CerrJ

Rt Hon Baroness Chalker of Wallasey has decades of experience of working with Africa and on development issues, both in and out of Government. She spent seven and a half years as Head of International Development and eleven and a half years as Africa Minister at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office under Margaret Thatcher and John Major, and has since founded Africa Matters, advising companies doing business in the continent, and the Chalker Foundation, which works to improve African healthcare. @BaronessChalker

Jamie Cooper is founding Chair and President of Big Win Philanthropy. Jamie has more than 20 years' experience in bringing private sector, government and non-profit leaders together to pursue innovative policy on economic and social issues. She previously co-founded the Children's Investment Fund Foundation and served as its President and CEO.

Flick Drummond MP was elected as Member of Parliament for Portsmouth South in 2015 and is a member of the Women and Equalities Committee. Flick was born in Aden, Yemen, and after spending most of her childhood in the Middle East and Asia has a passionate interest in humanitarian crises in the Middle East. She is a Council Member of the European Council on Foreign Relations. @FlickD

Professor Tom Fletcher CMG is a former UK Ambassador, and the author of 'Naked Diplomacy – Power and Statecraft in the Digital Age'. He is the Strategy Director of the Global Business Coalition for Education, chairs the Creative Industries Federation's International Advisory Council, and teaches at New York University. @Tfletcher

Nick Grono has dedicated the last fifteen years to fighting conflict and modern slavery. He is the inaugural CEO of the Freedom Fund – the world's first private donor fund dedicated to ending slavery. In its first two years of operation the Fund has liberated almost 9,000 men, women and children from slavery. Prior to setting up the Fund, Nick was the Deputy President of the International Crisis Group and served as Chief of

Staff and National Security Adviser to the Australian Attorney-General. @NickGrono

Christian Guy led Downing Street's work on life-chances and social mobility from 2015 to 2016, before which he was the Director of the Centre for Social Justice and speechwriter to Rt Hon Iain Duncan Smith MP. He has experience across a breadth of policy areas including working closely with the Prime Minister on modern slavery during her time as Home Secretary. @ChristianGuy_

Dr Karin von Hippel is the Director-General of the Royal United Services Institute (RUSI). She joined RUSI after serving as Chief of Staff to General John Allen, Special Presidential Envoy for the Global Coalition to Counter ISIL. Prior to that she worked as a Deputy Assistant in the Bureau of Conflict and Stabilisation Operations and as a Senior Adviser in the Bureau of Counterterrorism at the US Department of State. She has also worked for the United Nations and the European Union in Somalia and Kosovo. @kvonhippel

Sir John Holmes was until recently Director of the Ditchley Foundation, bringing together global experts to shape policy on international issues. Formerly UN Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief, his distinguished career in diplomacy includes time as UK ambassador to France and Portugal, and overseas adviser to Prime Ministers John Major and Tony Blair. He is also currently Chair of the International Rescue Committee UK. @HolmesPimlico

Baroness Jenkin of Kennington was created a life peer in 2011. In 2015 she co-founded Women2Win along with the new Prime Minister Theresa May. The organisation has been instrumental in encouraging more women to become Conservative MPs. She is the founder and former chair of Conservative Friends of International Development. @baronessjenkin

Kirsty McNeill is Save the Children's Executive Director of Policy, Advocacy and Campaigns. Previously, she spent three years as a Special Adviser in Number 10 and led the policy and influencing work of DATA, Bono and Bob Geldof's advocacy organisation, in the UK, Germany, France, Italy and the EU institutions. She is on the board of the Holocaust Educational Trust and a council member of the European Council on Foreign Relations. @kirstyjmcneill

Rt Hon Andrew Mitchell MP spent over seven years leading the Conservative Party's thinking on international development, first in the Shadow Cabinet and subsequently as the first Conservative Secretary of State for International Development. During his time at DFID he founded the Independent Commission for Aid Impact and led a successful drive for improvement in the transparency and scrutiny of British aid. He placed tackling conflict and promoting prosperity at the centre of British development policy.

Paul Polman is CEO of Unilever and a global advocate for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). He was a key business voice in the creation of the SDGs, having served as a member of the UN High Level Panel on the post-2015 Development Agenda. He is Chairman of the World Business Council for Sustainable Development and a founder member of the Commission on Business and Sustainable Development. In 2015 he received the Champion of the Earth Award, the UN's highest environmental accolade. @PaulPolman

Joe Powell is Deputy Chief Executive Officer, Open Government Partnership. He serves as an OGP spokesperson, leads on strategic communication and support to OGP governments, and works closely with the OGP Steering Committee. Joe previously worked for the ONE Campaign, where he was managing ONE's global campaign for increased transparency in the extractive industries. As Senior Policy and Advocacy Manager at ONE, Joe also led global advocacy on the G20 and policy development for the 2013 G8. @josephpowell

Dr Sanjay Pradhan is the CEO of the Open Government Partnership, which works with states, civil society groups and multilateral organisations to promote government transparency, accountability and responsiveness to citizens. A widely respected figure in the development community, he has held three Vice President positions at the World Bank Group leading on governance, anti-corruption and accountability. He has extensive experience working in developing countries and has authored numerous publications including being a principal author of the 1997 World Development Report, The State in a Changing World. @SPradhanOGP

Kevin Watkins is the CEO of Save the Children. Previously he was Executive Director of the Overseas Development Institute, a non-resident senior fellow with the Center for Universal Education at the Brookings Institution, and the director and lead author of UNESCO's Education for All Global Monitoring Report. @savechildrenuk

Sir Andrew Witty became Chief Executive Officer of GSK in 2008, having joined the company in 1985. Under his leadership, GSK has taken a number of steps to deliver innovative new medicines and vaccines and widen access to them around the world; these include introducing tiered pricing, healthcare infrastructure-building, data-sharing and innovative partnerships. Andrew has served in numerous advisory roles to Governments around the world and is also Chancellor of the University of Nottingham. ♦

Introduction

Kirsty McNeill and Kevin Watkins

This is a collection full of words. But sometimes there are no words which can describe the magnitude of the tasks before us. What words can describe the sorrow we felt when we first saw the photograph of little Alan Kurdi, lifeless on a Turkish beach after he drowned trying to reach safety in Europe? Or the video of Omran Daqneesh, dazed and bloodied in the aftermath of yet another bombardment in Syria's brutal civil war?

Sometimes it takes the face of a child to remind us of the human tragedies behind the big statistics that come with every international crisis. And it can take the face of a child to remind us of our collective responsibility to uphold their rights, expand their opportunities and protect them from conflict.

Save the Children was created almost 100 years ago in a period of dramatic social, economic and political change. We were established to advance the cause of child rights after the First World War. More recently, we have worked with governments to help make the United Kingdom a champion for children on the world stage. As a country, we should be proud of what has been achieved by governments of all parties through the aid partnerships that have saved lives, put children in school, advanced gender equality and supported economic growth.

But advancing the cause of children is about more than aid.

It is about using the full force of our diplomatic, trade, investment, and humanitarian assets to address the deeper development problems that destroy opportunities for children. Britain helped galvanise the world in framing an ambitious set of Global Goals for 2030, including the elimination of avoidable child death, universal secondary schooling and the

eradication of extreme child poverty. We now have a critical role to play in delivering on those goals by using our influence on the international stage. And we have an ongoing responsibility to protect children from conflicts they played no part in creating – children like Alan and Omran.

As an organisation that works for and with children, what we are able to achieve is inevitably shaped by wider currents. How political leaders and the public see Britain's role in the world matters. And in a rapidly changing international environment, Brexit has given a powerful new impetus to debates about Britain's place in the world. Our job as Save the Children is to put children at the centre of this discussion.

The implications of the referendum result for British policy and British politics are still playing out. This collection was conceived as a service to those new ministers (up to and including the new prime minister) who have not enjoyed the normal 'run-in' of a general election campaign to develop policies and make a case to the public for their governing project. And it was designed to help all of us answer the question of what a post-imperial, post-referendum powerhouse like Britain is really for. To that end we have asked all contributors to answer two main questions in their essays. Firstly, is Britain well placed to lead in this arena? Secondly, what would leadership look like in the next few years?

As a result this collection is avowedly national in its scope. Expect a lot about the machinery of Westminster and Whitehall and the agenda for Britain's particular suite of relationships (in NATO, the United Nations Security Council and the Bretton Woods institutions) as well as theses on how Britain's soft power assets (our language, cultural industries and historic alliances) can best be used to make progress on issues as diverse as climate change and modern slavery. At the same time our contributors have been acutely aware of the international context, including the imminent inauguration of a new US president and appointment of a new UN Secretary General. So we hope that this collection remains relevant to the peculiarities of our post-referendum British setting, without falling prey to introspection or self-obsession.

We don't agree with everything in the pages that follow and our essayists don't all agree with each other. Save the Children would differ with some of the analysis and not all the recommendations would get our endorsement. But we hope that the ideas set out and the open-minded spirit in which they are framed will help to inform the UK government's perspectives and – above all – that the pamphlet will promote debate. We all stand to gain from a culture in which dialogue does not mean division. The perspectives set out by our authors illustrate how diverse insights from the worlds of diplomacy, politics, research, philanthropy and business can enrich the thinking of each to the benefit of all.

The essayists here range widely over the whole terrain of international development and humanitarian action. Their contributions extend from nutrition to innovation, from defence to transparency. Despite the diversity of topics and backgrounds, two things emerge as strong themes across the board. One is the importance of history and the long-view. Contributors, even those drawn from electoral politics, suggest a British project which endures well beyond any given political cycle. They identify areas in which British policy-makers have had sustained impact because they have elevated certain priorities, from day to day decision-making to the status of perennial British interests, not least by legislating for the 0.7% aid target. The second is the striking optimism across these pieces, even from people dealing with some of the most complex problems in some of the most dangerous places on earth.

Looking beyond the individual parts, the whole story to emerge from this collection is not one of decline or malaise, but of a country whose internationalists have the conviction, capability and confidence to ensure Britain continues to play a leadership role for children.

At Save the Children we look forward to working with these contributors and the wider policy community to ensure that Britain's incredible potential – so eloquently explained in the pages which follow – is realised. ♦

Part 1

Our global leadership, values and traditions

1. A Development Agenda for the 21st Century

Rt Hon Andrew Mitchell MP

Our aid and international development budget is unquestionably in Britain's national interest. Above all it is an investment in our prosperity and security – enabling developing countries to climb out of poverty through growth, trade and investment, whilst bringing stability to some of the most volatile and dangerous parts of the world.

The economist Sir Paul Collier describes the idea of overseas aid spending as being of 'mutual benefit' to both donor and recipient – combining these national interest arguments with the moral imperative to help the world's poorest.

Britain's development commitments reflect both sides of this equation: our proud history of stepping up to support those most in need, and the advancement of British interests through an aid and development budget being deployed across government.

Despite the clear benefits to our country afforded by our aid commitment, this is not the primary reason the British public support international development. Recent analysis of centre-right voters' perceptions of overseas aid indicates that support for aid lies in their pride that Britain never turns its back on those most in need, rather than because aid serves our national interest. The public primarily wants to know that Britain is doing its bit for the world's poorest, and generations of generosity to charities working overseas and causes like Comic Relief show that we are willing to stump up as a country to fulfil this.

Ensuring aid delivers

However this big-heartedness is rightly matched by a robust public interrogation of aid. Taxpayers need to know that aid works and that their money is well spent.

Inevitably, aid is delivered in some of the most insecure and troubled parts of the world, which will always make guaranteeing impact and efficiency challenging. But we must always acknowledge where aid has been poorly delivered and ineffective.

That is why, as Secretary of State for International Development, I established the Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI) – an expert, objective watchdog which provides the toughest scrutiny of British aid spending. ICAI reports not to the ministers responsible – who could at least in theory ignore or bury concerns – but directly to Parliament.

Shining a brighter light on aid spending has rooted out examples of bad practice and minsters have rightly been hauled over the coals as a result, but the overall picture is extremely positive. Taxpayers can be confident that British aid is already amongst the most effective and well-delivered anywhere in the world.

However, the aid landscape is changing. Recent reforms mean that the amount of aid being spent by other government departments is almost tripling, including the establishment of funds with the Department of Health, the Foreign Office and the Business Department. British diplomats are spending aid to support our foreign policy objectives, NHS medical and research expertise is leading new efforts to combat disease around the world and aid is being delivered as part of ambitious private sector partnerships to drive growth in developing countries.

This multi-track approach is already delivering a revolution in international development. But it also presents a series of opportunities for the future of aid spending – greater targeting of aid to where it is most needed, more sophisticated scrutiny to track this more complicated map of spending, and an intensification of cross-government alignment of aid and development, trade, defence and diplomacy.

This approach offers new opportunities for policy alignment across government – enhancing British priorities overseas and multiplying the impact of aid. But it is also essential that the searchlight of scrutiny follows every penny of aid spending to guard against misuse and corruption and ensure value for money. There is a significant opportunity to apply the principles of the Independent Commission on Aid Impact and the oversight of Parliament's International Development Committee to cross-government aid spending – to drive both transparency and greater policy coherence.

Targeting the poorest and most marginalised

The world has seen remarkable progress in addressing global poverty over the last generation – British aid has been central to achieving the rapid increases in the number of children in school, and a halving of the number of children who die before their fifth birthday. But as well as sustaining this progress across the board, our attention in future should also be focused on those groups who have been left behind.

Where people live – or who they are – can determine whether they are reached by aid and improvements in public services and if they share in rising prosperity.

The UK has been at the forefront of addressing this kind of marginalisation by placing girls and women, too often locked out of economic and social opportunity and bearing the brunt of violence and conflict, at the heart of all our development work. As a result, British aid is being concentrated on getting girls into school, protecting women from sexual violence, increasing access to maternal and reproductive healthcare and opening up opportunities for women's employment. It is also tackling the blight of modern-day slavery. And our Girls' Education Challenge Fund – designed to secure schooling for up to 1 million excluded girls by supporting non-state into-school activity – is a world leader.

In 2015, the British government successfully led efforts to inject this approach into global development by setting a new standard for the 2015-2030 UN Sustainable Development Goals – the world cannot now celebrate progress if any economic or social group has been left behind.

This should help drive a new agenda for international development which delivers precisely what the public want from British aid – a robust targeting of aid on those most in need. This means reaching the very poorest and all those who face deliberate discrimination and exclusion – not just women and girls but ethnic and religious minorities and those excluded by geography or displacement as a result of conflict or natural disasters.

We can now deploy the scrutiny architecture established in the last six years to test whether aid is reaching these groups and understand the impact of different approaches to aid and development interventions in raising the prospects of those left the furthest behind.

Tackling corruption and tax avoidance

Continuing this shift in development to ensure it benefits the whole population of developing countries also means reaching beyond the traditional view of aid as simply meeting basic needs, like healthcare or sanitation.

We well understand that in addition to these basic programmes, investment is much needed in the infrastructure of an accountable state and the rule of law – enabling the state to deliver while empowering all citizens, no matter who they are, to challenge their government and demand transparency and equal treatment.

Developing countries will not graduate out of aid until they have these foundations – democratic institutions to hold governments to account and protect against corruption; consistent and transparent rules which prospective investors demand; and tax systems which enable countries to harness economic growth to build public services, rather than tax revenues and natural resource wealth slipping through the fingers of people in the developing world and into tax havens.

I am proud that during my time at the Department for International Development, the UK became the first country in the world to drive innovation in tackling corruption – working across the British police, the Crown Prosecution Service and serious organised crime agencies to root out money laundering and bribe-paying which has such a corrosive effect

in developing countries. Tens of millions of pounds of suspicious or stolen assets were frozen or recovered as a result.

As well as addressing corruption, there is a growing recognition, in governments and amongst the development community, of the essential thread which ties together development and tax. We are making significant strides forward, building tax capacity in developing countries, taking multilateral action over tax havens that do not meet rules on transparency, and increasing pressure on the wealthy and the powerful to pay their dues where tax is owed, not where they choose.

Around the world, the UK is leading the way in delivering British expertise and smart aid as the scaffolding within which developing countries can construct functioning state apparatus. For example, in Zambia in 2011 we began to target British aid on improving tax collection, land registry and the inspection and assessment of mineral exports.

Rwanda shows the long term potential of this – investment of British aid in reforming the tax system in Rwanda around the turn of the century delivered a tripling of tax revenues within eight years which, in turn, has led to a fivefold increase in spending on healthcare, falling income poverty and rising school attendance. The proportion of Rwanda's budget financed by aid is now falling rapidly. Over the last 5 years millions of lives have been transformed there.

A coherent cross-government development agenda

These examples illustrate the real opportunities presented by a cross-government approach to development. Aid and development cannot be effective without advocates across government, particularly in the Treasury and the Foreign Office, pulling the right levers. The UK is leading the way in creating the diplomatic and economic rules, systems, incentives and penalties which will give aid the maximum lasting impact. We need to move faster on joining up these agendas – building a global consensus on resourcing domestic accountability and tax systems and continuing multilateral action on tax avoidance. However, there also remains work to do to ensure that diplomacy and development are always pulling in the same direction.

Foreign Office expertise is working every day across the globe in the service of peace, liberty and prosperity; deploying our diplomats and our aid together to prevent or resolve conflicts, promote rights and create the conditions for economic growth. Yet we still see cases where there is a fundamental disconnect between British foreign policy and British aid.

Today, the most perverse example of this lies in Yemen. Britain is leading the response in a country which was already fragile but which is now in freefall as a result of bitter conflict. Human rights abuses and potential war crimes are reported to have been committed by all parties to the conflict, including our close allies Saudi Arabia. Perversely, we know that Saudi warplanes have destroyed supply warehouses filled with life-saving British aid and levelled hospitals and schools built with British support. Civilian casualties caused by our ally are overwhelming medical facilities which British aid is barely able to keep running. A port our allies were intent on disrupting was also the entry point for British aid and support.

It simply cannot be in our national interest for Britain to be leading the charge in delivering aid to cool tensions in the most war-torn parts of the world, when some of our allies are responsible for fanning those flames. Our long history as a proud humanitarian nation demands that we stand up for our principles including when it is our friends and allies challenging them. Yemen is a clear example of where British diplomatic strength, UK trade (including in arms) and British aid and development ought to be working together to bring an end to conflict, save lives and uphold international humanitarian rules.

Maximising aid impact and the national interest

International aid and development is one of Britain's most efficient, productive global exports; the mutual benefit for Britain and the developing world is undoubted and has won Britain huge respect around the world. However, if we are to realise the full potential of international development and ensure that it is truly working in our national interest, it is vital that we never relax and become complacent about the way Britain's development effort is conducted – targeting the poorest and most excluded, working hand-in-hand with diplomatic, defence and economic policy,

scrutinised wherever it is spent, and playing a leading role in a British foreign policy agenda which drives new standards in accountability and transparency across the world.

Doing something about the colossal discrepancies of opportunity, quality of life and wealth which exists in our world today must be an international priority. We can all be proud that Britain is playing a leading role in tackling this, but there is a great deal more to be done. ♦

2. The UK's role in disrupting ISIL

Dr Karin von Hippel

Nearly every week, it seems, we hear about a devastating ISIL attack far from the group's epicentre in Syria and Iraq. Over the last two years, the civilian death toll from these out-of-area attacks has indeed been alarming: thus far in 2016, over 300 have been killed in a steady stream of terrorist attacks, from Nice to Orlando to Dhaka, while in 2015, the figure reached 400 – many of whom were children. In contrast, in 2014, six civilians were murdered.[1]

What might account for this upsurge? Since the US-led military campaign was launched two years ago to confront ISIL's brutality, experts had been predicting that increased pressure on ISIL's core in Iraq and Syria would cause it to lash out on the periphery to demonstrate its significance, exploiting a mix of the recently radicalised with returned foreign fighters. Attacks far from ISIL's home also ensure a steady flow of fresh recruits, as they promote an image of ISIL's invincibility: the full might of the international community is pounding it in Syria and Iraq, and yet it is still able to cause significant harm elsewhere. In the coming months, as ISIL eventually loses its grip on Mosul in Iraq and Raqqa in Syria, we can expect additional, external terrorist attacks, unless more is done to stop the spread.

A number of countries have been updating their national counter-terrorism (CT) infrastructures in response, yet what is lacking is proactive leadership to stop the contagion. It may be that few recognise the need for such leadership because of the perception that the US-led Global Coalition to Counter ISIL is *already* providing it. The 67-member Coalition, launched by President Obama on 10 September 2014, includes working groups that coordinate: a) the military campaign, b) counter terror

financing, c) the foreign-fighter challenge, d) strategic communications, and e) stabilisation efforts (for Iraq and Syria as ISIL is expelled), while humanitarian assistance is managed by the UN. In fact, at the Coalition's most recent meeting, held in Washington, DC in mid-July, partners spent considerable time on ISIL's out-of-area attacks.

The Coalition can be credited for making significant military progress in Iraq, in some parts of Syria, and recently in Surt, Libya. Three of the working groups (foreign fighters, terror financing and messaging) also address the spread of ISIL globally through sharing of information and best practices. Yet, despite such progress, the Coalition is simply not able to halt this violent ideology as it metastasises across Europe, North America and elsewhere. The Coalition was designed to defeat ISIL in Iraq and secondarily in Syria, and not tackle out-of-area challenges, primarily because of concerns that it would fragment if efforts were directed elsewhere.

Indeed, when the Coalition was formed, ISIL existed only in Iraq and Syria. It would be roughly a year before it would begin to create distant provinces and foster attack cells. The Coalition explicitly chose as an entity to remain focused on core-ISIL, and deal with the provinces at a multilateral level. The Coalition has yet to embrace a strategy to deal with the disparate attack cells, and is unlikely to do so in the near future.

The United States is also unlikely to provide the necessary leadership in the coming months because US efforts are dedicated to the military campaign, Iraqi governance challenges and the Syrian civil war. In addition, President Obama is unlikely to add another complicated international security challenge to his overloaded agenda in his last few months as president, and the American public is too distracted by the presidential campaign to demand more, beyond the occasional (unrealistic) proclamations made by Donald Trump (though another significant attack in the United States could easily alter that calculus).

Another option might be the Global Counter Terrorism Forum (GCTF), launched at the start of the Obama administration and which includes 29 members as well as the European Union. But it too has not been able to play such a role. Neither has the European Union itself,

despite over a dozen ISIL-related attacks in EU countries over the last few years.

A key role for the United Kingdom

The UK may be best placed to lead such an effort: its CONTEST strategy was originally designed in 2002, and has been regularly updated since then.[2] CONTEST integrates hard and soft counter-terrorism and counter-radicalisation tools across government. It also incorporates partnerships with the private sector and local communities, while maintaining the necessary focus on human rights and civil liberties. If the UK steps in and plays a key role, it is likely that the United States would be supportive, if not relieved, given the close relationship between the two allies.

European states should also be amenable to Britain playing such a convening role: EU CT experts admit they turn to the UK for its expertise (the 2005 EU CT strategy was informed by CONTEST, and is also in need of an update).[3] Such an offer might even build goodwill during a period when many European governments are still extremely concerned about the aftershocks of Brexit. Finally, Britain is already sharing its CT expertise with a number of international partners, albeit in a more *ad hoc* manner.

In mid-July, Foreign Secretary Boris Johnson declared that a Brexiting Britain will be *"more active, more outward-facing, more energetic on the world stage than ever before"*. He also committed that the UK would lead a campaign to bring ISIL to justice, and warned of the global spread of ISIL fighters once they are ejected from Iraq and Syria.[4] The Foreign Secretary has committed to do more; what could this mean in practice?

A new strategy to address this distributed threat, one that complements Coalition efforts on ISIL's core, could focus on three distinct but interrelated challenges: 1) how to impede out-of-area, ISIL-*directed* attacks, 2) how to prevent ISIL-*inspired* attacks worldwide, and 3) how to roll back global ISIL affiliates. Each of these will require a range of partnerships between governmental and non-governmental actors, a mix of soft and hard tools, and the capacity to operate across a number of borders. They

also require a lead country to ensure synchronisation. Let's take each of the three challenges in turn:

ISIL-directed attacks

Why does it matter if an attack is ISIL-directed versus ISIL-inspired? The answer is that a different response kit is required for each. Preventing ISIL-directed attacks will require more creative, transnational partnerships, including better information-sharing and collaboration between governments and their citizens, so that best practices can quickly rise to the top, be shared and acted upon.

The UK could build on its own experience with CONTEST to update the EU and other country strategies to accelerate reforms. CONTEST is currently being updated, and hence not only would other countries benefit from the latest thinking, but the UK's strategy would also be informed by their expertise during the re-design process.

Given that CONTEST also includes a PREVENT component, this could also be applied to identify those at risk of radicalisation – the subsequent challenge – *before* they are inspired to carry out lethal attacks.

ISIL-inspired attacks

It is not always clear in the first instance when an attack is directed from ISIL's core versus when it is merely inspired by ISIL, and ISIL-directed attacks have on occasion been misattributed as lone-wolf attacks.[5] For ISIL-inspired attempts, it appears that self-radicalisation is happening much quicker than before, often within days, and sometimes only through the Internet, as opposed to the more typical pattern of some combination of online grooming and peer-to-peer radicalisation over time.

The late ISIL communications chief, Abu Mohammad al-Adnani, was particularly adept at motivating individuals from many parts of the world to carry out attacks, as was one of his predecessors, the Yemeni cleric, Anwar al-Awlaki, who was affiliated with al Qaeda and was also killed in a US drone strike. It is highly likely that another charismatic communicator will soon replace Adnani, hence a greater focus on prevention is needed.[6]

An excellent review of ISIL's propaganda by Mara Revkin and Ahmad Mhidi in Foreign Affairs found that many ISIL supporters are hoping for a Trump presidency because they believe that Trump's anti-Muslim rhetoric would antagonise American Muslims, which in turn would lead to more recruits and lone-wolf style attacks in the United States. The same would apply to the far right parties in Europe that are also espousing anti-Muslim sentiment. Revkin and Mhidi concluded, *"As ISIS has suffered territorial losses and military setbacks in Syria and Iraq, the prospect of life in a shrinking and embattled caliphate is becoming less attractive to potential recruits. And so, over the past year, ISIS propaganda has become increasingly focused on encouraging home-grown terrorism and lone-wolf attacks in the United States and Europe and devotes less coverage to the battles it is fighting (and losing) on its own turf."*[7]

Countering radicalisation requires bespoke CT packages for local communities, backed by empirical research.[8] While Coalition partners have undertaken significant efforts to prevent radicalisation, particularly through online and other communications channels, the efforts have not staunched the flow. Here again, Britain's PREVENT could provide lessons to inform other country strategies, even if it has not been welcomed by all its non-governmental partners in the UK.[9]

Global affiliates

Since the June 2014 declaration of the so-called Caliphate, ISIL's extreme tactics and savvy online recruitment skills have motivated a number of existing, local terrorist groups to pledge allegiance to Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, ISIL's leader. Such groups proclaim themselves to be *wilyah*, ISIL's *"distant provinces"*, and the list now includes groups in Afghanistan, Algeria, Egypt (Sinai Peninsula), Libya, Nigeria, the North Caucasus, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Southeast Asia and Yemen.[10] Fortunately, thus far, these affiliates are not yet operating as one organisation in tandem with ISIL core, but many do share expertise, personnel, resources and communications.

Other groups have also coalesced and self-declared as branches of ISIL, though whether they are fully connected remains in dispute. Finally, in still other cases, it may be that ISIL has sent foreign fighters back to their country of origin to establish branches, which may now be happening in Bangladesh. And there are ample opportunities here, given that volunteers have travelled from over 100 countries to fight or join the so-called Caliphate. Interestingly, thus far, a few groups, such as al Shabaab in Somalia and Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) have remained loyal to al Qaeda instead of joining ISIL (ISIL and al Qaeda fell out in early 2014).

Defeating the various affiliates will be an enormous challenge: some of the host governments implement less than democratic practices, which can lead to more radicalisation; others may be too weak to extend their writ across the territory, while still others simply will not have the capacity to implement necessary reforms. The response kit hence needs to be tailor-made to the circumstances of each case, hopefully early enough before the affiliate is able to cause harm and attract more to the cause.

Just as it is capable of providing leadership and expertise to address the ISIL-directed and inspired attacks outside the so-called Caliphate, the UK government also has the experience to advise other countries in building CT infrastructures to shut down the global affiliates and impede the wholesale movement of ISIL Headquarters to another, more amenable, territory when the HQ is shut down in Syria and Iraq. This may need to be done in different ways, depending on the case, which may require bilateral, sub-regional, regional or more multilateral partnerships.

The UK leading but not alone

The UK alone cannot be responsible for stopping the spread of ISIL's ideology and preventing future attacks. Ideally, the UK could take the lead and work closely with the United States and other countries to design and implement appropriate reforms, whether as a sub-group of the Global Coalition or in some other grouping of countries. This would be an enormous contribution to protecting civilians and children most of all. ♦

Notes

1 Figures taken from Wikipedia, "List_of_terrorist_incidents_linked_to_ISIL". The total shoots up significantly if one includes countries in the Middle East region, such as Tunisia and Saudi Arabia, or Afghanistan and Pakistan, and, of course, jumps even more when including Iraq and Syria

2 CONTEST includes four components: Prevent, Pursue, Protect, and Prepare, and integrates a range of government departments, which also work closely with the corporate sector, civil society and others

3 See http://register.consilium.europa.eu/doc/srv?l=EN&f=ST%2014469%202005%20REV%204

4 See http://www.theweek.co.uk/islamic-state/59001/isis-how-has-it-changed-and-can-it-be-stopped

5 E.g. Mehdi Nemmouche, who killed four people in the Jewish Museum of Belgium in May 2014, was initially assumed by the Brussels prosecutors to be a lone actor, yet later it was learned that he was likely connected to the Paris/ Brussels attack plotters

6 See https://rusi.org/publication/occasional-papers/lone-actor-terrorism-analysis-paper for RUSI research on lone-actor terrorism

7 From 24 August 2014, https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2016-08-24/why-isis-rooting-trump-0

8 RUSI has a small team based in Nairobi conducting research into radicalisation, focused primarily on al Shabaab in the East Africa region and not ISIL at this stage. The research then feeds into training and mentoring programmes and is updated regularly, given how rapidly this threat evolves

9 See, for example, http://www.theweek.co.uk/60665/theresa-may-casts-doubt-on-points-based-immigration-system

10 For example, see http://www.nbcnews.com/storyline/isis-terror/ new-counterterrorism-heat-map-shows-isis-branches-spreading-worldwide-n621866

3. British leadership on open government

Dr Sanjay Pradhan and Joe Powell

British leadership to promote open, democratic and inclusive values at home and abroad is needed now more than ever. We are in an era of increasing uncertainty in global cooperation, with populist and extremist leaders threatening to undermine progress towards democracy in many parts of the world, and civil society organisations experiencing a sustained crackdown on their freedom to operate.

It is in this context that we present some key areas where British leadership is essential, from doubling down on the fight against corruption and for improved governance, to standing up for civil society globally, and positioning open government as a framework for the new government to approach the complexities of Brexit domestically.

Five years ago the UK helped to set up the Open Government Partnership (OGP), which was designed to marry domestic governance reform with international leadership and agenda-setting. Participating governments committed to co-creating national action plans with civil society to make government transparent, participatory and responsive, so they truly empower and serve their citizens. This was complemented by UK-hosted international summits that stressed the universal challenges of improving governance, with every country having something to offer and something to improve.

Tackling the grand corruption exposed by the Panama Papers, or the inefficiency and bribery that too often accompanies public procurement, requires national action in tandem with global. Open government can be

the model for the new Prime Minister, enabling her to send a message that Britain is not only open for business and visitors, but also a world leader on open and responsive government domestically and internationally.

Supporting Open Government Reforms globally

Helping to build stronger institutions and stable governments around the world is firmly in the British national interest, and in the interests of citizens in poor and developing countries. Britain's role in the world can become defined by a resolute focus on democratic values, the rule of law, and tackling the corruption and inequality that undermines stable government and promotes insecurity.

This framework should recognise that the process of sustainable development is messy and political, and that it is the citizens of a country who play the single most important role in shaping its future. As such it is when citizens – especially youth at risk – feel excluded from political processes, and grievances go unaddressed, that radicalisation and marginalisation occur.

Reforms to open up government are often politically contested and driven by a small band of reformers within the system who are willing to take risks and innovate in order to improve governance. In 2011 Britain joined seven other governments and nine civil society leaders in creating OGP. In five years OGP has grown into a 70-country partnership of those reformers in government and civil society who are committed to making governments more transparent, responsive and accountable, so they truly empower and serve their citizens. Britain chaired OGP in 2013 and has played a vital leadership role in building the initiative.

This should continue in the shape of encouraging new countries to join the partnership, sharing expertise around the world and using aid money to back reform efforts in developing countries. British ambassadors in the 70 countries should also make it a priority to support the Ministers leading on governance reform, helping them to win political arguments for greater openness. Throughout, Britain should remain an equal partner by continuing to lead by example through its own open government agenda, helping to create an openness race to the top between countries within

OGP. This will constitute the crucial foundation of open, democratic governments globally that can best advance the new British Government's central priorities of security, inclusion and equality. As more countries embrace participatory processes through the OGP to involve youth and other marginalised groups at risk of radicalisation – as Tunisia is presently doing with its OGP national action plan, sustainable solutions to the challenge of radicalisation, conflict and insecurity will be nurtured in countries otherwise at risk.

Prioritising governance in DFID programming

The new government has rightly committed to continue spending 0.7% of Gross National Income on development assistance each year. To advance the new government's priorities it should reinforce governance as a major focus for DFID, and support the implementation of reforms that developing countries have prioritised as solutions in their own contexts but lack resources for. These may include areas that can underpin long-term development such as tax collection, judicial reform, anti-corruption efforts, devolution and strengthening parliaments.

This focus on promoting the rule of law and stability will have knock-on trade benefits for the UK, due to the investment-friendly environments needed to promote growth and jobs. It is also vital that this aid is transparent so that spending can be tracked and those whom it is intended to help have a say in it. DFID has high standards in this respect, but departments like the FCO and the Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy could improve. As their share of the aid budget rises, they could commit to match DFID's levels of transparency.

Britain's leadership will also be needed to support efforts to meet the Global Goals. In 2015 'honest and responsive' government was ranked globally as the fourth highest priority in the United Nations My World survey, one of the biggest public polls ever conducted. The UK could position itself at the forefront of a group of countries working together to implement Global Goal 16 focused on promoting peaceful and inclusive societies. It could also encourage open, transparent and participatory implementation of all of the Global Goals, including targeting assistance

at building infrastructure for monitoring the goals and plugging data gaps. Finally, the universality of the goals means Britain will require a plan for domestic action, for example on tackling inequality and the facilitation of illicit financial flows.

Supporting civil society abroad

Government's engagement with civil society is crucial to amplify the voice of the voiceless, ordinary citizens and the poor. Civil society is also a regular source of new ideas for governments, and can help hold leaders accountable for promises made. However, in far too many parts of the world basic freedoms for civil society organisations have been under attack in recent years. The International Center for Not-for-Profit Law estimates that since 2012 over 50 countries have introduced or enacted measures that make it harder for civil society to play its rightful role. These range from making registration and funding more difficult, to actively reducing civic space, including the freedom to speak out and organise. In 2015 Civicus calculated that one or more of these core civil society freedoms of expression, association and peaceful assembly were seriously violated in at least 109 countries.

The new government should use diplomatic pressure to support civil society where it is under threat, and ensure that on foreign trips Ministers make time to meet with local groups. President Obama's 'Stand with Civil Society' initiative shows the importance of expressing solidarity with activists in dangerous contexts, and of drawing political attention to the issue. The DFID Secretary of State could also signal her intent to support civil society organisations working on youth engagement, women and girls' rights and democratic reform, all critical for helping fragile states to build stronger institutions.

This will require a long term investment from DFID, to help transcend difficult divides in post-conflict societies, but where the costs of inaction could be a recurrence of violence and instability across borders. Protecting and enhancing civic space in countries around the world is a core priority for OGP going forward, and the British Government can actively leverage that platform to show global leadership in this area.

The new government's relationship with British civil society organisations is also critical, especially at a time of great uncertainty and of some tension in recent years. The Minister for Civil Society should ensure there is a cross-government approach to British NGOs that prioritises open communication, regular feedback and proactive engagement over confrontation and suspicion.

Brexiting Openly

The process of Brexit will be one of the most complex UK government undertakings for many years. By making it an open Brexit, with a participatory, transparent process, there is a chance to unite Britain around a vision based on liberty, freedom and inclusiveness.

Decades of regulation negotiated in Brussels will need to be reset, and new laws passed. For some this will be seen as a one-off opportunity to push special interests and loosen regulation on labour rights, the environment and the City of London, which would risk exacerbating the inequality in Britain which the Prime Minister has indicated she is keen to address. To counter this, the new government should make lobbying transparency reform an early priority, ensuring that the public, media and civil society are able to scrutinise who meets whom, financial payments and the steps in the policy decision making process. This could include a lobbying register that goes beyond consultant lobbyists. Steps could also be taken to fix the revolving door between decision-makers and industries in related areas to their former jobs, so that risks of conflict of interest are mitigated and mutual benefits are maximised.

The unprecedented public interest in the EU referendum should be harnessed to ensure citizens have a say on the shape of Brexit. After a narrow referendum result a renewed focus on open policy-making will help to engage those who were on different sides of the argument. The form Brexit takes should be opened up to wide consultation, and not be left to elites alone. One lesson from Brexit is huge swathes of the country feel left behind and not heard in Westminster. A radical programme of citizen engagement, using both online and offline tools, can help to

close this divide and remind us that we have more in common than is often portrayed.

Getting Britain's own house in order

Britain should also put its own house in order post-Brexit, with a fresh effort to renew its democracy to combat the lack of trust in politics and institutions that is fuelling populist and reactionary forces. The new government's focus on working for all in a way that will tackle inequality and promote fairness can only be delivered through greater citizen engagement and participation.

At the UK-hosted 2013 G8, and through successive OGP national action plans since 2011, there have been strong domestic commitments to improve transparency and accountability in Britain. This was framed as Britain getting its own house in order, as it advocated for greater international support for anti-corruption efforts in particular. Given the country's historic position as a global financial centre, and continued controversy over the role of the Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies in facilitating money laundering and tax avoidance, this effort should be re-doubled.

The previous government deserves great credit for being the first G20 country to create a public register of the beneficial owners of companies, providing a vital tool to those engaged in tackling financial crimes. The new government should go a step further and set up a register of foreign companies that purchase property or bid on central government contracts, as outlined in the UK's third OGP action plan. For both of these steps British officials involved in implementation will have learnt vital lessons that can be valuable to other countries who are now following suit with their own beneficial ownership reforms. This type of expertise can form the backbone of the government's commitment to build a new Anti-Corruption Innovation Hub to bring together business, officials, civil society and technologists to catalyse innovative approaches to tackling corruption at home and abroad.

Open contracting

Reforms to open up public contracting through improved disclosure, data and engagement have been another major area of open government innovation and one that is particularly relevant post-Brexit as the UK seeks to modernise, open and upgrade its economy.

Public contracting is a vital open government issue due to the sums involved, with government spending accounting for 15% of global GDP (approximately US$9.5 trillion). Public contracts are not only government's number one corruption risk (some 57% of foreign bribery cases prosecuted under the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention involved bribes for public contracts) but open contracting is an especially business-friendly innovation helping to create a level playing field for smaller businesses to win more government business as well as leading to cost savings and efficiency gains for government.

The UK has committed to the Open Contracting Data Standard for all contracts administered by the Crown Commercial Service, which will open up data across the contracting cycle to scrutiny and should help create a vibrant, open and competitive marketplace for UK government contracts. The UK has also committed to applying open contracting and open data to forthcoming major infrastructure projects, including High Speed Two rail. The new government should commit to swiftly apply the new data standard to all government procurement.

Internationally, the government could agree to become a showcase learning project in conjunction with the Open Contracting Partnership, which will signal the UK's global intention to be open for business post-Brexit, as well as encouraging smaller businesses and fostering local innovation and talent. The Showcase could also promote joined-up government, innovation and learning within the UK and abroad, and help inform the UK's global strategy for a better global business environment through its Prosperity Fund as well as through DFID's international development portfolio.

Taken together, this would be a proud agenda for an open government and an open Britain. ♦

4. Maintaining our traditions as an activist humanitarian nation

Dr John Bew

On 6 July 2016, the Chilcot Inquiry published its final report into the UK's role in the 2003 invasion of Iraq and the subsequent campaign to stabilise the country following the deposition of Saddam Hussein. The Iraq war provides a powerful reminder of the perils of intervening in the internal affairs of other states. But debates about intervention versus non-intervention continue to dominate foreign policy debates in the UK – perhaps more than almost any other issue. Failures in Iraq – and Afghanistan – have not changed that fact.

It was in the nineteenth century, as Britain rose to the position of the most powerful nation on the globe, that the arguments of interventionists and non-interventionists crystallised into a form we would recognise today. At many times in our past, one or other of these positions has been in the ascendant. In the aftermath of the Napoleonic Wars, the British Foreign Secretary, Lord Castlereagh, wrote his famous state paper of 1820 that laid out the "principle of non-intervention". Castlereagh's successor, George Canning, followed a similar approach, preferring to focus on Britain's "blue-water" empire than on costly entanglements in Europe.

Yet while non-intervention was the preferred starting position, it was never intended to be a concrete doctrine. During the Napoleonic Wars, and indeed before that, Britain often interfered in the internal affairs of other sovereign states. By 1827, the country engaged in what later became known as the first humanitarian intervention, sending the Royal Navy to the bay of Navarino during the Greek War of Independence.

Early British humanitarian interventionism

Like today, it was often events in the Levant and Middle East that shook Britain out of its preferred non-intervention stance. In 1860, Britain and France sent a joint force to modern-day Syria and Lebanon following the collapse of the Ottoman governing authority and the massacre of thousands of Maronite Christians in Damascus and Sidon. The intervention, according to the French and British foreign secretaries at the time, was an *oeuvre d'humanité* that included the protection of civilians, medical aid, the burying of corpses and the cleaning of streets.[1]

The most famous example of nineteenth-century humanitarian intervention was the role that British ships played in enforcing the abolition of the slave trade. Many MPs and diplomats, from across the political spectrum, viewed Lord Palmerston's activist foreign policy, including unilateral assaults on the slave trade, as dangerous and likely to cause war. The anti-slavery campaign was an intervention that lasted almost a century and was incredibly costly, both in financial terms and in terms of lives lost. It was almost halted on several occasions – subjected to heavy criticism from the anti-intervention lobby, free traders and those who felt that Britain had no obligation (or right) to interfere in the enslavement of Africans by foreign powers. At the end of the nineteenth century, Lord Salisbury bemoaned the *"practice of foreign interventions in domestic squabbles"* as he looked back on the history of the last seventy years *"strewn with the wrecks on national prosperity which these well-meant interventions have caused"*. However, the fact remains that the deployment of force for humanitarian purposes has a long lineage, stretching back more than two centuries.

The emergence of the Responsibility to Protect

It was during the 1990s that notions such as humanitarian intervention and responsibility to protect (R2P) reached their fullest expression. This signalled an evolutionary leap in our understanding of sovereignty by making it contingent on the protection of civilian populations from mass abuse of human rights.[2] In hindsight, the 1999 NATO intervention in Kosovo might be regarded as the high-water mark for R2P, in particular.[3]

The conditions that were propitious to a number of interventions in the 1990s do not exist today, yet a number of the concepts from that era are more entrenched in the international system that we might otherwise presume. At the time of the 2011 intervention in Libya, for example, the UN Security Council passed a resolution on the basis of R2P for the first time since the doctrine was approved, in principle, by the UN General Assembly in 2005.

The UK has been a world leader in championing these concepts. In 1997, the Foreign Secretary Robin Cook articulated a new foreign policy doctrine that reflected the changing role that Britain saw for itself in the world. This he called an "ethical foreign policy"; it was intended to support human rights, civil liberties and democracy around the globe, with the overall intention of improving Britain's global standing by making it a "force for good" in the world.

Similarly, Tony Blair was more active and interventionist than any British Prime Minister since the Second World War. His government engaged in five wars in six years; and in his 1999 Chicago speech, in the midst of the Kosovo intervention, Blair articulated a doctrine of international community. While humanitarian intervention was never adopted as a cast-iron principle of British foreign policy – Blair made clear that it had to be determined on the basis of circumstances in any given situation – it was looked upon more favourably than it had been in the years of the Major government which preceded it. The Chicago speech was a transformative moment in that it made a forceful case for the legitimisation of humanitarian intervention against more traditional conventions about the inviolability of national sovereignty.

A muddying of the waters after Iraq and Afghanistan

In more recent times, however, the notion of humanitarian intervention became entangled with the ISAF mission in Afghanistan, which began in 2001, and the 2003 war in Iraq. This is somewhat misleading; in both instances the immediate justification for war was one of national security. However, for both a broader humanitarian motive was also claimed. This became more important in Afghanistan after the swift fall of the Taliban

government in 2001, whereupon 'nation-building' became a declared aim of the ISAF mission and humanitarian motives were thus tacked on to the original mission. In the case of Iraq, the fact that Saddam Hussein had committed atrocities against his own people meant that the prospective liberation of the Iraqi people was also held out from the outset as a desirable humanitarian outcome of an invasion.

The severe difficulties faced in the occupations of both countries have undermined the idea that humanitarian outcomes could be delivered by intervention. This, in turn, has fed the notion that interventionism *per se* is flawed, and contributes to a general wariness on behalf of populations when presented with the concept.

Back to the 90s?

For those who maintain a belief in the concepts of humanitarian intervention or R2P, the temptation is to go back to the era before 9/11, or, more specifically, the period of the 1990s in which interventions like those in Kosovo and Sierra Leone were seen to have had largely positive humanitarian outcomes. Yet this only gets us so far; there are other changes in the international arena – including a shifting balance of power – that suggest that the emerging norms of the 1990s are not so easy to revert to two decades later.

The case of the UK illustrates a broader point. The activist energies that went into the UK's foreign policy in the 1990s have dissipated considerably. With the benefit of hindsight it is increasingly clear that the UK's championing of humanitarianism in the international community was partly created by the post-Cold War predominance attained by its greatest ally, the United States.

Even in the heyday of humanitarian intervention, in the late 1990s, it was very difficult to settle upon an international consensus as to when such interventions were permissible. To have the sanction or support of the UN General Assembly and/or Security Council was the ideal scenario, but the instances in which this has been attained are rare. Thus, some of the most important examples of successful intervention have taken place without UN sanction (above all, that in Kosovo in 1999). The

majority of consciously (and explicitly) humanitarian deployments have depended on the initiative being taken by one of the major powers within the North Atlantic community – America, Britain and France – often with the support of the next rank of powers such as Italy, Holland, or Scandinavian countries.[4]

Striking a balance

The decision to interfere in the affairs of other states – and certainly to actively intervene with military force – should always be a last resort. It is vital that we learn the lessons of Iraq, Afghanistan and Libya. It is no less vital, however, that we also learn the lessons of Syria and do not forget those of the 1990s, in places such as Somalia and the former Yugoslavia. The Chilcot Report requires deep study and reflection. It should not be used, however, to clamp a self-denying ordinance on British foreign policy.

For one, the scale of the humanitarian crisis in Syria outstrips that which saw portions of the international community coalesce over intervention in the former Yugoslavia in the 1990s. Setting aside the strategic context for a moment, the humanitarian imperative to act is arguably more powerful today in a number of conflicts than it was in the high point of humanitarian interventionism in the past. Meanwhile, the security threats arising out of the collapse of order in the Middle East and North Africa underline that these conflicts have too direct an impact upon our own interests, as well as our conscience, to be allowed to follow a natural course without outside interference.

It has long been an argument used by the advocates of intervention that "what happens there matters here". This thesis has many components to it. In some cases, the collapse of order, civil war and violent conflict have an immediate negative impact upon our own security, and that of our allies, for example through the emergence of ungoverned spaces that allow terrorist or insurgent groups to flourish. It was of course the fact that al-Qaeda was allowed a safe-haven in Afghanistan that provided it the opportunity to plan for attacks on the West. A more recent iteration of the same threat is the foreign fighter phenomenon which has seen hundreds of

Europeans flock to join Islamic State, and a small but significant portion attempt to travel back to their home countries to carry out terrorist attacks.

The dangers of unthinking anti-interventionism

It is in this respect that comparisons between today's world and that of the 1930s are most apt. To allow genocide or ethnic cleansing to take place, or to allow chemical or biological weapons attacks against civilians to go unchecked, is to preside over a steady deterioration of any ethical norms that is more likely to beget further atrocities, conflict and war. The notion of 'world order' evokes images of a balance of power between powerful nations, but, to mean anything, it also implies the existence of certain moral parameters. It is in those eras where a growing number of actors have transgressed moral as well as legal 'red lines' that we have come under most danger ourselves.

There are other changes in the international political scene that suggest it is short-sighted and premature to slip into an unthinking consensus on non-intervention without full appreciation of its moral and strategic costs. Even if we do not intervene, others will continue to do so – and in a way which will have worse humanitarian outcomes. The most obvious example of this was the unexpected Russian intervention into Syria in 2015 and continued air support that President Putin still provides for the Syrian regime.

To resort to an unthinking anti-interventionist consensus is to take an ostrich-like approach to a rapidly changing international environment, and to put the UK at a considerable disadvantage. If non-intervention is to be the future of UK foreign policy, this path should be taken with full situational awareness. Specifically, if the UK wants to revert to non-interventionism as its preferred doctrine, it needs to recognise that it is breaking with its own traditions and may well be drifting further away from its most important allies.

If we embark on interventions it should be with the conditions of the specific case in mind, rather than fighting the last war (or living in constant fear of its mistakes). There are countless instances in which our thinking could be sharper, less reliant on tired clichés and more grounded in reality.

If we cannot see an immediate solution to a seemingly interminable crisis, such as that in Syria, that does not mean we should wash our hands of any attempt to find one.

The world is a messy and dangerous place. Rather than thinking in terms of neat solutions to conflicts, it may be that we should think more in terms of the management of violence and the maintenance of certain moral parameters. This may mean doing more to provide humanitarian assistance in the form of relief, no-fly zones or safe-havens, rather than assuming full responsibility for a particular conflict or country.

The UK need not be, and should not seek to be, a global police officer. But we should do our fair share of burden carrying and protection of the norms we have helped to establish. ♦

Notes

1 John Bew, 'Las Vegas Rules Don't Apply in Syria', New Statesman, 10 July 2013, http://www.newstatesman.com/2013/07/las-vegas-rules-dont-apply-syria

2 James Patterson (ed.), Humanitarian Intervention: The Politics of Humanitarian Intervention (Sage: Los Angeles and London, 2014), p. xxxi-xviii

3 Andrew Cottey, 'The Kosovo War in Perspective', International Affairs (May 2009), Volume 85, Issue 3, pp. 593–608

4 This is a point made by Gwyn Prins, The Heart of War: On Power, Conflict and Obligation in the Twenty-First century (Routledge: London and New York, 2002), p. 138

5. Post-Brexit Britain as an international powerhouse for liberty, creativity and humanity

Professor Tom Fletcher

June 23 2016 marked the end of the 20th century, not just for Britain but for Europe and beyond. Yet the defining moment for the UK's place in the 21st century is not the EU referendum, but how we respond to it. The period ahead will require a sense of collective purpose and vision that we have not had since the Second World War.

Without having planned it that way, I spent much of the summer in places that have entered an uncertain period because of the referendum: Dublin, Belfast, Barcelona, Gibraltar, Berlin, London. Everywhere, there is a hunger for a clear statement of where we now stand, so that they can work out what it means for others.

So wherever we stood on the referendum, we must now marshal our best national instincts and values, and not our worst. We have to show the world that Britain has not become an intolerant or isolationist country. We have to take on growing cynicism, division, fear and rancour, at home and abroad. An age of austerity combined with an age of migration has empowered the extremists and the wall builders. In response, Britain's history should place us – much more confidently and assertively – on the side of liberty and tolerance.

This will require a new alliance between the progressive remainers and the libertarian Brexiters. Much will be about how we define ourselves at home. Preserving the Union retains a vital stream of Scottish progressivism and good sense at the heart of the UK's relationship with the world.

Defending the hard-won gains of the Northern Ireland peace process through the Brexit process will ensure that we don't ourselves become defined once again by conflict requiring external support. And finding ways to blaze a trail for more power in the hands of citizens could come to mean the referendum is seen as part of a wider trend towards individual empowerment. After all, from Magna Carta to John Stuart Mill to Emmeline Pankhurst, liberty is at the heart of our national character. It was made in Britain.

Liberty should also be a defining theme of how global Britain sets out its 21st century offer to the world, especially if we align a focus on our history as a great trading nation; our global reach and outlook; and our strengths as a financial centre and creative industries superpower. Pre-referendum, I suggested in a review of the FCO that the purpose of British foreign policy was to promote positive change in the world, in line with British security and prosperity. It is easy to dismiss that idea as idealistic do-goodery, but I know that it resonates with British diplomats seeking a stronger sense of purpose.

There are four great global challenges to liberty where Britain can lead the fight back: the freedom to coexist with security and dignity; the freedom of opportunity, including to live and work where we can best contribute; reform of the global architecture to defend the idea of universal rights and global citizenship; and in creating the space for the world's most ingenious and creative people to develop the responses to the threats created by massive technological and political change.

The Freedom to Coexist

The three cities in which I have spent most of my adult life – Paris, Beirut and Nairobi – have all been ripped open by acts of terror. The sociopaths with smartphones have our attention.

But let's not be misled about why ISIL targeted these cities. They hit what they call the 'greyzone' – places where Muslims and non-Muslims interact. In doing so, they pitched camp on the wrong side of the 21st century's key dividing line. Not between Christianity and Islam, East and

West, or even between haves and have nots. But between those who want to live together, and those who don't.

In doing so, they have also flushed out some in our own societies who share that divisive and wrongheaded outlook. The effort to close some US and European states to refugees is a propaganda gift to ISIL. Their publicity machine thrives on Donald Trump, burkini bans and any measure that makes Western claims of openness, tolerance and respect seem a sham. In the battle for modern Islam, we rely heavily on the moderate voices prevailing. Yet too often we undermine their message by not sticking to our deeply held values.

Those who see foreigners as fundamentally different probably haven't met many. However insecure we feel, the answer to modern security threats is in fact more liberty, equality, fraternity. Not less. And not just for those of us fortunate to have been born further, or so we thought, from the eye of the storm. If displaced people had a country, it would be the 21st largest in the world.

So we should be proud that Britain is magnetic, confident in our diversity, and smart enough to recognise the economic potential of migrants and refugees from Einstein to Jobs to the modern Londoners who have made the city the global capital.

Britain needs to place itself, confidently and consistently, on the side of coexistence.

Freedom of Opportunity

The referendum was a reminder that many feel left behind by globalisation. This is of course just a small part of a much wider, and potentially damaging, global trend. The annual World Economic Forum global-risk report lists growing inequality as the biggest geopolitical risk today.

So for moral and pragmatic reasons, our greatest challenge is now sharing the benefits of global prosperity more fairly. If we fail to do so, we will have more hungry and angry people heading in our direction.

That means we should put Britain's development offer at the heart of its international approach, not as a bolt on that we are too shy to mention, lest it embolden the isolationists to challenge it. Britain's post-Brexit

internationalists will need to be firmer in insisting that we do spend on aid; prouder in talking about *why* we spend so much on aid; but harder headed in deciding *how* we spend on aid. It is part of what defines us as a nation.

Freedom of opportunity also means protecting the most vulnerable.

Whether children are bombed in Gaza, Aleppo or Mosul, they look the same – small, broken, undefended. The response to horrific photos of Syrian children under Assad's barrel bombs show that we have not reached the limits of our compassion. Yet if this was happening in the town next door, we would never tolerate it. Despite the best efforts of so many to halt the conflict, it is as if the world has decided that the best approach is to try to quarantine it. The rise of the self-proclaimed 'Islamic State' demonstrates why this approach will come back to haunt us.

Post-referendum Britain can lead a global debate about when to use force, and rescue the idea of Responsibility to Protect from the rubble of Syria.

Iraq has scarred a generation of political and official foreign policy-makers, creating a more risk-averse policy environment and corroding public trust. The public are less willing to send other people overseas to defend the nation state, let alone other nations, and they are better able to express that.

Yet at a time when we therefore need a stronger sense of collective responsibility, we can no longer rely on the UN Security Council to act as a neutral arbiter. To insist on Security Council unanimity before any humanitarian intervention leaves a veto in the hands of authoritarian governments. In the case of Syria, it subcontracted our conscience and our foreign policy to Russia.

An individual's freedom of opportunity and security should not be defined by where they are born. We have what Joseph Nye calls "Duties Beyond Borders", just as we have duties beyond the end of our garden fence. We can't intervene everywhere, all of the time. So when we do, we need to be able to show that we have picked the right fight, that war is really the last resort, and that we have prepared for the consequences of

our intervention. Nothing gives us the right to defend a liberal world order beyond our confidence that the alternatives are worse.

All this requires a credible defence and foreign affairs budget alongside our aid spend, and willingness to make tough choices about what you drop in order to deliver it. You can't be Gladstone if you don't have the gunboats.

It will never be neat and tidy. No plan survives contact with the enemy. War is foggy. There are not always good guys and bad guys, though some sides are less bad than others. For intervention to ever be considered is recognition that the options are all bad.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is mankind's greatest text, the most powerful and revolutionary document of all time. The problem is not that we don't understand our duty to our fellow citizens, but that we don't have the will to deliver it. That needs a new debate, and Britain should drive it, with the next US administration, with NATO, and at the UN.

Reinvigorating the International System

Britain's exit from one piece of the international architecture should prompt us to double down on reform of the forums in which we remain – most importantly the UN.

The United Nations and Bretton Woods institutions, now almost 70 years old, are full of hardworking, usually well-meaning professionals. But in an age requiring global solutions to global problems, these institutions are no longer fit for purpose. The UN was set up as the answer to a different set of problems. The scaffolding that we have built around global security and peace is looking very fragile. Transnational challenges such as jihadism or epidemics such as Ebola are harder to respond to. It is recklessly irresponsible of us to subcontract global problems on this scale to institutions that can't cope.

Fixing the international architecture will take serious creativity, determination and patience. And the reality is that there is no forcing moment where pressure for change or reform comes to a head, where the national politics are aligned in the right way. Turkeys do not vote for Christmas, and bureaucracies do not volunteer for the axe.

Any discussion of reform of the international architecture has to begin with a debate over where we need to pool sovereignty in order to respond more effectively to the threats facing us, including: fighting infectious disease; migration; the health of the global economy; climate change; terrorism. These are all issues that cannot be tackled within national borders alone. Britain has decided to pool less sovereignty with Europe. But that does not mean we need to pool less sovereignty, where it is in our interest, with the world.

The last effort towards reshaping the international architecture was shot in the paddock by the world economic crisis of 2009, as many countries inevitably turned inwards. We now need to take up this challenge again. We will have to ensure that these institutions, or whatever replaces them, are more representative. They must involve a louder voice for the emerging powers. But we also need to escape from global governance as the equivalent of an annual promotion or relegation battle from a sports league, where the strongest nations of the day try to lock in that position, as we did in 1815 or 1945. Most importantly now, these institutions need to be representative of wider society, not nation states alone. We have to find ways to enfranchise more of the world's population.

So an urgent task for British diplomacy is to take a step back from the competing national agendas, shortening political and media attention spans and tactical challenges, and to redesign, refocus and reboot the international system. In the absence of such a debate, and such leadership, we will find that the institutions we have created to deliver a measure of humanity's collective governance cease to retain any influence or relevance, leaving a dangerous vacuum.

Freedom of Creativity

Britain is a creative industries superpower. The sector is the fastest-growing part of our economy, and an essential part of our soft power offer to the world. As part of our post-referendum global pitch, we will need our film makers, artists, sportspeople, games designers, architects and musicians to be out in front. We have to give them the tools they need, including proper education in creativity for the next generation.

And to seek out with vigour the new sources of partnership, innovation and opportunity.

Britain can also play a talismanic role in bringing together the next generation of global creators. London is already doing this. Our ability to keep pace with the dangerous political and social implications of technological change depends on our brightest global minds coming up with the ingenious solutions to problems from climate change to economic instability. We should be unashamedly backing freedom of the internet, so that the smartest people in the world can create together the extraordinary ideas that we don't yet know we need. We should be getting the 75 million young people who currently aren't in school back into the classroom, so that they face more than the perilous choice between the barrel bombers, extremists and people traffickers. And we should be overhauling the global education system so that future global citizens have equal access to the best of what we can teach them.

Where should we focus?

Diplomats normally break the world down by geography. Of course the big, hyphenated conflicts will remain critical – North Korea-South Korea, Israel-Palestine, India-Pakistan and the many other scraps for territory or dignity that fill the foreign affairs pages of the media. As I write, we face overlapping crises – Russia's aggression in Eastern Europe, continued upheaval in the Middle East, tensions in East Asia. None are overwhelming in their own right. But taken together, they present a significant collective threat, a transition from order to disorder. That should be a wakeup call for all of us.

There will be a temptation for some in Britain to try to pull up the drawbridge, focusing purely on domestic security or nationalist politics. Austerity has a tendency to make countries look inward. Yet historical precedent suggests that times of political and economic challenge are those when it is most important to look outward.

Post-referendum, and in facing down the 21st century's challenges, we will need more than ever to remain engaged with the rest of the world. This is no longer the zero sum game of great power politics. In fact, Britain's

national interest now depends on us rediscovering our internationalism. We have always been strongest when we are outward-looking, pioneering, exploring, welcoming.

There is no global challenge today to which the answer is to build a bigger wall. This has been a bruising year, and Britain's international reputation is in the balance. We can fight back with liberty, humanity and creativity, at home and overseas. Our resignation as a world power was not on the ballot. ♦

6. Building public confidence in Britain's moral mission

Christian Guy

It was three years ago in one of Brazil's favelas that I first encountered the scale of the development challenge, and the importance of British engagement. Fatherless families in leaking tin shacks – five children to a mattress – with damp and disease all around. Piles of rotting garbage and flowing sewage provided a playground for toddlers in nappies. Flooding from the fast and filthy river was a way of life. Stray animals were roaming and adults languishing in a lawless neighbourhood. This was as close to hell on earth as I had seen – and this was supposedly a country on the rise.

Just one small community, in one large country, on one enormous continent. And it struck me there in the middle of that slum that the complexities of aid spending originate from the complexities of the problems it tries to solve. Despite Brazil's sizeable economy and relative wealth, it felt as though the entire DFID budget could be directed to this dark corner of South America and still fall short. Further still I thought, what of the poorest in failed and fragile states which lack the hope found in Brazil's ongoing economic transformation?

Britain and our challenges suddenly seemed smaller, and eminently solvable in comparison. But the little girls we met there and see around the world are no less important and no less full of potential than mine. The parents raising their children no less deserving of healthcare, safety and opportunity.

The British people have a deep and long-held a commitment to helping the very poorest, and want to see these countries supported to turn themselves around. We need to protect this with everything we've got.

Cautious optimism but no complacency

It is too early to judge, but Theresa May seems to share this commitment. Minutes after becoming Prime Minister, she made two pledges that I hope will come to define her time in Downing Street: to fight what she described as "burning injustice", and to reshape Britain's role in the world successfully following the EU referendum.

One thing about that is abundantly clear: for a nation as strong as ours, and in today's globalised world, these challenges are deeply intertwined. Fighting injustice cannot stop at Britain's borders, and our "bold, positive new role" post-Brexit must be one that promotes opportunity here and overseas.

Part of that must be built on a determined recommitment to effective international development – championed passionately by the three Prime Ministers who preceded her.

Yet, looking ahead, those of us who consider this integral to our national interest and the prospects of our fellow citizens around the world must face facts: our commitment to overseas development may not survive the renewed political pressure it is coming under post-Brexit unless greater public support is secured and our critics taken on.

For many who campaigned against it, Brexit threatens a new era of isolationism and insularity. Remainers worry that 'taking back control' actually means checking out of global institutions and washing our hands of major problems – the mass movement of the displaced millions or human rights being two prominent examples. Those who won the referendum though argued that leaving the EU would allow the UK to be more outspoken, a more significant global influence and provide true freedom to lead on the most important issues facing the international community.

Time will tell, but there is some cause for optimism under this Prime Minister. Working with me and my team at the Centre for Social Justice when she was Home Secretary, I was inspired to see her lead the world in the fight against modern slavery, overcoming initial Westminster indifference, Whitehall apathy and scepticism from powerful vested interests. Introducing child-trafficking advocates and an independent Anti-Slavery

Commissioner, as well as creating tough new powers to tackle traffickers and increase transparency in big business supply chains, the Modern Slavery Act was one of the most significant achievements secured by the last Government. She and David Cameron were rightly proud of that legislation. It broke the mould. Other governments were inspired too by what was possible for the most disadvantaged and exploited people across the world when Britain led the way. And this is the spirit the May Government must now channel to meet the twin challenges the Prime Minister outlined on the steps of 10 Downing Street. A commitment to social justice – effective poverty-fighting and development – must be at the heart of this country's new global role.

Improving public understanding of aid

The political context and a damaging lack of confidence in our aid spending in certain sections of the public means it is vital our new Government – and the sector – gets to work bringing the British public onboard in new ways. International development has too long been seen as a soft target by many in the press, particularly on the Right, and as wasteful and unnecessary by its increasingly vocal critics. So the case for action and the way we work must be considered afresh.

That begins by being hard-nosed in our scrutiny of aid spending, cutting out waste and tackling corruption head on. This will breed greater confidence. We know David Cameron's Government was ranked as the world's most transparent by the World Wide Web Foundation in 2015, and Theresa May should build on this achievement. The Department for International Development has led the way in terms of aid transparency, not only through Andrew Mitchell's foundation of the Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI), but also with advances such as the DevTracker website, which details and maps every project funded by British aid. They should find ways of selling these reforms more widely and connecting real people to the results.

This kind of innovation can't end here though, DevTracker is a great example of the conundrum of Government transparency – it is a data

overload, with little public appeal. There are many examples though of how data can be much better harnessed to improve its impact. Professor Hans Rosling's Gapminder Foundation describes its work as "fighting devastating ignorance with a fact-based worldview that everyone can understand"; they present a treasure trove of data on every aspect of global development in a customisable online portal. Similarly, the Centre for Global Development's Aid Quality Index gives an interactive ranking of countries and agencies which give aid, based on their work in different sectors. These are tools that are simple and easy to use, and allow users to digest and engage with the data. While I'm under no illusions that an equivalent from the UK's Department for International Development would become wildly popular, it is this kind of innovation that is required to shift the narrative around the way British aid is spent.

More easily accessible data about British aid also allows us to highlight its impact, and research by Save the Children and Conservative Friends of International Development (CFID) suggests that this is the most powerful way of engendering support. While the research finds that there is a basic desire amongst voters for Britain to help the world's poorest and most vulnerable, this is muddied by very low levels of understanding about how taxpayers' money is actually spent on international development, which leads to assumptions of corruption. So the fact that support increases when the low base-level of knowledge about aid is increased is an encouraging sign, and proves the importance of better communicating its impact. The raw support for British aid exists, but it is damaged by a lack of knowledge.

This reflects a much broader truth that presenting people with the evidence of results is much more effective than discussing their ingredients. We speak about aid too often in terms of billions of pounds or a proportion of gross national income (GNI), and too rarely in terms of its achievements. But consider this: since 2011 the UK Government has responded to 32 humanitarian crises, given 11 million children a chance in life by supporting them through school, and improved nutrition for over 30 million children under five. This is the clearer language we must adopt.

Making aid personal

Of course the International Development Act, and its commitment to the 0.7% aid target, divides opinion – particularly on the right. But if we are to build public pride in development and the children's lives we save in the darkest corners of the world, let's not restrict the conversation to percentages. Instead, for example, we should talk about the 1,600 NHS staff and 800 UK military personnel, along with hundreds of British charity workers, who deployed to West Africa to combat the Ebola virus and prevent it spreading further. They trained 4,000 local staff, delivered 1,800 tonnes of supplies, ran three labs, built six treatment centres, saved countless lives and helped to stop the spread of the disease – helping to end the epidemic and leaving the region more ready to stand up for itself next time. This is what Britain can do when we lead, and we must celebrate it.

Bringing public opinion more squarely behind Britain's aid budget is not just a communications exercise though – it requires us to rethink many of the things we take for granted. We have to find ways to democratise development here. The 'Send My Friend to School' campaign is a great example of this – it allows British school children to reflect on their own education, and use it to press the importance of what is now a global UN goal – a commitment to provide education for all under-16s by 2030. This is a good example of how engaging members of the public with causes that they can relate to is done effectively by NGOs, and could be adapted by Government to increase support for aid.

Similarly, the Water Project provides donors with the GPS coordinates of wells that they have helped to fund, and organisations like Plan International help individual donors to sponsor individual children. While this direct link is often to some extent artificial, it is an approach that could inspire DFID to better connect their spending to the public who fund it. There is no doubting the compassion of the British public, not only from the evidence in Save the Children and CFID's research, but from their generosity to charities, and at events like Comic Relief which seem to break fundraising records every year, but more can be done to harness this generosity in support of the aid budget.

Increasing our appetite for risk and innovation

As steps are taken to improve value for spend, we also have to be honest with the British people and across party lines about the fact not every pound can be transformative. It is difficult work in theatre, and we have to face the critics about this head-on. Just as we recognise the importance of some flexibility in investment when it comes to domestic policy – such as piloting new programmes or innovation in medical treatment – so too the challenge with development spending comes in designing evidence-driven interventions, delivering them efficiently in the toughest places on earth and rooting out those that are less effective.

Sometimes critics seem to forget that British aid takes us to the most volatile nations, and requires engagement with radically different systems. These are places where, by definition, market forces have failed to provide prosperity and problems are entrenched. So a ruthless intolerance of waste must not end up being an innovation blocker. Accepting that some interventions will need refinement and others may be abandoned should not call into question whether DFID's work is right in principle. Those who seek to score points on the back of this fine balance play politics with people's lives and undermine our role in the world. We have to forge a fresh consensus in politics – across left and right – which takes them on.

The Prime Minister has an ambitious vision for her Government, and arguably, despite near total political dominance, she has a harder course to navigate than any of her recent predecessors. Most details remain undefined, but her pledge to forge a new role for Britain on the world stage presents an exciting opportunity to improve the way we act for the world's poorest people.

If, supported by the sector, she seizes this moment to tackle injustice, then Britain can again lead the global movement for sustainable development. But together we have to build new public engagement and trust, and harness the latent public will to help those less fortunate as we do so. This means making the case for aid with confidence, being meticulous with our spending and finding new ways to bring the British people into the effort as we save lives and rebuild countries. There can be no wider or more meaningful an impact for a Prime Minister than that. ♦

Part 2

Protecting the most vulnerable children

1. Britain's future humanitarian policy

Sir John Holmes

All genuine humanitarians are constantly hoping to work themselves out of a job as crucial needs are met and there is no further need for emergency international assistance. Perhaps this has always been a fantasy, but rarely can such a day have seemed so far away as today.

Natural disasters have long been expected to increase as climate change produces more extreme weather events; as vulnerable groups rise in number in parallel with the global population growth; and as rapidly mushrooming urbanisation and greater environmental degradation place ever more people at risk. However, few would have predicted that humanitarian need from conflict would have shot up at such a catastrophic pace over the last five years: internal conflicts have intensified, civilian casualties have multiplied and the divided international community's ability to bring such conflicts to an end has dwindled.

When I was UN Emergency Relief Coordinator from 2007 to 2010, needs were already growing quickly, and were estimated at some US$10 billion by the time I left. Since then, the impact of the disastrous conflicts in the Middle East, notably but not only Syria, has dwarfed such figures. The UN global appeals for 2016 amount to some US$22 billion, and continue to rise at a shockingly fast rate. The international response has been impressive in many ways. Spending on humanitarian aid has grown from around US$9 billion in 2010 to over US$15 billion today. The traditional donors have increased their spending faster than I would have believed likely or possible, especially in relatively unfavourable global economic

circumstances. But the gap between needs and response has continued to grow. Some vital appeals remain desperately underfunded, especially those which are out of the headlines and unattractive to donors for one reason or another.

A challenged humanitarian system

During this time, while the humanitarian system (if the current fragmented collection of UN agencies, NGOs and the Red Cross/Red Crescent movement can really be called that) has been steadily improving its performance and professionalism, questions about the real impact and effectiveness of its work have continued to be raised. Meanwhile wider international respect for humanitarian action has seemed to be declining too, despite the fine words of the World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul earlier this year.

Access is too often denied by governments or military movements to organisations and individuals with no ulterior political or other motives beyond seeking to help those affected by conflict or disaster. Civilians are being targeted as a matter of routine in too many conflicts around the world. Attacking health facilities like hospitals is seen as a legitimate military tactic, with horrific results. Humanitarians themselves are too often either deliberately targeted by combatants or see their fate regarded as a matter of indifference by groups or governments pursuing their own political ends.

Increasing British humanitarian spend

What should be the humanitarian priorities of the new British government in such challenging circumstances, and against the background of the referendum vote in favour of Brexit? Let me start from the assumption that there are no silver bullets or magic solutions to be found. I do not believe that there is an easy big-bang answer to the fragmentation of the humanitarian community, for example by radically reorganising the UN or the NGOs, although improvements in both of these areas are certainly needed. Incremental change has to be the way forward. But that still

means governments, like humanitarians themselves, have to be pushing constantly for better delivery and greater impact.

My main recommendation to the new Prime Minister would be not just that overall aid spending should be maintained as previously planned, but that the proportion of this aid spent on humanitarian needs should be significantly increased, from the current 11% to more like 20%. This is above all because needs are rising so fast, as set out above. Millions more people are being displaced every year, internally or across borders, with huge impact on their lives. The suffering of many millions more who cannot or will not move is a blot on the conscience of the world, not least that of major donor countries like the UK. These people need more life-saving help – and this help also needs to recognise that displacement is not just a short-term problem when so many spend years in refugee camps or on the margins of cities before durable solutions can be found.

More humanitarian spending can also be justified by its evident impact on the lives of those most in need, and value for money. Governments and public alike crave reassurance that their money is being well and properly spent, without disappearing into the pockets of governments whose citizens we are trying to help. This is not an argument against other kinds of aid. Well-targeted development aid can certainly make a difference, and the British government's targeting is better than most. But it is a plea in favour of stepping up the proportion of spending which can make a quick and visible difference to the poorest and worst-affected communities and individuals in the world.

There is rightly a continuing effort to bridge the artificial gap between development and humanitarian aid, since there are many situations where the distinction means little – it never does to the beneficiaries themselves – and where the two need to blend seamlessly.

Countries suffering from chronic food insecurity which frequently tips over into disaster are only one example: the immediate symptoms and the underlying long-term causes need to be treated simultaneously and with the same degree of urgency. My proposal may seem to run counter

to this bridging effort. However, in practice, at least for now, the two activities and two funding streams often remain largely distinct, and giving more emphasis to the humanitarian stream than we presently do still makes sense.

How to spend it

First, part of the increased spending should flow to the vital effort to deal with the European migration and refugee crisis. Even if the new government remains as reluctant as its predecessor to take in more refugees from the current Middle East conflicts, as I fear will prove to be the case, there is a huge amount to do to deal with the human misery these conflicts are causing. This is true not only in and around the countries of the region, where the UK has already been playing a major and honourable role through its aid spending, but in Europe itself.

The plight of the refugees stranded in Greece and elsewhere is a growing scandal which cannot be ignored. Brexit or no Brexit, the UK should work to encourage more coordinated and effective European policies, and play a full part in funding them. Part of this should be more spending on emergency education for the generations of children stuck in refugee situations, wherever they may be, and more support for those trying to assist those trapped in the host countries of the region such as Jordan and Lebanon to find employment and be able to help themselves. This really is an area where the short and long-term goals must come together.

Second, and more briefly, there should continue to be a growing emphasis from donor governments and humanitarian aid organisations on encouraging prevention/anticipation/disaster risk reduction and on empowering and facilitating local action, as opposed to international intervention. International humanitarian aid may be more essential than ever in the conflict situations in the Middle East and North Africa, but it is still true that wherever possible local governments, local aid organisations and local businesses should be helped to take the lead. This is particularly important for natural hazards in the most disaster-prone areas of the world. South East Asia is already showing the way here.

Third, the trend towards using cash and vouchers, rather than handing out goods which are not necessarily what people need or want, and which always risk ruining and distorting local economies, should be accelerated and intensified. There will always be situations of extreme emergency where local supply chains have disappeared and where people require immediate food assistance and basic supplies. We should be able to mobilise such help quickly. Otherwise, helping rebuild and restock the local supply systems and local economies should be the target. This is the best way to encourage the community resilience which has been an important policy target for the UK and other donors for some years now.

Fourth, DFID should intensify support for evidence-based assistance. In other words, despite the inevitable difficulty in being sure about exactly what works and what doesn't, even in emergencies, money should flow where there is evidence to support its value. The search for impact data and analysis should meanwhile be stepped up, with acquiring this a condition of funding where good evidence does not already exist.

Fifth, DFID should use its funding influence to encourage NGOs to specialise and coordinate with other NGOs – for example to ensure that similar services are not offered in the same locations; to share services such as in-country logistics wherever possible; and to pool resources for innovation and impact evaluation. Each NGO is rightly independent and takes its own decisions, but the current fragmentation of effort helps no-one. As a quid pro quo, effective NGOs should be given a proportion of core funding to enable them to plan and improve their work, or at least a sufficient percentage of grant funding to cover their real costs, not an arbitrary and unrealistic amount which may appear to save taxpayers' money but is short-sighted and damaging in its consequences.

Sixth, the UK should ensure it is fully coordinating itself with other major humanitarian donors. The donors have always been strong on telling others in the sector to coordinate but weak on doing it themselves. This would help to improve both geographical and sectoral coverage and avoid the plague of underfunded 'orphan' crises. Working with other donors and operational agencies, DFID should also play its part in ensuring that the

humanitarian sector has meaningful collective goals in areas like health and education, to underpin the broader Sustainable Development Goals agreed by the international community as a whole.

The impact of Brexit

What difference will or should Brexit make? Of course this is hard to say until we know more about what it might mean in practice and whether the UK will still be part of the European Economic Area, which has implications for continued access by some humanitarian actors to European humanitarian funding. A minimum aim should be that any drop in EU multilateral funding for NGOs with bases in the UK should be made up by more bilateral help, in line with promises made by the new government in other areas such as agriculture. Cooperation with EU partners should also be maintained where possible, even if the UK is no longer a contributor to multilateral giving through the EU.

Similarly it is vital that the UK's role in addressing underlying political crises, to diminish humanitarian need, is not diminished by Brexit or rendered ineffective through growing isolation. Maintaining the commitment to the 0.7% target for aid will help give the UK the standing to work with others to address global problems. But greater aid funding can never be enough in itself to bring about solutions, and the diplomatic effort through the FCO and other departments to promote peaceful outcomes must be not only maintained, but stepped up.

Finally, the UK must continue to be a prime supporter of the independence and neutrality of humanitarian action. Any humanitarian policy, to be worthy of the name, must be genuinely needs-driven, not dictated by the donor country's political and security priorities. It is of course understood that a country like the UK can have a particular historical or current interest in specific countries or crises, for example if its troops are deployed there, and can therefore focus some of its funding in some of these locations. But the humanitarian aid itself should not come with political or other strings attached, and should not be instrumentalised for security ends.

The UK should also ensure that it remains in the forefront of those insisting that humanitarian access should be unconditional, and that where contact with groups such as Hamas or al-Shabaab is needed to facilitate such access and assistance, because they are in control of particular geographical areas, that should not be seen as aiding and abetting terrorism and lead to any kind of sanctions.

Humanitarian aid may be simpler than development aid, but it comes with its own challenges. The proposals above are only a partial contribution to improving what humanitarians do. They should be looked at against the background of the ideas agreed earlier this year at the World Humanitarian Summit. I hope that they may offer some guidance as aid policies and priorities are considered afresh. ♦

2. Protecting children affected by conflict

Flick Drummond MP

All wars hurt civilians, either directly through bombing, crossfire or terrorism: or indirectly through the disruption of society. Famine, loss of access to clean water or sanitation, destruction of healthcare facilities and schools, and the disruption to the economy affect everyone in some way. But the impact on children is always the greatest. War strikes children at an age when they are still learning to cope with the world, which can be stressful enough in any society. In a war zone where children are unable to defend or care for themselves that impact is multiplied.

Britain is already a world-leader in humanitarian response in conflict zones like Syria and Yemen. We are the second-largest donor of international aid, led only by the United States, and our aid makes a difference for millions of people around the world. It is a vitally important area of foreign policy, and we should not be bashful about it. Our commitment to international aid is not just about soothing our conscience as a leading post-Imperial power, it is a practical tool for building a better world. We can never isolate ourselves from the consequences of tragedy elsewhere – they will reach our shores sooner or later, despite any current political fashion for isolation.

However, as well as delivering on our aid commitments, there is more Britain can do to lead the world in championing international humanitarian law and norms to protect children in conflict from abuse and exploitation, establish safe places for children like schools and ensure that war does not create lost generations with no access to education.

Children are being failed

In conflict zones around the Middle East, it is the children that are being failed as war continues to rage. Images of children affected by war shock the media and the public. Phan Thi Kim Phuc was photographed running from a napalm attack in Vietnam 45 years ago; much more recently Omran Daqneesh was captured sitting in an ambulance in Syria covered in dust and blood. But for every child caught on camera there are thousands of other children unseen in the conflict. Shortly after Omran was photographed, he was joined in that ambulance by other children wounded in the bombing. He lost his own brother in another air attack.

Do the pictures actually strike policy-makers hard enough to make a difference? Or is there an institutional cynicism which makes them blind to what the rest of us can see? President Nixon mused at first that the Kim Phuc photo may have been fixed, and the father of Alan Kurdi has recently commented that nothing had changed since the photograph of his dead son washed up on the beach.

Kim Phuc and Omran Daqneesh are the lucky children, who survived despite their terrible ordeals. But emotionally there is an effect on every child traumatised in war. What of the other children who have become displaced, or orphaned, many of whom have seen unimaginable sights? Kim Phuc has set up a foundation in her name to provide medical and psychological assistance to child victims of war, but governments need to ensure that there are enough psychologists and facilities to help the thousands of children affected around the Middle East with some urgency. It is vital that we stabilise the situation in the conflict region, both to avoid the perils refugees face in migrating away permanently and in order to give displaced and traumatised people faith that their homes can be rebuilt.

Children forced to fight

In every conflict, children are being dragged into war as combatants. Abusing the emotional fragility of children in this way is an unspeakable atrocity. We must be clear that although we have to deliver aid, we also have to take whatever measures are necessary to eradicate the evil which perpetrates these horrors.

Child soldiers may feel they have little in the way of future prospects, so stay with militias to feed themselves and have protection. Away from their homes, they may also come to consider them family. There must be systems in place to get these young people the psychological help they will undoubtedly need.

There has been some criticism from the outside that the Arab world can do more to help defuse tensions, but there are organisations making a real contribution. Two groups in the UAE, Hedayah and Sawab, are making inroads into preventing young people from being indoctrinated. Hedayah is looking into the psychological reasons why young people are being attracted to organisations like ISIS, and Sawab is using social media to send out positive messages about peaceful Islam.

It is understandable that children who cannot see a future are being ensnared by propaganda emanating from social media. If children in the UK are susceptible to it, with the sophistication and openness of our society, we can well imagine how vulnerable children are in war-torn countries to the propaganda. Governments can only do so much to stop the activities of an ever-changing cast of social media propaganda accounts. They depend on the help of social media platforms and service providers, who are often reluctant to get into what they naively see as arguments about "free speech".

Children losing access to education

Developing countries host 86% of the world's refugees and are now responsible for the welfare of some of the world's most vulnerable people. Financially and socially this is a huge burden, and it is where foreign aid can have most impact. I worry that our domestic and European focus on migration and its consequences is blinding us to the reality of where the burden of the refugee crisis is currently hitting hardest.

The aim of the World Humanitarian Summit in May was to empower women and girls as change agents and leaders, but disappointingly there was no specific commitment to education. Focusing on building capacity in developing countries is the most important foreign aid goal but building the future of the country can only be achieved by educating and supporting

the next generation. We need to include education as a first-order priority in humanitarian response and identify how education stakeholders can better ensure educational continuity in emergencies, particularly in the face of protracted crises.

Only 50% of refugee children are enrolled in primary school, yet nearly every child wants to continue their education. Education in developing countries is prized as the route out of poverty and this is more focused in refugee camps where children see an education as the way out of the camps. Developed countries, led by the UK, can make a difference here with aid to build up the capacity in school buildings and teachers keeping children near their homeland and teaching in their own languages. Half a million displaced Syrian children are being helped by UK aid to maintain their education.

The UK has led in the *No Lost Generation* initiative for children in the Syrian conflict and the Girls Education South Sudan programme, but the international community must make education a priority if we are expecting war-torn countries to have a future with an educated population.

Education can also be a powerful tool for conflict-prevention and resolution. Rwanda is an example of a country working hard to bring the community together through work with "the next generation" in schools. One of the great organisations working on this is actually called Generation Rwanda, which is working to heal the rifts of war which remain long after the conflict has abated.

The need for safe schools

Closure of schools leaves young people vulnerable to distraction and attraction to the violence around them. In a country like Syria which previously had a good record in education, a generation of children is growing up without access to schools. This can be either through fear of going to a school, or because it has been put out of action in the fighting. Some schools have been commandeered for military activities or detention centres by armed forces. Others have been damaged or destroyed outright in the fighting, often being deliberately targeted.

In Afghanistan, there have been more than 1,110 attacks on school-level education. In societies where women face a range of social hurdles to overcome in their everyday life, attacks on children like Malala Yousafzai are a constant threat. It is often girls that suffer most. In Libya, Save the Children estimates that half of all children are not in school, a vacuum being filled by crime and recruitment by militias.

The Safe Schools Declaration, an inter-governmental initiative, gives countries *"the opportunity to express broad political support for the protection and continuation of education in armed conflict"*. Led by Norway and Argentina, countries such as Afghanistan and South Sudan have signed and it seems a sensible pledge to show solidarity towards the aim. The UK Government has yet to sign this accord. If the UK will show its support for the Declaration, it would be a major signal of intent and I call upon our government to make that commitment.

A world-wide recognition that schools are a haven for children, and not just in an educational sense, will be a big start towards reducing the harm of conflict and ensure that populations will have a future.

Preventing sexual violence against children

Lastly but importantly, girls and boys impacted by conflict must be protected from sexual violence. The UK leads in this area following the 2013 Declaration of Commitment to End Sexual Violence in Conflict. It is an area where William Hague did so much good work during his time as Foreign Secretary, and I hope it will be a lasting legacy.

No perpetrator must be allowed to get away with sexual violence, and every effort must be made to bring the criminals to justice. There is evidence that ISIS are brutalising young boys, as well as the much reported evidence about the atrocities against women and girls in territories which have fallen under their control. The experiences of peoples like the Yazidis have been horrific, and offering support to the victims of brutality should be a key objective of our aid involvement in the areas affected.

The UN Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism established in 2005 must be strengthened and pressure must be put on countries to comply with their international obligations. The prevalence of non-state armed

groups makes this much harder, but this should not deter us from finding a way to engage these groups to protect children.

One of the most tragic examples of the impact of conflict on children lies in Yemen, which faces a child-protection crisis with an estimated 7.4 million children in need of some form of assistance. Save the Children has been working to support health facilities there but the shortage of supplies and interruption caused by bombing of facilities make the programme difficult. In countries like Yemen, any organisation faces huge challenges delivering a programme or even monitoring the situation on the ground. Families do not feel safe and prefer to stay in their homes because they are too scared to go outside. This deprives them and their families of access to healthcare, and prevents the use of preventative medicine as well as access to treatment for illness or injury.

Holding perpetrators to account

Any violations against children under 16, be it through sex, soldiering or in other roles, are the most heinous crime. I hope that international courts will eventually bring the criminals responsible to justice. The International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia led the way in the prosecution of sexual violence in conflict – over a third of the cases it heard involved it. The sister tribunal looking at the conflict in Rwanda also played a leading part in bringing these criminals to justice. The UK has an historic and proud involvement in both these countries.

We must make sure that all the forces of international law are brought to bear on those who inflict torture and suffering on struggling populations around the world. We need enforcement as well as aid. There is still work for our government to do to live up to the expectations of people both at home and abroad. But in the UK we are traditionally in the forefront of these efforts across government, the third sector and as a society which cares about the world around it. ♦

3. Leading the way on eradicating child malnutrition

Jamie Cooper

In July 2016 the respected Copenhagen Consensus think tank published a study of the cost-effectiveness of action to meet the 169 new UN Sustainable Development Targets – it being important, with so many targets, to know which will deliver most 'bang for the buck'. The study involved over 100 peer-reviewed papers by 82 of the world's leading economists and an assessment by a panel that included two economics Nobel laureates.[1] It concluded: *"Nineteen of the 169 Sustainable Development Targets are so effective that focusing on them first would effectively quadruple the aid budget without any extra spending."*[2] The study's number-one target, at the very top of the list, was child malnutrition.

The study also examined how long the gains would take to be realised for the various targets. Child malnutrition was one of just eight "quick wins" that could be achieved in a relatively short time by scaling up existing programmes.

UK leadership on nutrition is renowned

Thanks to the British government's consistent commitment to improving child nutrition, the UK has built an international reputation for leadership in this area. A cornerstone of this positioning was the 2013 Nutrition for Growth summit held in London which I was honoured to co-host with the then Prime Minister David Cameron, together with the then Vice President (now President) of Brazil, Michel Temer. The event was attended by eight heads of state and heads of government and by figures

such as Bill Gates.[3] It secured £15 billion of new commitments on nutrition from 26 governments and other stakeholders.[4] Rajiv Shah, then head of USAID, described it as *"a landmark event"*.[5]

The UK's reputation in nutrition has been maintained in the years since the 2013 summit. In 2015 the global health advocacy partnership, Action, assessed the performance of eleven major donors including the US, the EU and the World Bank in meeting their commitments on nutrition. The UK got a higher rating than any other donor, being the only one to be scored as both "ambitious" and "on track".[6]

This global leadership role, on a previously neglected development issue of increasingly acknowledged importance, reflects well on the UK which can be seen as having reacted with speed and determination to the growing new evidence base. The fact that the issue also has a high level of emotional resonance – the provision of nourishment to children – has added to the reputational impact of Britain's leadership.

Britain has much to gain by building on this international positioning, and much to lose were it to take its foot off the pedal and be perceived as diluting its commitments. This essay summarises the basic case for action on nutrition and the kinds of interventions that are needed. It then sets out how the effect referred to as the "demographic dividend" could leverage the impact of action on nutrition to help deliver an economic step-change across sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia within a generation.

The case for action on nutrition

Children who experience chronic under-nutrition are described as stunted. Lacking key nutrients in the crucial 1,000 days from conception to the age of two, they grow into adulthood permanently shorter, weaker, more vulnerable to disease and with cognitive deficits because their brains do not develop properly. They do less well in education, earn less as adults and contribute less to their country's economies. Once the 1,000 day biological window has been passed, it is too late to remedy poor nutrition and the impairments are irreversible. Under-nutrition contributes to 3.1 million deaths each year – 45% of all child deaths.

Better child nutrition is an economic imperative for much of Africa and South Asia, where stunting rates are very high. Some key facts help explain why:

- In many countries in sub-Saharan Africa, where 38% of children are stunted, addressing this could boost Gross National Product by 11% by locking in human capital for life.7
- If young children avoid stunting, when they grow up they will earn around 20% more and be 33% more likely to escape poverty.
- Nutrition interventions have high cost-benefit ratios of around 1:20, similar to infrastructure investments such as irrigation or roads.
- Good child nutrition is good for the development of a thriving private sector because it leads to a more productive workforce and a more affluent consumer base.
- Good nutrition can break the intergenerational cycle of poverty, because a woman who avoids stunting as a child is then three times less likely to have stunted children herself.
- Better child nutrition could also contribute to social stability by helping to provide the fundamental human capital foundations to build a skilled, employed workforce, so avoiding the social unrest and political instability that can result if a large population of young people feels excluded.

The kinds of action needed

Child nutrition programmes involve both "nutrition-specific" and "nutrition-smart" interventions. Nutrition-specific interventions aim to improve nutrition during the first 1,000 days of life by directly enhancing the nutritional intake of pregnant women, breastfeeding women, babies and young children. This involves action such as giving vitamin and mineral supplements, increasing the intake of protein, promoting breastfeeding and encouraging changes in household behaviour such as food preparation.

However, under-nutrition is caused by multiple factors and so nutrition-specific interventions on their own are not enough. Other sectors need to redesign their own programmes of work to make them more "nutrition-smart" (also called "nutrition-sensitive"), for example:

- In agriculture: through a more diverse range of crops, crop strains with more nutrients, post-harvest fortification, more widespread use of livestock and more domestic kitchen gardens.
- In health: through treatment programs for intestinal worm infestations (which damage the gut's ability to absorb nutrients) and prevention of malaria (which reduces nutritional status).
- In the Water, Sanitation and Hygiene sector: by reducing intestinal infections through clean water and better hygiene practices.
- In education: through better awareness of the need for good nutrition and how to get it.
- In social protection: by making cash transfers dependent on the recipients fulfilling nutritional requirements such as attending food preparation classes.

The great prize of the demographic dividend

There is a one-off window of about three decades in a developing country's journey, when improved child survival and lower birth rates enable accelerated economic growth – known as the "demographic dividend". Many countries in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia are approaching or entering this window.

This demographic dividend occurs when falling mortality due to factors such as better sanitation and healthcare results in a generation larger than previous ones because more children survive. Then, as parents become more confident that children will reach adulthood, they choose to have fewer children and so subsequent generations reduce back down in size. The unique "bulge" generation then matures into a population of workers which is historically large compared to the numbers of children and old people who need to be provided for. The high ratio of workers to dependents allows surplus wealth to be created which can be used to improve living standards and increase investment for the future. Finally, the bulge generation enters old age and itself becomes dependent, the ratio of workers to dependents falls and the economic opportunity to gain a demographic dividend fades forever.

However, the demographic dividend is not automatic. Many years in advance of the youth bulge, governments must make large-scale human capital investments in areas such as health, nutrition, family support and education to improve the life chances of the bulge generation. These investments will help to ensure that, by the time the members of the bulge generation enter the workforce they are healthy, skilled and joining an economy able to offer employment. Without sufficient human capital investment, the demographic dividend will not materialise and the opportunity will have been lost.

One of the most impressive examples of a demographic dividend is South Korea. It achieved a 22-fold real-terms increase in income per person between 1960 and 2014 (from US$1,107 to US$24,566)[8], of which about a third was due to the demographic dividend.[9] While few countries in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia are likely to achieve quite such spectacular levels of growth, even a fraction of this would have a dramatic effect on their economies.

This century Africa will see massive population growth, from around one billion to around four billion people. If these three billion new human beings are treated as assets to be invested in rather than as burdens, threats or a humanitarian obligation, they could generate an immense increase in prosperity.

Good nutrition during the first 1,000 days of life is arguably the most fundamental human capital investment of all, involving as it does the biochemical raw materials for healthy bodies and minds. A focus on nutrition during the one-off period in a region's history when a demographic dividend is possible would have impacts far beyond the short-term economic benefits. It could have a transformational effect on the long-term future for billions of people.

DFID's special role

The British Government, and DFID in particular, has so much potential to change the lives of children around the world. But realising this potential will require action in six areas:

1. *Leadership:* Britain should maintain and enhance its acknowledged role as a global leader on the issue of child under-nutrition. This is in keeping with the emphasis of the Prime Minister, Theresa May, at the G20 Summit in September 2016 that Britain "will continue to be a strong and dependable partner" in its international affairs.
2. *Goals:* Britain should base this commitment on the second of the Global Goals adopted by the United Nations, which deals with hunger and nutrition. Its wording includes the pledge *"by 2030 end all forms of malnutrition, including achieving by 2025 the internationally agreed targets on stunting and wasting in children"*.
3. *Innovation:* Britain should treat this as an opportunity to utilise and showcase the expertise and innovation of British development institutions, British companies and British universities to develop new products, programmes, technologies and delivery systems to address under-nutrition.
4. *Mainstreaming:* Britain should mainstream nutrition into its overseas development assistance by redesigning programmes across multiple sectors such as agriculture, health, education, social protection, water, sanitation and hygiene, to make these more "nutrition-smart". Nutrition should be made an important aspect of the performance-indicator metrics by which these programmes are assessed.
5. *Convening power:* Britain should utilise the same convening power it demonstrated at the 2013 Nutrition for Growth summit to bring together a wide range of players (governments, multilateral institutions, the private sector, NGOs and others) to address the multi-dimensional nature of under-nutrition. While there are a number of existing fora that bring different sectors and countries together in this way, the effort needs to be greatly intensified and made more effective.
6. *Allocations:* In making future decisions about the allocation of aid money, Britain should prioritise countries where governments have a demonstrable commitment to delivering improved nutrition.

Britain has already been an incredible leader in changing the world for children at risk of malnutrition. This is how the new government could continue to lead. ♦

Notes

1 Copenhagen Consensus, 2016 http://www.copenhagenconsensus.com/post-2015-consensus/nobel-laureates-guide-smarter-global-targets-2030

2 Copenhagen Consensus, 2016 http://www.copenhagenconsensus.com/sites/default/files/expert_outcome_one_pages_combined.pdf

3 UK Government, 2013 https://www.gov.uk/government/news/world-leaders-sign-global-agreement-to-help-beat-hunger-and-malnutrition

4 UK Government, 2013 https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/207274/nutrition-for-growth-commitments.pdf

5 USAID, 2013 https://blog.usaid.gov/2013/06/a-more-nutritious-future-for-all/

6 Action, 2015 http://www.action.org/images/general/Following_the_Funding,_Nutrition_for_Growth_(ACTION,_April_2015).pdf

7 Haddad, 2013 https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/view/33272691/ending-undernutrition-background-framing-paper-final-may-2013/6

8 World Bank country dataset for South Korea, GDP per capita in constant 2005 US dollars (which takes account of inflation)

9 Africa's Prospects for Enjoying a Demographic Dividend, Bloom et al, 2016 https://cdn1.sph.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/1288/2012/11/Africas-Prospects-for-Enjoying-a-Demographic-Dividend.pdf

4. A development agenda with girls at its heart

Baroness Jenkin

This time last year, world leaders came together at the United Nations to agree the most ambitious agenda for global development that the world has ever seen. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development is a road-map for eradicating poverty in all its forms, within a generation. At the centre of the Agenda lies a critical promise that no one will be left behind. We are not talking about halving poverty; we are speaking of ending it for all people everywhere. This will mean prioritising the most marginalised and vulnerable.

This pledge holds particular promise for girls. Across the world, girls are disproportionately represented amongst the poorest and most excluded from society. Centuries of discrimination have placed girls firmly at the back of the queue, denying them opportunities to grow into healthy, productive and fulfilled women.

To tackle the challenges of development we must place the position of women and girls in the most impoverished parts of the world at the centre of everything we do. Girls' life experiences are different from boys'. They are not inferior or superior, but different, and that difference has to be better reflected, whether through the targeted investment of British aid, through sending technical gender experts to developing countries or by boosting accountability to girls for policies that affect them.

It is about fairness, about levelling the playing field so that every boy and girl has the opportunity to get on in life, to reach their economic and social potential. We need to turn the technical 2030 Agenda for Sustainable

Development into an action plan that helps lift the world's most vulnerable girls out of poverty and protects them from harm. Investing in women's economic empowerment sets a direct path towards gender equality, poverty eradication and inclusive economic growth – fostering both dignity and prosperity.

Progress shows we should be ambitious

If we fail to reach millions of the world's girls, we effectively shut off vast reserves of ambition, creativity and intellect that could contribute to the economies and societies they live in. Educating girls and harnessing their potential can result in rapid benefits for countries' economies – ranging from expanding the market and making labour markets more competitive to reducing the burden on the health sector as more educated women are more likely to take part in family planning. As head of UN Women Phumzile Mlambo-Ngcuka recently said, *'If you don't know where to start with the SDGs, start with women and girls, and everything else will fall into place.'*

The UK government has wholly recognised this need and I am deeply proud that we have led the global push to increase the empowerment of women and girls. We were one of the strongest supporters of the establishment of UN Women; we pushed for greater support for tackling child marriage and female genital mutilation at the 2014 Girls Summit in London; we continue to invest in girls' education through the innovative Girls Education Challenge Fund and we convened other donors and stakeholders at the recent Girls Education Forum.

The significant progress that girls and women across the world have made in recent years demonstrates that change is possible.

Take education as an example. In 2000, 54% of all children and youth out of school were girls. By 2014, the gender gap had virtually closed, with 19% of girls out of education, compared to 18% of boys.[1] Improvements have also been made for one of the starkest indicators of inequality – life expectancy. Women are now living longer than men in all regions of the world, and women in low income countries are now living on average 20 years longer than they were in 1960.[2]

Poverty compounds marginalisation

While solid progress is being made, it is not being made for all children equally; it is when poverty overlaps with marginalisation of girls that we see some of the most shocking and persistent violations of girls' rights.

Poverty forces families to make difficult decisions about how to allocate the scarce resources they have. These decisions are often informed by norms about the value that girls and boys bring, and the roles that they should play. For example, when there is sufficient money to send one child to school, it is often boys that benefit as they are perceived to be more likely to be able to use that education to get paid work later in life.

Girls can be forced into marriage in order to relieve the financial burden they are considered to impose on the household, or to build financial links between families. In communities that practice female genital mutilation or cutting, the practice is often perpetuated across generations by women who are fearful that their daughters will not find a good match unless they are cut.

Once the cycle between marginalisation of girls and poverty is unleashed, it is hard to stop. Girls that become child brides are usually forced out of education, depriving them of access to knowledge, networks and confidence that could help them into decent employment or influence household decision making. In Sierra Leone, the Ebola crisis has decimated livelihoods, forcing some girls to eke out a living from transactional sex. But these girls face severe social stigma as a result, often depriving them of support from their communities and plunging them further into poverty.

Some of the most tragic stories I hear come from girls who have become pregnant as a result of rape, and who are blamed and excluded from their families and communities. A spiral into poverty often ensues, with dim prospects not only for mothers, but also for their babies. Statistics demonstrating the scale of this problem are alarming. In Kenya, for example, a girl is raped every 30 minutes, and 25% of girls and women aged 12-24 lose their virginity through rape.[3]

Girls who are most at risk of getting trapped in a cycle of poverty are those that suffer from multiple, overlapping forms of disadvantage including poverty, ethnic or religious identity, living in a remote area, or disability. Girls in conflict-affected and fragile regions, and those on the move as migrants, refugees and victims of trafficking, are amongst the most vulnerable in the world.

Power is at the root of the problem

Power, or rather lack of it, lies at the root of the challenges facing girls worldwide. Deeply rooted economic and political inequalities are exacerbated by harmful social norms which devalue girls and deprive them of opportunity. Such social norms can be incredibly hard to shift, especially when they reduce girls' confidence, making them less likely to challenge discrimination and harmful practices.

When girls do mobilise to demand change, they often face an uphill battle against powerful individuals and institutions that benefit from the status quo. Violence, endemic in societies across the world, is an extreme expression of power imbalances and is particularly harmful, robbing girls and women not only of their bodily integrity, but also of their self-esteem.

Four ways to empower girls

The solutions lie in identifying ways to tip the balance of power back towards girls, enabling them to take back control over their own lives. In light of this, the UK should build on its leadership in this area and continue to put girls at the heart of its development agenda. The government should focus on four key policy areas.

Investment in essential services

Greater investment in essential services would significantly boost girls' well-being and economic potential. Education is particularly important for equipping girls with the knowledge, skills and networks that they need to realise their aspirations and take control of their lives. The statistics speak for themselves: child marriage rates in Africa and Asia would fall by an estimated 64% if all girls received secondary education, and 59% fewer girls would become pregnant.[4] One area in which the UK could make a

real difference is drawing on British expertise in tax and fiscal policy to support developing countries to raise domestic revenues for investment in services for girls, particularly health and education.

Social protection

Building the capacity of developing countries to stand on their own two feet and provide social protection for their citizens in times of hardship would help to break the relationship between poverty and marginalisation. It would help to keep girls in school, ensure access to nutritious food and give families more freedom to allow their children to enjoy their childhoods, without being forced into work or marriage prematurely.

DFID has a very strong track record in this area, and we should continue to provide British expertise to strengthen social protection systems and build accountability.

Changing norms and enforcing laws

While important, access to services and financial security alone are not enough. The stereotypical norms and values that lie at the heart of girls' disempowerment must be tackled head-on if we are to see meaningful and sustainable progress in the long run. As a first step, the UK should work with the governments it supports to ensure that policies and laws that discriminate against girls are reformed, and that laws are introduced to ban harmful practices.

But real change will require ensuring that these laws are implemented and enforced, as well as working to shift discriminatory attitudes, beliefs and behaviour. Gendered norms are produced and reproduced by public institutions and society, as well as within households. Working with men and boys must be a central component of these efforts, as demonstrated by the impact that community discussions on female genital mutilation have had in helping to discredit the practice in Ethiopia, Somalia and beyond.[5]

UK development policy and programmes must work across these levels, through diplomacy, tailored community-level programmes, support for public information campaigns, legal and policy reform, and partnerships with influential spokespeople and leaders. With the new UK Aid strategy

setting out a vision for cross-government development, this has never been more achievable.

Our government's willingness to engage with difficult issues is demonstrated by our leadership in putting violence against women and girls on the international agenda and in developing innovative, evidence-based programmes in this area. The challenge now is to scale up this work.

Empowering women and girls

The final, but perhaps most important, policy area that requires sustained support is increasing the visibility and influence of girls and women in public and political life, an area I care passionately about.

Providing support to improve women's representation in parliament, government and business is critical. In countries across the world, having more women in parliament is linked to policy making that better addresses the needs of girls and women. Women leaders act as role models for girls, and can help to shift societal norms about their role in society.

Of course we in the UK have some way to go on this front, but through initiatives such as Women2Win which I co-founded with Mrs May in 2005, the Conservative Party has taken concrete steps which have boosted the number of female MPs. The number of female MPs elected in the Conservative Party and in the UK Parliament is at a record high and we must keep going. Given our proud democratic history and position in parliamentary networks with the Commonwealth and beyond, we are in a unique position to share our expertise and encourage others to take action.

But UK efforts must go further than this through providing platforms for girls' voices to be heard directly by all the partners we work with – including governments, donors, agencies and private sector organisations. Only then will the nature and the challenges that excluded girls face really be understood by governments, and effective solutions identified.

Ensuring that excluded girls have spaces to develop knowledge, networks and confidence to speak out is also important, including through support for girls' clubs and women's movements. These can be important incubators of collective action, allowing women and girls to come together to share their experiences and push for change. The UK should continue to

invest in locally driven women's and girls' movements and organisations. These have considerable potential to catalyse change from the bottom-up, but too often struggle to access long-term funding that would make all the difference to their work.

A joined up, cross-government approach is needed

Focus on these four key areas would demonstrate continued UK leadership on girls' social and economic development, helping to level the playing field and open up more opportunities for the poorest girls.

A joined up, cross-government approach is key to reaching those girls who are currently furthest behind, including those caught up in, or fleeing, violence and insecurity. Some of this work is already underway through the UK's National Action Plans on Women, Peace and Security and Violence Against Women which are helping to build a coherent and coordinated approach across DFID, the Foreign Office, the Ministry of Defence and the Home Office.

This work must continue, with a sharper focus on the world's most excluded girls. This is particularly urgent for humanitarian response, where child protection and education should be central, and tailored to meet the different challenges faced by girls and boys in different age groups during an emergency.

The road ahead will not be easy, but it is one that we must tread. Only then will we ensure fairness and equal opportunity for all and deliver change for the world's most vulnerable girls. ♦

Notes

1 UNESCO (2016) Leaving no one behind: How far on the way to universal primary and secondary education? Policy Paper 27/Fact Sheet 37. Quebec/Paris: UNESCO Institute for Statistics and Global Education Monitoring Report

2 World Bank (2012) World Development Report 2012: Gender Equality and Development. Washington DC: World Bank

3 Plan International 2015 State of the World's Girls 2015: The unfinished business of girls' rights Woking: Plan International

4 UNESCO (2014) Op. Cit

5 See https://plan-international.org/men-speak-out-about-fgm

5. Modern-day abolitionists: Putting Britain at the forefront of fighting slavery

Nick Grono

Following Brexit, Theresa May's government will need to recast the role it plays in global affairs. As it becomes increasingly independent of the European Union, the UK should pursue opportunities that draw on its historical legacy and acknowledged development strengths to serve its national interest, enhance its global reputation and contribute to the greater global good.

Leading the fight against modern slavery internationally will help achieve all of these goals. The UK should build upon its past abolitionist achievements and seek to complete the mission of William Wilberforce and his fellow activists to end slavery around the world. Such an approach would provide a powerful organising principle for the UK's international development work, and help make the world a better place for its most marginalised and vulnerable people. It would also reaffirm the UK as an outward-looking and internationalist nation.

Theresa May has already declared modern slavery *"the great human rights issue of our time"* and committed to *"[ridding] our world of this barbaric evil."* This commitment should form the basis of an ambitious anti-slavery agenda that – given this crime flourishes in environments where there is corruption, poverty, vulnerability, and weak rule of law – will also advance the UK's hard-earned reputation as a leading global development actor.

The persistence of slavery

At the end of the 18th century, slavery was a broadly accepted fact of life within the UK and around the world. It formed a significant component of British trade, and powerful economic interests profited handsomely from it. Yet in the space of just over two decades a small, visionary band of abolitionists, led by William Wilberforce and Thomas Clarkson, were able to persuade the UK government to abolish the trans-Atlantic slave trade and then deploy the full force of the Royal Navy to enforce that prohibition. That was followed by the abolition of slavery in America in 1865, and prohibition of slavery internationally.

Yet slavery as a broader phenomenon has persisted right up to the present day. Though it is illegal under international law, and in every country, the Global Slavery Index estimates some 45.6 million people around the globe are nevertheless enslaved.

In West Africa enslaved children pick cocoa for our chocolate; in the Congo, men, women and children are compelled by militias to mine minerals for our smartphones; Burmese migrants are trapped on Thai fishing boats and forced to fish seafood that ends up on our supermarket shelves; and slave-picked cotton from Uzbekistan and exploited workers in Bangladesh are used to make our dirt-cheap t-shirts.

Of course, slavery doesn't just exist in business supply chains. Around the world, vulnerable girls and women in search of better lives are tricked and deceived and then forced to work in brothels, and raped on a nightly basis. Or they are forced into marriages where they are not only sexually abused but also subjected to lives of domestic servitude.

Conflict-ridden countries and those with weak institutions are at particular risk of slavery, along with many other evils – as currently seen with child soldiers in South Sudan, and the sexual slavery of girls and women practiced by ISIS and Boko Haram.

Sadly, the varieties of this criminal trade are nearly endless, but the essence is the same: violent and coercive exploitation of the most vulnerable human beings, who are deprived of their liberty and forced to work for others' gain.

Slavery persists because, in its modern form – encompassing forced and bonded labour, human trafficking, the worst forms of child labour and forced marriage – it is a lucrative criminal enterprise that generates $150 billion in profits per year. This makes it one of the most profitable international criminal industries, second only to the trade in illicit drugs.

It thrives when three factors intersect: the demand for excessively cheap labour; individual vulnerability and marginalisation (which can take many forms, such as caste, ethnicity, gender, illiteracy and migrant status, or just sheer poverty and lack of economic alternatives); and weak rule of law, which results in a fundamental failure to both implement anti-slavery laws and to internalise the international norms against slavery and extreme exploitation, allowing slavery to thrive. It is enabled by corruption, is practised by abusive power-holders and hobbles development by imposing significant costs on communities and states.

What the UK can do

As Pope Francis has noted, slavery is a *"global phenomenon which exceeds the competence of any one community or country."* To tackle this entrenched crime, we need a renewed and robust abolitionist movement committed to ending slavery across the globe. We need powerful political leadership. We need businesses to get serious about tackling slavery in their supply chains. And we need to empower consumers to choose products free of slavery.

The UK government should play a leading role in advancing all of these goals internationally. And in so doing, it can promote a robust human rights approach to global development, and put the rule of law at the centre of its efforts.

It has already made a good start: the UK government was instrumental in ensuring the eradication of modern slavery was included in the Global Goals. Now it has a key role to play in making certain this goal is implemented by the UN and member states. It can start by supporting much greater investment to measure slavery at a country level, and fund research to identify the most effective interventions.

The UK can also assist other countries to develop robust and effective anti-slavery legislation of their own. While all states prohibit slavery, these

prohibitions take various forms – combining legislation against slavery and human trafficking and forced labour. The UK passed its own progressive and effective Modern Slavery Act in 2015, under Theresa May's leadership as Home Secretary, and the UK could play a valuable role in assisting other states, including those with a high prevalence of slavery, to develop and implement similar legislation.

Recognition of the central role of business and consumers in fighting modern slavery prompted the inclusion of a supply-chain clause in the Act. This requires businesses operating in the UK with an annual turnover above £36 million to publish a statement each year detailing the steps they are taking to ensure that slavery is not part of their own business or their supply chains. Properly implemented this will help consumers, investors, and the broader public to engage with businesses on modern slavery, as well as incentivise senior management to take action.

But while greater supply chain transparency is key to tackling slavery, it does impose a regulatory burden on companies required to comply with the UK Act. So the government should make it a priority to internationalise these provisions to help create a level playing field for UK-registered businesses competing internationally with those not covered by the Modern Slavery Act.

In encouraging widespread adoption of transparency regimes, the UK should model its approach on the successful efforts to promote anti-corruption legislation globally. In that case, the key elements of the US Foreign Corrupt Practices Act were progressively adopted by other countries, culminating in the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention of 1997 and a much more robust international regulatory regime on bribery.

Implementing the UK's anti-slavery agenda

Fighting slavery should have broad support from states around the world. It is not a particularly contentious issue geopolitically. It is prohibited under international law and in every country. It is widely acknowledged to be morally abhorrent. Ending it not only extinguishes an injustice but also enables people to contribute more productively to their communities, creating greater prosperity.

But actually ending slavery is much more complex, and requires tackling deeply entrenched economic, cultural, religious and institutional practices. It requires normative change, so that governments, business and individuals not only believe that slavery is wrong, but act on that belief.

Restart the campaign

The 18th century abolitionists understood the need to change norms. Thomas Clarkson and his colleagues were remarkably innovative in developing campaign tools, many of which we take for granted these days. These included: investigative reports and journalism, letter writing campaigns, consumer boycotts, use of powerful images to shape opinions (most notably the devastatingly powerful diagram of a slave ship jam-packed with its human cargo), and strategic litigation. They even established the world's oldest human rights NGO, the forerunner of today's Anti-Slavery International.

These tools all lend themselves to powerful anti-slavery campaigns today. As part of its broader programme of work, the government should partner with campaign organisations with similar objectives to mobilise voters and consumers and help change social norms.

International summit

To kick-start its global campaign, the UK government should host an international summit on modern slavery, in the vein of the 2014 Girl Summit. The objectives of such a summit would be to encourage coordinated state action, the best use of resources, and innovative and impactful policy-making. To produce real on-the-ground benefits it would need significant grassroots involvement and result in concrete and substantial outcomes such as a ground-breaking national and international commitment to anti-slavery measures, business commitments to rooting out slavery in their supply chains, and the significant mobilisation of new funds.

International organisations

The UK is also very well placed to use its membership of, and influential role in, key international organisations to advance the anti-slavery agenda.

As a member of the UN Security Council's P5, the UK has significant influence within the larger UN system. It should work to ensure that slavery is high on the agenda of the next UN Secretary General. It should also push for better coordination and coherence in the UN's anti-slavery efforts through the appointment of a special envoy tasked with developing a proposal for a Global Partnership to End Modern Slavery, mainstreaming UN system-wide action and developing system-wide thematic guidance, and developing effective supply chain transparency measures to ensure that legitimate businesses and the UN itself do not unwittingly encourage modern slavery, an area where the UK can lend particular expertise.

The UK could similarly capitalise on its lead role in The Commonwealth by illuminating the links between corruption (which The Commonwealth has already done significant work on) and modern slavery. It could also encourage the broader Commonwealth to adopt the UK's model of corporate disclosure of policies and practices to tackle slavery in supply chains.

The OECD is already very active on anti-bribery measures through its working groups and has issued standard-setting guidance on modern slavery and supply chains. It is therefore an obvious avenue for significant UK engagement with, and pressure on, other states to adopt policies and legislation to combat slavery.

Post-Brexit, the G20 and B20 summits provide opportunities for the UK to both smooth its relations with some of its European neighbours and at the same time clearly reassert its international standing and leadership role. The modern slavery issue offers an ideal vehicle, given its truly global relevance and universally accepted ethical and economic validity. The UK should put the issue firmly on the G20 agenda, and work to ensure both agreements for practical reform measures and sound recommendations for longer-term action.

At the G7 in May 2016, leaders made a short but important reference in their final declaration to modern slavery and the need for a collective response. Future engagement at this forum could go a long way towards spurring wide reaching and fundamental change across the globe. Certainly at both the G20 and G7, more needs to be done to drive home the fact

that effectively tackling all forms of slavery will produce broader success across the entire economic, trade and development agenda.

Evil can be defeated

Two centuries ago, the UK led global efforts to abolish the slave trade. If there is one overarching lesson to take from the success of Britain's 18th century abolitionists, it is that – however insurmountable the task of eliminating slavery may appear – this evil can be defeated by international leadership and a modern movement that persuades states and business to meet their responsibility to end this crime.

At a time when governments across the world are walking back from their human rights commitments, and the progress made in recent decades to protect the most vulnerable is at risk of stalling, the fight against modern slavery is one of the very few human rights battles today where we are seeing tangible success. We need to build on and accelerate this progress.

By taking the global lead in this fight, the UK could have a truly significant impact, showing real, measurable progress in the next decade on a fundamental human rights issue, as well as reaffirming that the UK remains an outward-facing and internationalist nation despite its decision to leave the European Union. The UK has long driven global efforts to end slavery – it now has the opportunity to double-down on this effort and be at the forefront of the abolition of this egregious crime. ♦

Part 3

The role of innovation

1. Using innovation, technology and research to deliver a world free from poverty

Sir Andrew Witty

Innovation at its best can be a great leveller. Technology – be it a vaccine or a mobile phone – can help equalise the life chances of children and their families, regardless of where they live. Babies in Ethiopia and the UK can receive the same vaccine against a severe form of diarrhoea. Health workers in Kenya are embracing mobile technology to manage mothers' health records. Drones are beginning to deliver medical supplies to remote corners of the world.

These are powerful examples of why we must invest in innovation – and strive to make these interventions accessible to all who need them – if the Global Goals are to be achieved by 2030. Leaving no-one behind is integral to these 17 Goals, which came into effect this year. But there is a consensus that with the tools currently available, we will not achieve the ambitious agenda set out for ensuring health and wellbeing. While health is just one goal, it underpins all other aims – from education to economic growth. As an enabler of sustainable development and an end in itself, health deserves sufficient attention and investment.

Business has a critical role to play in driving this innovation. By doing what business does best – in our case, developing medicines and vaccines and improving access to them – we can use our resources and reach to improve wellbeing, create prosperity, provide employment and deliver the goods and services that people want and need.

In the UK, we are fortunate to have a thriving pharmaceutical industry, which employs around 73,000 people – 23,000 in highly skilled roles – and invests about £11.5 million every day in research and development.[1] This makes us ideally placed to bring major health benefits to patients not only in Britain, but to export this innovation – from asthma to oncology – across the globe.

Searching for interventions to improve the health and prospects of people around the world is part of being a modern company. This kind of business can look beyond the next quarter and consider where growth will come from in the long term, and recognise that we can do well by doing the right thing. Addressing the most intractable healthcare challenges will unlock human and economic potential, creating an environment in which communities, governments and business can prosper.

Innovation through collaboration

Taking on these challenges demands that we think and behave differently – to redefine the way we do our research and how we widen access to these innovations.

When I joined GSK in 1985, the company's policy was to keep off the radar. Scientific breakthroughs happened behind closed doors. Data was closely guarded. The focus was on making white pills for Western markets. With demand for healthcare in emerging markets fast increasing, such an approach was unsustainable. A responsive, relevant business has a responsibility to deploy its resources against a broad range of issues, not simply the short-term money makers.

The economics of this are tough. When developing tools for communities who cannot afford to pay much – if anything – for them, the traditional incentives for research and development evaporate. This compels us to be thoughtful and targeted about how and where we invest, to create a balanced portfolio, and to shake up the traditional conditions for research and development.

It also means we have to be more collaborative in our research: to open up the doors of our labs. This is especially pertinent when driving research into neglected diseases that trap families in a cycle of illness and poverty.

So GSK has created an 'open lab' at our research site in Spain, where our scientists work alongside visiting researchers. By bringing together the brightest minds, we aim to advance research into diseases that disproportionately affect developing countries. We are now applying a similar approach to non-communicable diseases in Africa.

Collaborative research has been vital to developing our malaria vaccine candidate, RTS,S – a 30-year endeavour. The global community has made a concerted effort to loosen malaria's grip and since 2000, deaths have plummeted by 60%.[2] The UK should be proud of the role it has played in the fight against malaria, providing fundamental research, policy support and much needed financing. But this progress is brittle. Malaria continues to claim more than 400,000 lives a year – mostly children in sub-Saharan Africa – and saps communities' economic potential.

More innovation is needed to strengthen our arsenal against malaria. To progress development of our candidate vaccine – designed for young children in sub-Saharan Africa – GSK teamed up with the PATH Malaria Vaccine Institute, a non-profit. Scientists across Africa led the clinical trials, involving more than 16,000 children. Only by working together, and combining our respective resources, could we shoulder the scientific and economic challenges of developing a malaria vaccine.

This partnership approach has got us to an unprecedented stage – RTS,S last year received a positive scientific opinion and the World Health Organization could begin large-scale pilot implementation of the vaccine candidate from early 2018. While RTS,S is not the complete solution to malaria, used alongside tools like bed nets, it would provide a meaningful contribution to controlling the impact of this disease on children in African communities.

Innovation in access

Innovations are irrelevant if they are out of reach for those who need them most. In this respect, the healthcare industry has not always got it right. But there is evidence to show we are making progress in helping medicines and vaccines to reach the most possible people; 17 million people[3] being treated with AIDS medicines developed by the research-based industry is a case in point.

In scientific research – the lifeblood of our organisation – there is a fine line between success and failure. When we have developed a product, manufacture is fraught with challenges. Take our vaccine against pneumonia: this is one of the most complex we have ever made, essentially combining 10 vaccines in one; more than 500 quality tests are performed before it is released. When dealing with something so technically challenging, we need to generate a return that will enable us to continue to invest in developing the medicines and vaccines of tomorrow.

However, innovation and access are not mutually exclusive. Through models such as tiered pricing of medicines and vaccines, we can ensure affordability is in step with a country's income and still invest sustainably in our research. Tools like our malaria vaccine candidate, which are designed for the poorest communities, will be offered at a not-for-profit price if approved for use. We take a graduated approach to intellectual property, which is reflective of a country's economic maturity. When it comes to widening access to healthcare, there is no silver bullet – we must pursue bespoke approaches appropriate to particular circumstances.

There are signs this philosophy is bearing fruit. More than 70% of our vaccine doses are supplied to developing countries – through partnerships including with GAVI, the vaccine alliance. Following an agreement with the Medicines Patent Pool, we extended access to our newest HIV medicine to countries where 93% of adults and 99% of children with HIV in the developing world live.[4] At the same time, our sales and profits have improved, putting us on a sustainable footing. Increasing access, incentivising innovation appropriately and achieving business success can go hand in hand.

Strengthening health systems

A medicine or technology cannot reach a patient if the infrastructure is fragmented. Governments take the lead on shaping health systems but business – as part of the social fabric – also has a role, along with NGOs and civil society. Given we all stand to benefit from healthier communities, all of us have a stake in creating and sustaining robust healthcare infrastructures.

There is evidence this can be achieved. Increasing access to polio vaccines has taken us to the brink of wiping out a disease which has devastated many children's lives.[5] Collaboration between pharmaceutical and logistics firms, UN agencies and NGOs has mobilised donations of medicines to help control neglected tropical diseases like lymphatic filariasis (LF). A recent paper estimated that as a result of the Global Programme to Eliminate LF, prevention of clinical disease could leave 46 million individuals better off.[6]

At GSK, we have taken steps to directly link our business success to building local capacity, recycling 20% of our profits from the Least Developed Countries back into strengthening their health systems. As our business grows, so does our scope to reinvest. Since 2009, we have reinvested £21 million and our three NGO partners – including Save the Children – have helped train more than 40,000 health workers, reaching 11 million people. These training programmes are aligned with government and community priorities to ensure they can have a long-term impact.

Building on this approach, we have deepened our partnership with Save the Children. No single organisation or sector can help unlock the challenges that mean 5.9 million children still die before their fifth birthday – mostly from preventable causes.[7] It takes teamwork. So our collaboration with Save the Children goes beyond the traditional charity-corporate models, combining their experience in reaching some of the most vulnerable and marginalised children with our skills and resources.

Insights from Save the Children helped us to reformulate an antiseptic solution in a GSK mouthwash into a gel to prevent umbilical cord infection among newborns in poorer countries. Going beyond R&D, our partnership helps to strengthen immunisation coverage; and increase the supply of and demand for effective healthcare. Three years in, our partnership has reached 1.3 million children, including fully immunising more than 23,900 children and helping more than 100,000 children in emergencies. These promising results drive us on, and hopefully inspire others to form innovative partnerships that strengthen local healthcare systems.

Working in partnership with businesses, governments and local actors, the UK has consistently championed strengthening of health systems. If we are to meet the ambition of the Global Goals, more donors must now follow suit. In the context of today's uncertain world, health systems may not always feel like an immediate priority. But in the long term they are one of the most important ways to help developing countries tackle current and future health challenges.

Innovating for the future

Huge strides have been made towards driving innovation in models of science and access. But only governments can create the right conditions in which to maintain this progress and ensure all sectors maximise its contribution to improving health and economic growth. This includes keeping health high on the political agenda and driving public awareness of the sustainable development vision. Maintaining consistent resources and funding – both for scientific research and international aid – is critical, as is creating the right policy environment for enabling innovations to scale up and reach the most possible people. In this context, the UK Government's recent promise to maintain both its 0.7% aid commitment and funding for research and innovation projects was welcome. Innovators also need in place the appropriate intellectual property protections to incentivise and reward their research.

Governments play an equally important role in supporting innovation to pre-empt and manage future hazards – such as unpredictable, yet likely, virus outbreaks and increasing antibiotic resistance. If we fail to adequately prepare for future challenges, we risk reversing our hard-won achievements to improve the health and life chances of children and their families. The devastating Ebola outbreak – to which the public health response was slow – claimed thousands of lives, undermined progress against malaria[8] and crippled the economies of affected countries.[9] Increasing antimicrobial resistance is also a real danger. With few new antibiotics in development, millions of lives could be lost to infection and trillions wiped off the global economic output.[10] In order to tackle these challenges in the long-

term, governments across the world should look for opportunities to align research and development policy. The UK Aid Strategy – published last year – took this approach by establishing the new £1 billion Ross Fund for global public health.

Responding to these threats also demands industry and government to get smarter – and to work hand-in-hand. GSK has made a substantial commitment to provide on a permanent basis to the world's governments a standing research capability that would support development of vaccines for future outbreaks. This approach will need the support of governments as well as the private sector. With government backing, public-private partnerships and novel models of funding, industry can work to overcome the scientific and economic hurdles of developing new antibiotics.

Inroads made into diseases such as malaria and polio show that progress is possible. We can generate innovation to combat global health challenges which jeopardise the life chances of too many children and their families. Through industry redefining its approach to research and shaking up its commercial models, we can deliver these interventions to more people than ever before. By working in unprecedented partnerships between business, government and civil society, we can break the deadlock of ill health and hardship and help deliver a world free from poverty. ♦

Notes

1 See http://www.abpi.org.uk/industry-info/achievements/Pages/pharmaceutical-industry.aspx

2 See http://www.who.int/malaria/media/world-malaria-report-2015/en/

3 See http://www.unaids.org/en/resources/fact-sheet

4 See http://annualreport.gsk.com/downloads/GSK_Responsible_Business_Supplement_2015.pdf. p.25

5 See http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs114/en/

6 See https://idpjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s40249-016-0147-4

7 See http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs178/en/

8 See http://www.thelancet.com/journals/laninf/article/PIIS1473-3099(15)00061-4/abstract

9 See http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2015/01/20/ebola-most-african-countries-avoid-major-economic-loss-but-impact-on-guinea-liberia-sierra-leone-remains-crippling

10 See http://amr-review.org/background

2. The business case for sustainable development

Paul Polman

Since the historic endorsement of the Global Goals one year ago the extraordinary business and economic opportunities of building a more sustainable and equitable world have become even more apparent. This shouldn't be a surprise. In the developing world, business provides 80% of the financial flows, 90% of job creation and 60% of GDP. It also delivers much of the innovation, technology and leadership needed for shared prosperity.

In many cases, the value of the potential benefits runs well into the trillions of dollars, with huge positive implications for both markets and society. This has been highlighted quite clearly by the recently established, Business and Sustainable Development Commission ('the Commission'), chaired by Mark Malloch-Brown.

The role of the Commission – in which Unilever is a founder member – is to identify and quantify the business and economic case behind implementing the Global Goals, demonstrating for example the market opportunities that arise from tackling global challenges including poverty, inequality and environmental stress.

Early findings show that developing countries account for a large share of the value of these business opportunities. Indeed, it shows a strong alignment between private-sector self-interest and progress in reducing poverty in emerging markets. This is not surprising when you consider the huge yields to be found in social investments. $1 invested in sanitation for example has been shown to have an economic return of $6. [1] Similarly, a $1 investment in nutrition to avoid stunting provides a $17 return. [2] In

education – just one extra year of secondary school for a girl will increase her income by 15-20%.[3] More broadly, economically empowering women would boost the global economy by $28 trillion.[4]

Global challenges as future value drivers

For businesses that approach these global challenges as future value drivers, there will be enormous rewards. It's about seeing long-term potential over short-term risks or responsibilities, and about seeing development issues not as a 'leave it to the next guy' problem, but a 'leave it to me' opportunity. This could turn out to be the biggest growth and job-creation agenda at a time when we seem to have run out of other options.

And these opportunities exist across a broad spectrum of industries. Just some of these, as identified by the Commission, include:

- The food sector: sustainable technology in large farms, reaching consumers the bottom of the pyramid, reducing food waste.
- The zero-waste 'circular economy': particularly across the car, electronics and energy sectors.
- Health companies: innovative and reengineered processes to increase affordability and profitability of healthcare.
- Construction and engineering: low-cost housing as the world becomes more urban, addressing the $3.7 trillion annual global infrastructure gap – an extraordinary market opportunity.

Firms willing to reinvent their business models in order to maximise their social and environmental impact and address the development agenda will be the biggest beneficiaries.

Unilever's approach

This approach lies at the heart of the approach we have taken at Unilever with our Unilever Sustainable Living Plan (USLP), built on the understanding that business can only thrive in stable and prosperous societies and that our own self-interest lies in serving the wider needs of society.

It is a total value-chain approach, accepting responsibility for what goes on – not only within the relatively narrow sphere of our own operations – but across the full extent of the value chain, from our suppliers to our consumers. Working with our suppliers, and particularly with the

thousands of smallholders farmers with whom we partner across the world, means that we are now able to source 60% of our agricultural raw material from sustainable supplies – up from just 10% a few years ago.

But the USLP really comes alive at the level of our brands and in our interactions with consumers. By embracing a clear social or environmental mission, including many of those identified as most urgent within the Global Goals (like malnutrition, hygiene and sanitation), these sustainable living brands are growing faster *because* they are serving a wider purpose.

The value of partnerships

Working in partnership with others to scale up our efforts is leading to even bigger impacts. Take an issue like illegal deforestation for example, a major contributor to climate change. Through partnerships with other global manufacturers, retailers and governments, including the UK, we are building together the mechanisms (e.g. the Tropical Forest Alliance) and the public-private commitments (e.g. the NY Declaration on Forests) that can ultimately help to eliminate illegal deforestation from global supply chains. This contributes to our business goals but also helps deliver goal 15 of the Global Goals: Life on Land.

Or take mainstreaming sustainable agriculture; by combining our size, scale and reach with the on-the-ground expertise of Acumen and the Clinton Giustra Enterprise, we are helping to improve the livelihoods of as many as 300,000 people in smallholder communities across Africa, South Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean. By working with Oxfam and the Ford Foundation we are providing a mix of loans, guarantees and grants to incentivise investment in new processes that aim to improve agricultural yields for farmers and their local communities. Helping to end hunger, achieve food security and improve nutrition is not only aligned with our Unilever ambitions, it is also central to achieving Goal 2: Zero Hunger.

Other companies are doing the same. For each product sold for example shoemakers TOMS helps give shoes, glasses, water or a birth kit to a person in need. Big data firms are unlocking new sustainable business models, from Big Thunder, IBM's hyper-local weather forecasting tool for small farmers, to smart metering for savings in electricity use, contribut-

ing to a broad spectrum of Global Goals. More than half of the Fortune 100 companies are saving around US$1.1 billion every year from energy efficiency, renewable energy and other emission reduction initiatives.

Investors are taking note too; issuances of green bonds for sustainable infrastructure have tripled in the last year to US$36.6 billion, and over 400 investors with more than US$24 trillion dollars of invested capital are calling for a price on carbon. This is no surprise, considering the global market for low-carbon and environmental goods and services are already worth more than 5.5 trillion US dollars.

Business as usual won't do

So the momentum is building. But progress is too slow and disjointed to ensure the Global Goals are met. We will not achieve the necessary scale or speed with business – or politics – as usual. After all, the sustainable development agenda is about better markets and better government.

Only through collective action, new types of public-private collaboration and new business models can we hope to catalyse and accelerate the change that is needed. It is a shift so significant that it adds up to what the Business & Sustainable Development Commission has called a 'new social contract' between governments, business and finance.

This transition to a sustainable economy is centred on four key areas:

1. *Jobs:* The world needs 600 million new jobs in the next 15 years to absorb growth in the global workforce.
2. *Innovation:* Governments need to think much harder about incentives for private sector R&D. Businesses need to recognise that some of the greatest innovation opportunities can be shared – e.g. Tesla's willingness to share its patents or the Semiconductor Technology Roadmap.
3. *Correcting market failures:* Includes elimination of fossil fuel subsidies (every second the fossil fuel industry receives $166,666 in subsidies, equivalent to providing 1.5 million homes with 20 solar panels every day), natural capital, more incentives for ESG practices, a fairer tax system and policy frameworks with long-term pathways.

4. *Transparency and accountability:* Businesses need to take on a transparency-on-demand mind-set, which includes: human rights, environmental performance, labour standards, tax and political lobbying where campaign-finance donations are an especially key area for far greater disclosure.

Some businesses already operate on these principles, but as the Commission has found, they are still the exceptions. That needs to change quickly.

The UK's leadership role

Governments have an important role to play in creating the right policy framework and of course in providing funding. The estimated cost of implementing the Global Goals is put at between US$2-3 trillion, yet the total budget for overseas development aid (ODA) is only about US$140 billion – barely 7% of what is needed. Without the necessary financial mechanisms, the Global Goals are doomed to fail.

That's why the UK can be proud of its 0.7% overseas aid commitment, despite economic and recessionary pressures. As the first major economy to meet the UN's spending target, the UK is now widely recognised for its leadership role. At a time of growing global uncertainty, that commitment sends a strong signal to developing countries that the UK will keep its promise to them.

Not only is it the right thing to do, ODA is firmly in the UK's national interest, especially as the nation looks to reassert its influential voice and renegotiate its position in the world. Indeed, trade and aid are great partners, and absolutely key to tackling inequality and instability – which we know fuels unrest.

On a number of occasions in recent years the UK has shown itself willing to lead on the development agenda. In 2013, Unilever was pleased to partner with the Government in a special G8 Summit event on nutrition, bringing together 90 development partners, businesses and civil society to sign the Global Nutrition for Growth Compact, which will prevent at least 20 million children from being stunted and save at least 1.7 million lives by 2020. The Summit led to commitments totalling US$4.15 billion

to beat hunger and improve nutrition – a significant investment to address one of the developing world's greatest and most challenging issues.

The 2015 Modern Slavery Act was another bold step – the first piece of legislation which attempts to prevent slavery and punish those found guilty, crucially with specific relevance to transparency within business supply chains. Recent data provided by the Salvation Army[5] indicates that reporting on slavery have increased fivefold over the last year; with some suggesting that efforts to highlight the issue have been somewhat successful.

And earlier this year London was the setting for a UK government-hosted summit on anti-corruption – one of the biggest scourges of the development agenda. Representatives from 40 countries came together – many in the developing world – to commit to exposing corruption wherever it is found and tackling the root causes, also publishing individual statements which set out their national corruption-fighting priorities. This was an absolutely critical step forward for the development agenda that once more proved the UK is stepping out in front.

The UK's role in the developing of the Global Goals and its 0.7% aid commitment adds up to a proud record. It does not go unnoticed. Moreover, it provides encouragement and reassurance to the private sector that governments are serious about providing the right policy environment. Certainly, we must hope that – despite times of uncertainty and change – the UK will continue to meet its responsibilities and help set the standard for other countries to follow.

By working together, business and governments have the opportunity to change the lives of the world's poorest and most vulnerable people, while creating the next generation of global business opportunities. It's a win-win too big to pass up. ♦

Notes

1 World Health Organisation

2 World Bank Group

3 UNICEF

4 McKinsey Global Institute, The power of parity: How advancing women's equality can add $12 trillion to global growth, 2015

5 Salvation Army, 2016 Anti Human Trafficking and Modern Slavery Report

3. Driving innovation in global health

Joe Cerrell

A recent cover story in the *Spectator* highlighted something that we at the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation have been certain of for some time now. It's a finding so controversial and counter-intuitive, so against the grain of everything we've been taught to believe in the West, that we sometimes shy away from saying it out loud or putting it down on paper. It's a simple but startling proposition.

Life is better now than it has ever been.

For many people this is pretty hard to believe, and I have to admit that it's something I've struggled with myself at times.

But the truth is that over the last 15 years the world has made more progress in reducing poverty and improving the health of the poorest people than in the whole history of mankind.

Poor countries are not doomed to be poor forever. Far from it; the world is more prosperous, and peaceful, than it has ever been and by 2035 there will be almost no countries left that would be described, by today's standards, as "poor". If life for some remains nasty, brutish and short, it is for a minority that is getting smaller every year.

Proof of Progress

There's a graph I find fascinating which demonstrates this. It looks at the relationship between wealth and health, starting 200 years ago. In the early 19th century, every country was pretty poor and pretty sick. There were fabulously wealthy people, but they didn't live very long. Most people were poor and they didn't live long at all. Only Britain and the Netherlands offered a happier picture, and only marginally so.

Slowly, thanks to innovation, the industrial and agricultural revolutions, and the spread of capitalism and democracy, the world started to get better. Disease (in particular the Spanish Flu Epidemic) and war pushed us back a few times, but after 1948 the world saw huge progress. The downside was the growth of inequality between the rich world and the rest. But in the 1970s Asia started to catch up, and over the last 15 years Africa has moved as well. In fact that progress has been so fast that the percentage of people living in extreme poverty has dropped by half since 1990.

But it has been in health where the results have been most striking.

In the last 15 years child mortality has been cut in half – and maternal mortality has also nearly halved. In Africa child death rates are dropping five times faster than they did in the 1990s – things are not only getting better, they are getting better faster and faster. At the same time, despite folk wisdom to the contrary, global population growth is slowing every year as women gain access to contraception and have fewer children as their wealth increases.

We've also made real progress in fighting disease. In the 20th century at least 300 million people died of smallpox. In 1979 the world eradicated it forever.

In 1986 there were 3.5 million cases of guinea worm, a horrific, debilitating, parasitic infection caused by a worm that grows inside its human victim before burrowing its way through the skin of its host. In 2015 there were 22 cases across the whole world.

In 1988 there were 350,000 cases of polio. There are few generations left in the UK who remember polio, few left who had it and survived, few who understand the terror it brought: the iron lungs, the tens of thousands of children struck down or paralysed. Thanks to development of a vaccine by Jonas Salk which helped end polio in the UK and the US, and thanks to a concerted global effort, we are on the brink of eradicating it forever. In 2015 there were only 98 cases worldwide.

That effort didn't only help to beat that disease. Thanks to the infrastructure built to beat polio in Nigeria, when Ebola struck, that country beat Ebola. In three months. On its own.

And when it comes to malaria, a disease that has crippled an entire continent, killing over 500,000 people in Africa every year and costing the continent US$12 billion a year in direct costs as well as reducing GDP growth by 1.3% annually, we've halved the death toll since the turn of the century. Investment in simple measures like insecticide-treated mosquito nets and preventative treatment for pregnant women has been so successful that we continue to shrink the map of areas afflicted by malaria. And with some exciting new tools to tackle the disease that are under development by British and international scientists, we believe it will be possible to achieve complete eradication within a generation.

What's behind these achievements?

There is no doubt that some of this progress is driven by the amazing growth that comes from exposure to capitalism. A great deal of that progress has been due to the ingenuity, generosity and skill of scientists and inventors, many of them British. And credit also goes to the expansion of free trade, improved tax collection and the removal of corrupt and ineffective leaders by African people themselves.

But progress like this happened not because the world just stood back and let the market get on with it.

These successes were not just the natural outcome of economic growth or a good idea. They occurred because we harnessed the creative power of capitalism, using deliberate, sped up, interventions, funded by international development and philanthropic capital, to work for the world's poorest people.

The market couldn't have provided a solution on its own for a problem like Ebola, polio, malaria, or guinea worm with little or no profitable solution. It took government support for R&D to jumpstart the creativity and commitment of the private sector to be entrepreneurial and take investment risks. It took government investments in universities and labs that led to the private sector building the businesses that can also deliver solutions, create jobs, and strengthen economies in the process.

Return on Investment

Once those initial hurdles were overcome investments like these have delivered market-beating returns on investment for the UK and the world.

If we look at the big picture we know for a fact that health improvements spur economic growth. The Lancet Commission on Investing in Health found that between 2000 and 2011, reductions in mortality due to health improvements accounted for at least 11% of the economic growth in the world's low- and middle-income countries.

As impressive as that number is we get even better results if we look at some of the specific project areas the British Government invests in.

Both the UK and the Gates Foundation are big backers of childhood vaccination, and of GAVI, the vaccine alliance. GAVI is a unique public-private partnership which pools investment from international partners – including the Department for International Development – and works with the pharmaceuticals industry to focus on developing and distributing vaccines. It played a key role in working to develop a vaccine to fight the Ebola outbreak in 2015 for example.

Since its establishment in 2000 GAVI has reached 500 million children and prevented more than 7 million deaths in the process.

And that's not the half of it.

To establish the economic impact that vaccination has The Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health recently examined the projected return on investment of vaccinations between 2011 and 2020 in 94 low- and middle-income countries in a first of its kind study. When looking only at the direct costs associated with illness, such as treatment and lost productivity, they found that the return on every pound spent on vaccines was £16. When they expanded their analysis to look at all the benefits associated with vaccines by looking at the broader economic impact of illness they found that the return was £44 for every £1 spent, a return on investment way better than what you might get on the stock market.

Another area that the UK and the Gates Foundation work on together is a group of diseases that were so comprehensively ignored that they are actually called "Neglected Tropical Diseases." Researchers from the

Erasmus University in Rotterdam looked at the return on investment when we focus on these diseases. They found that meeting current targets would return $565 billion (£430 billion) to the global economy from lost productivity between 2011 and 2030. The return on each pound invested in fighting NTDs is somewhere between £38 and £140.

Enabling women to gain access to modern contraception has equally impressive returns. When women can time and space their pregnancies it reduces their risk of complications and increases the likelihood they and their children will be healthy. When women space their births by at least three years, newborns are twice as likely to survive their first year. Delaying pregnancies among girls and young women not only reduces their health risks but also enables them to stay in school, advancing their education and providing a better future for their children and communities. It gives women the time and space to earn an income, helping to lift them and their families out of poverty. Family planning is transformative, for women, families, nations.

But you shouldn't just take our word for it. In a recent Copenhagen Consensus Centre study family planning was found to provide more than a £15 return for every pound spent. And investments in family planning have been shown to produce cost savings in other areas, like education, food, housing and sanitation. In Zambia this was found to be £4 for every pound spent, in Egypt it was as high as £31.

Finally, it's not only in human diseases where we are making progress. Thanks to joint investments by DFID and the Gates Foundation we are actively working to fight the scourge of diseases like bovine TB and wheat rust that affect farmers around the world, threaten global food security, and can lead to famine, instability, and conflict.

Not only do interventions in global health save lives, they also save the global economy billions of pounds.

Open for business

These returns aren't just good for people overseas; they benefit us as well as they help spur science, innovation and businesses here in the UK. Great British companies like GSK, which employees 16,000 people on 18 sites

across the UK, are an integral part of the international development ecosystem due to the drugs they produce for people in the developing world, drugs that are often paid for through the international aid system.

But it isn't just big companies that benefit. Let's look at two other examples. Vaccines need to be kept cold at all times and for years doctors and vaccinators struggled with how to get vaccines into remote, hard-to-reach locations around the world when battery power didn't last long enough. Ian Tansley and a small company from Wales came up with a solution. SureChill is a unique freezer that freezes water and then uses the melting ice to keep its contents at 4°C – the perfect temperature for vaccine storage – without the need for a constant power source or access to the grid. As simple as it sounds, this is now one of the most important innovations saving children's lives around the world.

Another great example of British ingenuity helping to save lives is a device called a Microlife Vital Signs Alert or VSA. This simple gadget is the world's first medical device to detect shock and high blood pressure in pregnant women and could cut maternal deaths in developing countries by up to 25%, saving more than 70,000 lives a year.

Keeping us safe through the 2.7% commitment

These investments are also vital to keeping us safe. Diseases like Ebola and Zika and health emergencies like anti-microbial resistance threaten all of us. There is a significant chance that a substantially more infectious epidemic than Ebola or Zika will come along over the next 20 years. To keep ourselves safe from the spread of these problems we need to combat them when and where they emerge. We can't build a wall to hold back the next Spanish Influenza epidemic. We need to help build the surveillance and response systems to detect it. We need to be able to quickly develop a test for it and start to produce a cure. And we need basic health infrastructure to be available so that when a poor country is hit by an epidemic it can be dealt with fast and at source before its starts to spread.

All of this means that investing in global health isn't just a nice-to-have. It doesn't just make moral and financial sense. It's also firmly in the national interest and vital for the future safety and security of all of us.

The 0.7% commitment to overseas development aid stands proudly alongside the 2% commitment to national defence as the two sides of the kind of power that will keep Britain safe in the 21st century. The 2.7% commitment is the combination of soft and hard power; of prevention and response to threats here and abroad; and of meeting what we know now and insuring ourselves against the unknown. With all the rest of government spending going to domestic concerns, it's that 2.7% that will underpin the Global Britain of tomorrow.

Global Britain, Global Health

At the Gates Foundation we have an almost obsessive focus on results and measurement, and our founder insists that we account for every cent we spend. We see, in the UK, a partner that is just as committed to making every penny count. It's because of that that we are proud to partner with the Department for International Development to immunise children; fight malaria, HIV, and TB; ensure women have access to contraception; and develop the drugs and treatments of the future. Britain can, and should, be proud of the role it is playing in making the world a healthier, safer place. ♦

4. Defending prosperity and the environment (at the same time)

Ben Caldecott and Sam Barker

In 2013 Liam Fox (now international trade secretary) published *Rising Tides: facing the challenges of a new era*. 'Rising tides' refers not to oceans primarily, but to Act IV of Shakespeare's Julius Caesar:

'There is a tide in the affairs of men.
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows and in miseries.

Dr Fox's *tour d'horizon* displays an acute awareness of the environmental challenges the world faces. It explores water politics: half the world's population, divided largely between India and China, is served by water flowing off the Tibetan plateau. It shows that resource constraints and conflict overseas have global repercussions in a globalised world. Most importantly, it adopts the correct stance towards these challenges: a moral responsibility to act, and an opportunity for 'fortune'.

Growing global demand could require 50% more food,[1] 30-60% more energy,[2] and 55% more water[3] by 2050. Biodiversity around the world is crashing. This risks livelihoods and a rich pharmacological seam. The world is urbanising fast: more than half the global population now lives in towns or cities, many of which are inefficient, gridlocked, polluted and unhealthy. Solutions to one problem exacerbate others: clearing forests to grow food or find fuel can adversely impact habitats and carbon sequestration.

Without global progress, the impacts of climate change will make it incredibly challenging to secure long-term economic sustainability.

The literature on this is well-established, large, and growing.[4] Not least, key UK and global trade partners are likely to be seriously impacted; the US, China, India and Australia all rank highly in terms of exposure to climate risk.

Those in poverty tend to be most vulnerable to environmental hazards.[5] They can lack the resources to ride out shocks like failed harvests or natural disasters. They lack the finance to deal with rises in costs of food, fuel and raw materials. As the global middle class expands from one to three billion in the coming decade, demand for raw materials will peak. Without new business models that drive efficiency, increased demand can only drive increased prices.[6]

That extreme poverty persists is morally reprehensible. Conservatives such as Shaftesbury and Disraeli spearheaded the war on destitution in the UK. It is right that Conservatives continue to lead an active global assault on poverty today. As the UK begins to forge new relationships with the world, it is pre-eminently placed to help the world meet the environmental challenges of the coming century.

Prosperity is key to sustainability and to tackling poverty

Margaret Thatcher told the Royal Society in 1990 *"We must enable all our economies to grow and develop because without growth you cannot generate the wealth required to pay for the protection of the environment."* In other words, wealth can be created in pursuit of a better environment. In the nineteenth century the Lever brothers worked to get affordable soap into the hands of the poorest. In the twenty-first century, Unilever's purpose is 'to make sustainable living commonplace'. The approach is contributing to business success: in 2015 'Sustainable Living' brands delivered nearly half the company's growth and grew significantly (30%) faster than the rest of the business, and faster than in 2014.

Almost every environmental challenge the world faces can also be an opportunity for entrepreneurship and investment. The market has often led where political negotiations have lagged. Even after the collapse of the 2009 Copenhagen climate talks, clean energy investment exploded (US$1,462 billion between 2010 and 2015)[7] and the price of renewables

fell dramatically (59% for solar photovoltaics over the same period).[8] The world is now adding more capacity in renewable power each year than coal, natural gas, and oil combined.[9] Clean technologies will continue to transform markets and disrupt traditional business models remarkably quickly.

The disruptive power of entrepreneurial business

The UK should do all in its power to accelerate the disruptive power of entrepreneurial business for poverty eradication and environmental action. NGOs like Save the Children are working on this with corporate partners, as is DFID. Under Grant Shapps and Nick Hurd 'Energy Africa' has begun to change lives amongst 621 million Africans with no access to reliable, affordable energy. It uses fast declining cost curves in solar technology, and the rise of entrepreneurial pay-as-you-go companies like d-light, M-KOPA solar and Off-Grid Electric to accelerate distribution (at the same time, DFID is working at the crucial national level, putting money into grid power).

Cities offer a similar opportunity. Better building makes for more efficient use of space and resources. Efficiency, for example in water use, means reduced costs, and reduced environmental impacts. Better urban environments will deliver dynamic urban economies, and raise the living standards of those in informal settlements. Such work creates and sustains jobs around the world. The UK has world-leading building regulation and world leading civil engineers. HMG should work to lend and export this expertise.

London is the 'green' financial capital of the world. This privileged position was achieved almost entirely by accident – sustaining and developing its valuable lead will require effort. An important contributor has been the active promotion of green and climate change-related policies by successive British and EU member state governments. Unlike many key competitors, London is in and around jurisdictions that has committed to international climate action. Not only does this create a plethora of green investment opportunities in a large and close hinterland that can be accessed by London-based professionals, but it also means that London has become a leading green policy hub and ideas machine. Green policy

ideas started by London's think tanks, NGOs, and academic institutions are quickly picked up by UK politicians, disseminated through London's international media hub and then promoted internationally. This nexus of green innovation is something Britain can be proud of.

A number of (particularly low- and middle-income) countries require international climate finance to reduce emissions and adapt to current and future climate change. There are also sources of emission reductions, such as preventing deforestation in tropical forest countries, which require financial flows into those countries that can be partly mediated via the international process. London is hugely important in leveraging this finance.

The global transition to more sustainable and low carbon energy systems is essentially a story of moving from operational expenditure (paying to burn oil, gas, and coal) to capital expenditure (paying for wind, solar, storage infrastructure which will then have low or zero marginal costs). This benefits capital and the providers and organisers of finance. London as a financial centre has much to gain from this shift, and the UK should work to retain this cutting edge.

The role of governance

British forms of law and government have influenced countries across the Commonwealth and beyond. Consequently, British legal and institutional responses to challenges can often be informative for such countries, and provide influential models.

The UK's Climate Change Act of 2008 has been described as a 'landmark piece of environmental legislation'.[10] The Act was a rare piece of cross-party consensus in Westminster and remains a model for market and science led, lowest cost decarbonisation, and has influenced legislation in Mexico, China, Denmark and Australia. The UK leads in other areas: for example at the forefront of Natural Capital Accounting. According to the LSE's *Global Climate Legislation Study* 75 countries have framework laws or policies to address climate mitigation.[11] Benefits will accrue to those jurisdictions making the legislative running, and the UK has a strong reputation for well-constructed laws. The UK should remain at the cut-

ting edge of environmental legislation, not least where it might be taking control of EU competences.

Using Climate Diplomacy

Given this lead in environmental business, finance, and legislation, it is unsurprising that climate and environment diplomacy has been an important thread in the UK Foreign & Commonwealth Office. Key speeches were made by William Hague in 2010[12] and by Philip Hammond at the American Enterprise Institute in 2015.[13] Both noted the interrelation of environmental action, prosperity and security. The FCO has sustained an important network of 'climate diplomats', giving complementary threads to the UK's trade-focussed diplomatic effort. Many of those emerging economies which Britain is keen to work with (and where poverty is an everyday reality for millions) are committed to 'green growth' pathways. China, Brazil, Ethiopia and Cambodia have all made explicit commitments.

The UK should continue to build on this work in its hard and soft diplomacy. It should continue to achieve what it can within the UN architecture, including driving ambition within the Paris Agreement. Another big win would be an ambitious hydrofluorocarbons amendment to the Montreal Protocol. Secured by Thatcher and Reagan, the Protocol is a model of effective, savvy and business friendly environmental legislation.

But much can be achieved outside the UN. For example, key countries can identify key sectors and then mobilise the right coalitions to reduce emissions from those sectors. Cement production, deforestation and coal-fired power generation are three such sectors – each incredibly important accounting for 5%,[14] 15%[15] and 20% [16] of global emissions respectively. The top-five countries account for 72% of total global cement production,[17] 47% of deforestation[18] and 77% of coal capacity [19].

Sector-specific agreements would complement the UN process, but could be separate from it. They would each involve the main countries responsible for emissions in a sector being brought into a negotiation process with each other and key countries to try to agree on timelines for closing down the least efficient power generation or industrial processes, or

stopping deforestation. Agreements would undoubtedly require developed countries to move more quickly than poorer ones and funds would need to be made available to support transitions.

The UK is already leading the world in phasing out coal power. By securing comparable commitments elsewhere, the UK can reduce emissions globally and create new diplomatic possibilities.

Putting our aid to work for the environment

The government should deploy its aid budget in rigorous, cost-effective, high-impact ways. Environmental sustainability is key to growth within least developed countries, and beyond them. For example, if Myanmar liquidates its vast forests (among the largest intact rainforests in the world) it damages its own future economic sustainability. It also impacts global efforts to tackle climate change and biodiversity loss.

The next few decades hold particular pressures. The global population is levelling off, via a boom in working-age and retired groups. The 'middle class' will expand, consuming more, and raising the expectations of living standards worldwide. Governments are expected to create environments for prosperity. Even the most committed Burkean can be tempted to rob future generations by, for example, destroying rainforest for agriculture or leaving pollutants for others to clean up.

There is a strong case for front-loading efforts to prevent irreversible and counter-productive decisions, such as the liquidation of virgin rainforest. DFID has become effective at measuring outcomes for many aid programmes: the number of vaccinations given, children schooled, or amount of food relief delivered to disaster zones. But, the benefits of work on climate change and environment are harder to quantify, and such programmes can languish. This need not be. Under Conservative leadership, the UK is at the cutting edge of 'natural capital accounting.' This should assist policy-makers to make the most cost-effective use of the environment, taking into account future generations. DFID should use this and other expertise to give environmental action parity with other forms of aid.

Furthermore, the Government should consider frontloading some of the 0.7% commitment into areas where it unquestionably makes sense to

act sooner rather than later. Vaccines, education, environment and climate adaptation might fit into this category. Forests would be a good area for such frontloaded expenditure: in terms of livelihoods, climate change, irreversibility (once cut down, they are very hard to restore) and biodiversity. The mechanism for doing this could be bonds issued on the back of future aid commitments, drawing down say 20-25% of the 15 years' budget.[20]

Environmental degradation is a major contributor to persistent poverty in the world. There are win-win solutions which create wealth in developing countries and have benefits in the UK and elsewhere. Free enterprise and the rule of law will foster those solutions, and are areas of UK expertise. The UK should adopt a whole-of-government approach to tackling the challenges, using FCO diplomacy, trade and industry, and prime ministerial leadership as well as development expertise and finance from DFID. In a new era for the UK, it should not shy away from these global challenges, but seek complementarities between what needs to be achieved domestically and across the world to end poverty. ♦

Notes

1 N. Alexandratos and J. Bruinsma, 'World Agriculture Towards 2030/50: The 2012 Revision', ESA Working Paper, No. 12-03, 2012, p. 7.; D. Hofstrand, 'Can we meet the world's growing demand for food?', AgMRC Renewable Energy & Climate Change Newsletter, February 2014

2 For example, The World Energy Council estimates that total primary energy supply (equal to consumption) will increase globally from 546 EJ (152 PWh) in 2010 to 879 EJ (144 PWh) in their Jazz scenario and 696 EJ (193 PWh) in their Symphony scenario in 2050. https://www.worldenergy.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/World-Energy-Scenarios_Composing-energy-futures-to-2050_Full-report.pdf

3 For example see OECD via http://www.globalwaterforum.org/2012/05/21/water-outlook-to-2050-the-oecd-calls-for-early-and-strategic-action/

4 See climate change impact reviews conducted by the Met Office, Royal Society, Lloyds of London, Munich Re, Ministry of Defence, US Department of Defense, and Chatham House, among many others, to see how climate change could impact the UK and other countries

5 For example, UNFCCC AR5 found " People who are socially, economically, culturally, politically, institutionally, or otherwise marginalised are especially vulnerable to climate change and also to some adaptation and mitigation responses (medium evidence, high agreement)." http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar5/wg2/ar5_wgII_spm_en.pdf. The Human Cost of Natural Disasters from CRED found "levels of economic development, rather than exposure to hazards per se, are major determinants of mortality" in disasters. http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/PAND_report.pdf

6 For further discussion of this see Mckinsey's Resource Revolution work www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/sustainability-and-resource-productivity/our-insights/resource-revolution

7 Bloomberg New Energy Finance, "Global trends in clean energy investment", http://about.bnef.com/content/uploads/sites/4/2015/04/BNEF_clean_energy_factpack_q1_2015.pdf (2015).

8 Michael Liebreich, "Bloomberg New Energy finance summit", http://about.bnef.com/content/uploads/sites/4/2015/04/BNEF_2014-04-08-ML-Summit-Keynote_Final.pdf (2015)

9 Bloomberg Business, "Fossil fuels just lost the race against renewables", http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-04-14/fossil-fuels-just-lost-the-race-against-renewables (2015)

10 See http://www.wwf.org.uk/what_we_do/tackling_climate_change/how_we_re_tackling_climate_change/our_climate_work_in_the_uk/climate_change_bill_successes/

11 See http://www.lse.ac.uk/GranthamInstitute/legislation/2015-global-climate-legislation-study-at-a-glance/

12 See https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/an-effective-response-to-climate-change-underpins-our-security-and-prosperity

13 See http://www.aei.org/events/energy-and-climate-policy-remarks-from-the-right-honorable-philip-hammond-mp-uk-foreign-secretary/

14 Columbia Climate Center, "Emissions from the cement industry", http://blogs.ei.columbia.edu/2012/05/09/emissions-from-the-cement-industry/ (2012)

15 World Wildlife Fund, "Deforestation", http://wwf.panda.org/about_our_earth/deforestation/

16 Derived from: Allianz, "15 sources of greenhouse gases", http://knowledge.allianz.com/environment/climate_change/?651/fifteen-sources-of-greenhouse-gases-gallery; Coal Industry Advisory Board, Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions: the potential of coal (Paris: IEA/OECD, 2005), 12

17 U.S. Geological Survey, "Mineral Commodity Summaries", http://minerals.usgs.gov/minerals/pubs/mcs/2015/mcs2015.pdf (2015)

18 Derived from: Maps of World, "Top ten countries with highest deforestation", http://www.mapsofworld.com/world-top-ten/countries-with-highest-deforestation-map.html (2015); FAO Facts and Figures, "Deforestation and net forest area change", http://www.fao.org/forestry/30515/en/(2010)

19 Smith School of Enterprise and the Environment, Stranded Assets Database, (University of Oxford, 2015)

20 See here for more detailed proposals: The Prince's Rainforests Project, "An emergency package for tropical forests", http://princes.3cdn.net/f29d276ce664b2db67_y6m6vtxpe.pdf (2009)

5. The role the UK can play in Africa's economic development

Rt Hon Baroness Chalker

Having had the chance to spend a considerable part of my life working with Africans from all parts of the continent, I remain convinced that there continues to be a critical role for Britain in Africa in business and development assistance in the decade ahead. Few who have direct experience of the positive changes these bring will deny this. This is the good news which is rarely shared amongst the wider British population.

So much has changed for the better since I first saw Lagos in 1966, but in every African country, there remain huge areas of need. Far too many of the economic and educational improvements are restricted to major conurbations and to those with more advantages.

Sharing out the benefits of financial growth fairly will always be a tough debate in Britain as it is in many African nations. But even without advanced systems of redistribution, taxation in all its forms, far more can be achieved by sharing knowledge and community advancement than is currently the case. So it is not just about investing money in the developing world, it is also about investing time, knowledge and care in ways that best support long term positive change. It was from this position that many have developed strong corporate social programmes for businesses. This has now rightfully expanded to include sound programmes of environmental improvement, but there is still a huge gap between the theory in some Boardrooms and the practice in local communities, on whose production those businesses rely.

Good governance at the heart of achieving value for money

In the eyes of a broad swathe of journalists, and so their readers, international development is not seen to have succeeded, particularly in Africa. It is often claimed that large amounts of donor money is wasted or stolen, and business is nearly always 'considered to be corrupt'. After over 30 years working with business and many governments across the African continent, I find this claim greatly exaggerated. It is so often a very false picture of the many Africans trying through enterprise and effort to improve their businesses and to do so for family and country. The rogues exist, of course they do, as everywhere, even in the UK, but as more and more African leaders are convinced of the need to fight corruption, to improve both commercial and political governance, the use of investment and training assistance is producing better value for money and steadily improved management of resources.

My main work focus continues to be sound business practice. Thus I emphasise that support to the African Corporate Governance Network, local Transparency Initiatives, the training of corporate secretaries, lawyers and accountants still needs real support from the donor community.

Persuading trained Africans working in the US, Europe or elsewhere to return to their home countries can only become a reality if the standards of business and working practices in Africa can begin to rise. Encouraging Governments to respond by improving standards in every aspect of public life, and by creating and maintaining commercial regulations in tune with good modern practices is vital for any economy, but nowhere is it more important than for those struggling to work their way out of poverty. There is a broad spectrum of services including health and education, for which development programmes could multiply their impact through supporting good governance of a country's own resources.

The Investment Climate Facility and the impact of well-targeted technical support

But I want to turn to what can be done with Governments to improve their operation at home in Africa in order to stimulate greater business activity. Born out of the Africa Commission at the G8 Gleneagles summit in 2005, a public private partnership was born named the Investment Climate Facility for Africa. That concept to give specialist training to African Governments in financial and management partnerships, appealed to no less than 21 African partner Governments. They invested with the ICF public-private partnership to improve conditions of a wide variety of practices in 36 countries. I have been a Trustee since the beginning and am sad to say that this is now to end, but its contribution over the years is a lasting one, of which the original investors, our own Department for International Development and its partner donors from Holland, Germany, the Irish Republic, Norway, the African Development Bank and the International Finance Corporation, can rightly be proud. In addition to the 21 countries assisted, 3 African regional bodies, COMESA, the EAC and OHADA have benefitted. These deeply committed countries were joined by private sector donations from Anglo American, Celtel, Coca-Cola, SAB Miller, Sasol, the Shell Foundation, Standard Bank and Unilever.

The ICF was unique in that with a team of just 21 employees at our maximum, we brought business practices to operations in Africa, where Governments needed to change practices, modernise systems and upgrade services to business and in collaboration with other Government departments and regional trade bodies. We only carried out projects where the Government benefitting also contributed in cash, and sometimes in kind too, to the costs of the project. It was the African Government buy-in that ensured that ICF gave them real value and ownership of their work. This in turn has given the recipient Governments lasting value from sharing improvements of operation to their businesses.

In all we have worked on 73 projects, 9 for commercial courts, 6 for online tax systems, 5 for Single Window operations for trade, 5 for Business

Registries, 4 for Arbitration Courts, 3 for Construction Permit systems, 3 for On-line Land registries and 1 E-trading platform to improve the efficiency of commodities trading activities. In sum, over 11,000 people were trained and helped to build the capacity of African governments, public institutions, the private sector and citizens in a variety of areas. This is a good summary of how many business consultancies have worked with ICF to improve development in many essential but slightly boring business areas, previously held up by inefficient government processes.

Spreading business knowledge as a development tool was first seen to be clearly effective when in the 1990's the United Kingdom began a major sharing of know-how in the former Eastern Europe and Soviet Republics through the programmes of the British Know How Fund. The ICF has worked on similar lines, but with greater engagement of the recipient countries, for we had learned the great value of committed participation, not only of those involved in the training itself, but also of those to whom they reported and the Ministers in the Governments for which they worked.

One of the most impressive statistics has been the reduction in time that resulted for businesses to register or complete a transaction that was necessary for them to operate more efficiently. We worked and had success in numerous difficult contexts, such as helping Liberia to totally reform its Business Registry, which has been of inestimable value to micro, small and medium enterprises. Similar reforms reduced business registration from 18 days to 3 in Burkino Faso. Even the more advanced Mauritius suffered a nightmare over its document storage, before the Registrar General's Department asked for ICF help with their 13 million pages of deeds dating back to 1804. These pages have now been digitised, so that electronic searches can now be done, and registration completed, within two hours, rather than more than 1 day. Cape Verde, tiny with only half a million inhabitants living across nine inhabited islands, also benefitted through a major reform of systems by electronic registration for its plethora of micro, small and medium enterprises. Construction permits in Rwanda used to take anything from 2 months to a year plus, but now

permits are usually issued in 7 days, provided the paperwork is up to date and within 21 days at the most. Local sourcing in six COMESA countries has stimulated local food production, and its parallel training has improved standards of hygiene and product quality in each of them.

Improvements were achieved in the operations of commercial courts in Rwanda, Sierra Leone and Tanzania, Alternative Dispute Resolution projects in Cote d'Ivoire, in Togo, in Lagos State (Nigeria), as well as Contract Enforcement and updated commercial justice practices in Tanzania. These successes plus law reviews in the 17 member states of OHADA (Organisation for the Harmonisation of Business Law in Africa) demonstrated ICF to be a more efficient dispute resolver than we ever believed possible in 2007. Modernising the Judiciary in Zambia and Stock Exchange Capacity Development in Tunisia, as well as the Ethiopian Commodity Exchange electronic development all seemed almost beyond our capacity in the early days, but as the strength of the team and advisors grew, more and more ideas gelled with our young energetic management. Trade facilitation improvements in Kenya, Sao Tome and Principe as well as in Senegal, plus import and export clearance procedures in Tanzania were truly valuable and Tax Authority reforms and Land Registration processes have surprised even the major audit committees who have reviewed this work.

Since President Mkapa of Tanzania and Niall FitzGerald, earlier Chairman of Unilever Ltd and NV, started the ICF on its path to reform administration of business in Africa after the 2005 Gleneagles G8 conference in Scotland, there have been changes in many of those involved. What I know with my hand on my heart, is that ICF has been one of the best projects of knowledge sharing with which I have ever been fortunate enough to be involved and that the new Prime Minister and her government could learn a lot from its example. ♦

savethechildren.org.uk
@SaveChildrenUK

Save the Children

Registered Charity England & Wales (213890)
Scotland (SC039570)