

# **NOREF Report**

## **– for internal use in the Norwegian MFA**

### **From Contributor to Partner? Norway's role in foreign policy research and implementation in the United States**

**Tove Bjørgaas**

#### **Introduction**

The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) is one of the largest foreign government financial contributors to foreign policy research in the United States. Since 2006, The MFA has supported financially some 45 U.S. think tanks and research institutions as well as a number of policy implementing non-governmental organisations.

MFA funds research and projects focusing on Norwegian foreign policy priorities such as peace and reconciliation, climate change and deforestation, non-proliferation and global health. In some cases Norwegian funding has clearly helped keep “forgotten issues” on the research agenda in the United States.

The contributing role of the MFA creates an important platform for Norway in the U.S. foreign policy research environment. However,

the Norwegian government and foreign policy environment could clearly reap greater benefits from its sizable financial contribution. The Norwegian MFA could become more strategic in the United States by funding fewer and more strategically important partners and by building stronger political cooperation with the institutions funded. Renewed funding should not be automatic, and all partnerships should be reevaluated.

Norwegian diplomats at home and abroad could also use the networks created by the cooperation in the U.S. more actively and to build stronger political cooperation with the think tanks and other partners. The Norwegian foreign policy research community should also be encouraged to strengthen its partnerships to leading institutions in the United States.

# Contents

<b>1. Executive summary</b> .....	3
The Current situation.....	3
What the MFA gains .....	3
Challenges .....	4
Recommendations: Norway’s great potential.....	5
<b>2. The project</b> .....	6
Background .....	6
Process .....	6
Challenges in limiting scope of project.....	6
<b>3. The U.S. foreign policy think tank and research environment.</b> .....	8
<b>4. Survey of Norwegian think tank cooperation</b> .....	11
Background .....	11
Survey of Norwegian partners.....	11
1. Partners with framework agreements .....	13
2. Partners with project funding.....	17
3. MFA Development aid recipients in the United States .....	24
4. MFA Prospective partners .....	26
<b>5. How the MFA can become a more strategic actor in the U.S. foreign policy environment</b> .....	28
What does the MFA want to achieve through funding U.S. foreign policy research?.....	28
How can MFA staff become better-coordinated grant makers? .....	30
How can the funding of U.S. partners produce qualitatively better results and synergies for the MFA? .....	31
How to proceed .....	32
<b>6. Concluding remarks and acknowledgements</b> .....	33
<b>Appendix 1: List of partners interviewed</b> .....	34
<b>Appendix 2: MFA contributions to U.S. based institutions 2006-2010</b> .....	35

# 1. Executive summary

## The current situation

### *Norway among largest international contributors to U.S. foreign policy research*

- The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) is one of the largest foreign government financial contributors to foreign policy research/implementation in the United States. Only Qatar and the UAE give more money than Norway to foreign policy research conducted by think tanks and research institutes, but Norway distributes funds to a wider range of grantees. Other European governments and Canada support many of the same institutions, but Norway seems again a broader and larger donor. However, aggregate numbers for all foreign think tank/ research support in the U.S. are difficult to produce.
- In 2011 Norway funded more than 40 U.S. think tanks and foreign policy research/ implementing institutions and paid out approximately 250 million NOK in such support. Of this amount, approximately 122 million NOK was contributions to research. The amount of awarded grants and number of partners have been increasing rapidly since 2006.
- The MFA funds U.S. research on a wide range of topics, the most significant being Peace and Reconciliation, Climate Issues/ REDD+, Disarmament and Non-Proliferation, Global Health, Corruption and illicit capital flows. Almost all funding comes from the Norwegian foreign aid budget, and is therefore awarded to research on DAC country-related issues.
- The size of the MFA's contributions gives Norway a significant positive stature in the think tank/foreign policy research environment in the United States.
- Norway is respected for its foreign policy priorities and for "punching above its weight". In this regard Norway has some amount of soft power in international and U.S. foreign policy environments.
- The MFA is seen as unbureaucratic and less cumbersome regarding reporting

requirements and paperwork than most other government donors in the United States.

## What the MFA gains

### *Access and aid in policy making*

Funding American think tanks provides the MFA and the Norwegian Embassy with important opportunities and access in the foreign policy environment in the United States:

- The embassy and the MFA use their partners in the United States in policy making, although this could be done more systematically and with greater output.
- MFA funding gives Norwegian cabinet members, parliamentarians and other officials access to foreign policy experts, especially in Washington, who might otherwise be difficult to access.
- Funding of think tanks does also, in some instances, provide better access to Congress and the administration in Washington. In the U.S. capital there seems to be a clear link between the size of financial contributions and the level of access a contributor can achieve. The MFA's large contribution to the Brookings Institution helps create important access for Norway.
- Each section of the MFA awarding research contributions seems to benefit from its partnerships in the United States. Many relationships with U.S. think tanks and research institutions have lasted for several years.

## Some influence on U.S. policy

In some cases, the MFA's contribution seems to assure the production of policy-advocating research. MFA staff and think tanks themselves convey that some research would not have been possible without Norwegian funding:

Some examples are:

- *The Center for International Cooperation*, Track 2 peace process study in Afghanistan.
- *United States Institute of Peace*, Peace dialogue in Afghanistan study, in partnership with PRIO.
- *The Brookings Institution's* managing global order project, which aims to produce alternative scenarios for how the U.S. administration should view the world and approach emerging powers.
- *Global Financial Integrity (GFI)*, illicit capital

flows project, which includes joint Norwegian/GFI follow-up towards states that may benefit from a strengthening of their systems of financial integrity.

- *Center for International and Strategic Studies (CSIS)* work on high north issues, in partnership with IFS in Norway.

### ***Influence on global policy***

In some areas the MFA's contribution to research in the United States could have global policy impact. The global agenda-setting role of U.S. think tanks enables Norway to use them as partners in promoting certain global policies and priorities Norway would not be able to bring forward as effectively on its own:

- The MFA is the world's main funder of the global REDD+ agenda, and channels some funding through United States NGOs/think tanks that work to promote this agenda (Rights and Resources Initiative, World Resources Institute, Clinton Climate Initiative). These institutions all claim that there would have been little progress in promoting the REDD+ agenda without the MFA.
- The Norwegian contribution to global disarmament/non-proliferation research has helped advance this research and the non-proliferation regime through the last decade. Support of the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists* and CISAC (Stanford University) and CNAS (Monterey Institute of International Studies) are examples.
- Think tanks working with the UN in New York, such as the *Conflict Prevention and Peace Forum (CPPF)*, stress that the MFA's funding of certain ad hoc projects makes it possible to influence the UN's processes in ways that would otherwise not have been possible.

### **Challenges**

- Norway has gradually become a more important force in U.S. foreign policy research than the MFA seem to be aware.
- At this point better coordination and follow-up mechanisms could give the MFA and Norway much more in return for its contributions.
- The MFA should assess whether it is funding research in too many different areas. In the last five years many U.S. partners have been

added, but few have been dropped.

- The MFA should assess whether it should shift its funding away from past priorities, (such as disarmament/non-proliferation) and towards current priorities (such as emerging global powers role in peace/reconciliation, climate issues, international economic instability). An assessment of the priorities in the U.S., and the priorities of the philanthropic institutions funding U.S. research world, could help the MFA to reorient its funding.

### ***Pressing need for better coordination/overview***

- A comprehensive list of all MFA funding to U.S. think tanks did not exist prior to this study.
- Funding to U.S. institutions comes from several different sections of the MFA, and they are at times not aware of each other.
- There seems to be considerable overlap: some U.S. institutions receive funding from different sections of the MFA and NORAD for research in different fields. The Brookings Institution, one of the MFA's largest U.S. partners, is one example. Several others grantees receive funds from both NORAD and the MFA.

### ***Need for better information-sharing and follow-up***

- The continuous staff rotation at the MFA calls for an easy-to-transfer system of information sharing and follow-up regarding U.S. partnerships.
- An easy to maintain web-based system of partnerships/partnership agreements, important contacts, application materials and checklists for follow-up and reporting should be created.
- The MFA and the Embassy should dedicate more resources to partnering in developing and promoting policies in areas that are central to Norwegian foreign policy priorities. Norwegian diplomats have a unique network at hand in the think tanks and other U.S. partners. This network is only partly explored by a handful of civil servants. The MFA should encourage its employees to become more active policy partners and set up venues that

- can stimulate networking and interaction.
- A strengthened role for the embassy in Washington in recommending, implementing and following up partnerships is important. This requires allocation/reallocation of resources.

## **Recommendations: Norway's great potential**

The Norwegian MFA could become more strategic, gain more influence and enjoy greater benefits from its funding of U.S. think tanks by:

**Funding fewer and more strategically important partners.** Renewed funding should not be automatic, and all partnerships should be thoroughly evaluated. Double funding should be avoided. (Since the establishment of NOREF by the MFA in 2009, coordination is needed between the two to avoid double funding as well.) The embassy should advise in suggesting new, key partners.

**Building stronger political cooperation with U.S. institutions.** Norwegian diplomats at home and abroad should also use the networks created by the cooperation in the U.S. more actively and to build stronger political cooperation with the think tanks and other partners. Resources should be set aside by the MFA for this purpose, and some clear aims should be set for the each MFA/U.S. partnership. Questions to ask could be: What political output does the MFA want the partnership to produce? What activities should the partnership produce?

Encouraging partnerships/joint projects between Norwegian foreign policy research institutions and key think tanks in the United States. Norwegian institutions could be a partner in more agreements between the MFA and leading U.S. think tanks. Steps should be taken to promote joint U.S.–Norwegian research, and funding could be used as a tool.

**Partnering with excellent institutions outside Washington/New York** in areas of strategic importance for Norway and Norwegian policy towards the United States. Houston and Minneapolis are two cities of such strategic importance. Research partnerships here should be promoted.

**Partnering with institutions of great importance to Norwegian foreign policy that do not receive support today.** Global energy policy and global financial challenges are such topics, and the Baker Institute of Public Policy at Rice University in Houston and the Peterson Institute of International Economics in Washington, DC, are examples of institutions that could be key partners for Norway and the MFA.

**Keeping track of the new global order.** In the new international architecture Norway is establishing new relations and partnerships with emerging powers as Brazil, India and Turkey. Eventual partnerships with U.S. think tanks could be important for exploring the future relationships between emerging powers (China, India, Turkey, Brazil), Europe (Norway) and the U.S.

## 2. The project

### Background

NOREF commissioned the project in April 2011. The aims were to, in cooperation with the Royal Norwegian Embassy in Washington, advise the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) of policy-related research of relevance for Norwegian foreign policy and suggest a direction of future support to existing and potential think tank partners in the United States. The tender stated these specific objectives:

- **develop** closer and more operational ties between the Norwegian foreign policy environment and foreign policy oriented think tanks in the United States;
- **seek** to make Norwegian policies and viewpoints within the field of peace building better known in key research and policy environments, and identify common interests;
- **strengthen** the knowledge of Norway as a key player in global processes such as REDD+, Health, Women, Peace and Security, as well as humanitarian disarmament and peace processes;
- **solidify** U.S. interest in Norway as a partner on these issues.

### Process

The project has been divided into three major tasks.

**TASK 1: Compile** a list of ongoing support from the Norwegian government to U.S. think tanks and policy research institutions in cooperation with the Embassy and the MFA.

**This task has involved:**

1. Gathering data from NORAD's statistical team, the MFA and the Embassy. No comprehensive list of such data existed previously, and the attached list (Appendix 1) is a product of database searches and manual data sifting in the PTA database and Agresso systems at the MFA. It is not possible to search for the U.S. specifically in the U.S. database.
2. Interviewing embassy staff, MFA staff, NORAD staff and think tank staff to collect additional data. Quality control of information and search on numbers.

**TASK 2: Map** the think tank environment in the key academic areas of the U.S. (such as the East and West Coast, Massachusetts), and seek out possible new strategic partners for Norwegian cooperation.

**This task has involved:**

1. Exploring existing MFA/U.S. partnerships and networking with partners to discuss how their relationships to the Norway could be strengthened. Throughout this process I have met with some 35 existing partners (list of meetings in Appendix 2).
2. Mapping out the entire foreign policy research environment in the United States to identify new possible partners that may be strategically important to the MFA. Expert advice has been sought from Ambassador Wegger Strømme and DCM Johan Vibe as well as from Norwegian consuls around the United States and U.S. experts on policy think tanks.
3. Exploring partnerships and links between Norwegian foreign policy research institutions and American think tanks/research institutions. In this process advice has been sought from key research directors in Norway such as Director Kristian Harpviken of PRIO and Director Ulf Sverdrup of NUPI.

**Task 3: Consult** with U.S. philanthropic institutions that work on U.S. foreign policy to learn from their expertise and methods and explore current and potential joint funding with Norway.

**This task has involved:**

1. Meeting with experts linked to the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Endowment.
2. Seeking information about other foreign-country funding of U.S. think tanks and research institutions.

### Challenges in limiting scope of project

It has been a challenging task to limit the scope of the project in the most reasonable way.

The key issue has been defining which U.S. partners of the MFA can be considered think

tanks/research institutions. The MFA supports many organisations that work on implementing policy in ways that might not necessarily be described as research. In the United States the MFA partnerships seem to have been established (1) to support research, (2) to support policy implementation and (3) to create access for Norway to important stakeholders. To be able to paint a full picture of the MFA's non-governmental partnerships in the U.S., the scope of this study has been broadened.

In Appendix 1, a spreadsheet listing all cooperation between the MFA/NORAD and U.S. institutions, I have included all U.S. partners found in the NORAD PTA database.

In the spreadsheet's Sheet 2, I have narrowed the selection to partners involved in research.

The list of funded partners has been compiled by manually going through funding information provided by the NORAD statistical team. It is not possible to search for U.S. partners in this database. Thus, manually going through some 4,000 partners of the MFA worldwide was necessary to identify U.S. partners.

The MFA funds a limited number of NGOs and development assistance providers in the United States. Some of these also do research, and it has been difficult to choose which partners to include in this study. Examples are the National Democratic Institute (receiving support for work in Haiti as well as several African countries)

and the Carter Center (receiving support for development work in Africa, but still in some respects considered a think tank in the United States).

I have chosen not to include these partners., but they have been separated into the research/non-research categories described above.

Many of the partners linked to the United Nations environment in New York might not be seen as important think tanks in the U.S. Some of these do, however, receive considerable funding from the MFA [especially the International Peace Institute (IPI) as well as CPPF and CIC], and they must be part of this study.

Making the distinction between what is foreign aid and what is research is more difficult when considering the fields of climate change and deforestation/REDD+. Some of the U.S. partners Norway supports classify themselves as research organisations (Brookings, German Marshall Fund), others as "do-tanks" or more practically oriented think tanks (World Resources Institute). Yet, others see themselves as research or lobbying facilitators (Rights and Resources Initiative, Clinton Climate Initiative). I have included all these partners in the study, though.

Appendix 1 gives a list of think tanks/research institutions receiving support. Appendix 2 presents a list of persons interviewed for this study.

### 3. The U.S. foreign policy think tank and research environment

A **think tank** or **policy institute** is an organisation, institute, corporation or group that conducts research and engages in advocacy in public policy. Many think tanks are non-profit organisations, which some countries such as the United States provide with tax-exempt status. While governments, interest groups or businesses fund many think tanks, some think tanks also derive income from consulting or research work related to their mandate. Today there are around 1,900 think tanks in the United States.

According to Richard Haas, president of the Council of Foreign Relations, think tanks affect American foreign policy-makers in five distinct ways: By generating original ideas and options for policy, by supplying a ready pool of experts for employment in government, by offering venues for high-level discussions, by educating U.S. citizens about the world, and by supplementing official efforts to mediate and resolve conflict.<sup>1</sup>

#### The evolution of the U.S. foreign policy think tank

The first U.S. organisation devoted solely to foreign affairs was the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, founded in 1910 to investigate the causes of war and promote the pacific settlement of disputes.

Soon after, President Woodrow Wilson discreetly assembled prominent scholars to explore options for the post-war peace. Known as “The Inquiry”, this group advised the U.S. delegation at the Paris Peace Conference and, in 1921, was joined by prominent New York bankers, lawyers and academics to form the Council on Foreign Relations. The first generation of think tanks helped build and maintain an informed domestic constituency for global engagement.

The first entity to be established as a private organisation devoted to analysing public policy issues was the Institute for Government Research, which was founded in 1916 and later became the Brookings Institution (1946). The Brookings Institution is today one of the U.S.’s most influential think tanks and the MFA’s most important partner in Washington and globally.

The RAND Corporation, initially established as an independent non-profit institution with Air Force funding in 1948, launched pioneering studies of systems analysis, game theory, and strategic bargaining that continue to shape the way we analyse defence policy and deterrence decades later.

Since the 1970s, a third wave of think tanks has emerged in the United States. These institutions focus as much on advocacy as on research, aiming to generate timely advice that can compete in a crowded marketplace of ideas and influence policy decisions. The prototype advocacy think tank is the conservative Heritage Foundation, established in 1973. The liberal Institute for Policy Studies plays a similar role. Both focus more on domestic than foreign policy, but work on both.

Other influential foreign policy think tanks in the United States have a more specific focus. Some, such as the Peterson Institute of International Economics, the Inter-American Dialogue or the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, focus on particular functional areas of foreign policy or regions. Others, such as the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) cover foreign policy in more totality.

A few think tanks, such as the Brookings Institution, have large endowments. Others, like RAND, receive most of their income from contract work, whether from the government or from private sector clients; and a few, such as the United States Institute of Peace (USIP), are maintained almost entirely by government funds. In some instances, think tanks double as activist non-governmental organizations. The International Crisis Group, for example, deploys a network of analysts in hot spots around the world to monitor volatile political situations, formulating original, independent recommendations to build global pressure for

<sup>1</sup> Haas, Richards, “Think Tanks and U.S. Foreign Policy: A Policymakers perspective”, In *The U.S. Foreign Policy Agenda*, vol 7, no 3.

their peaceful resolution. Yet again others such as the World Resources Institute, a major MFA/NORAD partner, work on both policy analysis and activities on the ground.

Many U.S. universities have started their own think tanks, which can operate more freely in the U.S. environment of policy research than heavier academic institutions.

Some prominent examples are the Belfer Center at Harvard University, the Center for International Cooperation (Norwegian MFA partner) at New York University, the Baker Institute of Public Policy at Rice University in Houston (in dialogue with MFA at time of writing) and the Earth Institute at Columbia University (run by Jeffrey Sachs and also a partner to the MFA).

Other universities have more traditional foreign policy research institutes to which Norway also contributes. Some examples are MFA partners in the non-proliferation research field: the Monterey Institute's Center for Non-Proliferation Studies and similarly CISAC at Stanford University.

## **The role of think tanks in U.S. foreign policy making**

There are many examples of how U.S. foreign policy think tanks have directly formulated American foreign policy. Presidential candidates are especially susceptible to such advice and often exchange ideas with policy experts and test them out on the campaign trail. It is like a national test-marketing strategy. The most celebrated case occurred after the 1980 election, when the Reagan administration adopted the Heritage Foundation's publication "Mandate for Change" as a blueprint for governing. A more recent instance was a 1992 report by IIE and the Carnegie Endowment proposing an "economic security council". The incoming Clinton administration implemented this proposal in creating a National Economic Council (a body that continues today). A more recent example, among many, is the Brookings scholar Bruce Riedel, who in the early days of the Obama administration helped the new president formulate an Afghanistan policy before again returning to his position at Brookings.

Today, think tanks play an important role both in providing research and recommendations to the U.S. administration and by supplying staff to key government positions. The revolving door between think tanks and the U.S. administration is notorious and helps solidify the close relationship, albeit claiming their independence, think tanks have with government. Many higher government officials are recruited from think tanks and many officials go back to work at places such as Brookings and CSIS after their stints in government end. This creates important informal networks as well.

## **The role of philanthropy**

Although it is not an aim of this report to analyse the sources of funding for U.S. think tanks, it is important to stress that philanthropy is a huge sector in the United States. There are more than 76,000 foundations in the U.S., and in 2010 they made grants amounting to \$45.7 billion (274 billion NOK). Several of the 25 largest and most influential foundations fund foreign policy/international development research. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundations (the largest in the U.S.), the Ford Foundation, the MacArthur Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation are some examples. U.S. philanthropy has a long tradition rooted in its culture, and has been decisive in the creation and maintenance of think tanks. To some extent it is impossible to conceive or understand the role of the think tank without taking into consideration the existence of the philanthropic sector, its huge resources and its trends and political orientations.

The world of private foundations in the United States is very different from and much more operational than that of foundations in Europe in general. In the Scandinavian countries in particular, the strong role of the state as a provider and guarantor of services has displaced the role that private foundations could play. Only in recent decades have some private initiatives started to emerge.

If Norway plans to continue funding think tanks in the U.S., the MFA should pay attention to the work of philanthropic institutions in funding foreign policy research and the evolution and trends that this sector is following. If Norway is

interested in having a strategic approach with regard to what sectors and research topics to fund and to whom to give funding, knowledge about the philanthropic sector is vital. At some point, funding coordination with some U.S. foundations could be in the strategic interest of the MFA and could present an opportunity for a potentially sophisticated interaction for Norway.

## Which think tanks are the most influential?

Several rankings are done every year on think tanks in the United States and the rest of the world. It is hard to make an objective ranking of which are the qualitatively best and most influential think tanks. An annual study by the University Of Pennsylvania, *The Global Go-To Think Tanks Report*, presents the following list of the most influential U.S. think tanks for 2011. This list is somewhat subjective as it is based on interviews and peer recommendation, but it is included here because it lists some of the most important think tanks in the US. The think tanks in bold receive support from the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs:

- 1. Brookings Institution**
2. Council on Foreign Relations (CFR)
- 3. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace**
- 4. Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS)**
5. RAND Corporation
6. Cato Institute
7. Heritage Foundation
- 8. Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars**
9. Peterson Institute for International Economics
10. American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (AEI)

- 11. Center for American Progress**
12. National Bureau of Economic Research
13. Pew Research Center
14. Hoover Institution
- 15. Atlantic Council of the United States**
- 16. United States Institute for Peace<sup>2</sup>**
17. Open Society Institute New York (OSI)
18. Human Rights Watch
- 19. Center for International Development, Harvard University**
- 20. Center for Global Development**
21. Urban Institute
22. Center for a New American Security
- 23. German Marshall Fund of the United States**
24. James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy, Rice University<sup>3</sup>
25. Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University
26. New America Foundation
- 27. Earth Institute, Columbia University**
- 28. World Resources Institute**
29. Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs
30. Hudson Institute
31. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities
- 32. International Food Policy Research Institute**
33. Foreign Policy Research Institute
34. Freedom House
35. Pew Center on Global Climate Change
36. Resources for the Future
37. Stimson Center, FNA Henry Stimson Center
- 38. Inter-American Dialogue**

<sup>2</sup> USIP cannot receive funding from foreign governments, but is supported by MFA through a partnership with PRIO.

<sup>3</sup> A process to encourage an partnership and an application for funding has been started with the MFA.

## 4. Survey of Norwegian think tank cooperation

### Background

Norway has for many years had close relations with several foreign policy research environments in the U.S., but the financial components of these relationships have grown considerably in the last five to six years.

If one includes funding given through the deforestation project of the MFA, the ministry's financial contributions to the U.S. research environment increased from 44 million NOK in 2006 to more than to 150 million NOK in 2010. In the following I will:

1. **provide an overview** of the partnerships Norway currently has with U.S. foreign policy think tanks and research institutions;
2. **suggest** a few strategic U.S. partners for future MFA collaboration.

### Survey of Norway's partners

Since 2006 Norway has supported some 45 U.S. think tanks/foreign policy research institutions in miscellaneous foreign policy areas.

An overview of partnerships with funding figures for 2006–2011 can be found in Appendix 1. Below is a survey of most partners Norway is/has been supporting in the United States.

Funding to institutions in the United States are drawn from a number of different budget lines at the MFA and NORAD. Some embassies also have funds that they award to partners in the U.S.

The MFA currently funds U.S. institutions either on a project-by-project basis or through broader partnership agreements.

The survey is organised as follows:

1. partners with broad, multi year framework agreements;
2. partners with project funding by topic;
3. some key U.S. development organisations/ groups receiving development aid from Norway;
4. suggested prospective partners that could be of strategic importance to the MFA.

There is no guarantee that this survey is exhaustive.

<b>Partners with framework agreements</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Research area supported</b>
1. The Brookings Institution	Washington	Peace and reconciliation, climate change, disarmament
2. Center for Global Development	Washington	Development policy, climate change
3. Center for International Cooperation	New York	Peace and reconciliation
4. International Peace Institute	New York	Peace and reconciliation, UN issues
5. Global Financial Integrity	Washington	Corruption
6. World Resources Institute	Washington	REDD+, climate change
7. Rights and Resources Initiative	Washington	REDD+
8. Feinstein International Center	Medford, Massachusetts	Humanitarian relief
9. Conflict Prevention and Peace Forum	New York	UN issues, peace and reconciliation
10. ICTJ, the International Center for Transitional Justice	New York	Human rights, democratisation
<b>Partners with project funding</b>		
11. Center for Strategic and International Studies	Washington	Peace and reconciliation
12. United States Institute of Peace	Washington	Peace and reconciliation
13. Independent Diplomat	New York	Peace and reconciliation
14. New America Foundation	Washington	Peace and reconciliation
15. Search for Common Ground	Washington	Peace and reconciliation
16. Center for Global Engagement	Santa Fe	Peace and reconciliation
17. Woodrow Wilson Center for Scholars	Washington	Peace and reconciliation
18. Interamerican Dialogue	Washington	Peace and reconciliation
19. Center for American Progress	Washington	Peace and reconciliation
20. Columbia University	New York	Global health, energy, peace and reconciliation
21. Harvard University	Cambridge, Massachusetts	Global health
22. Institute for Inclusive Security	Washington	Women, peace and security
23. Bulletin of Atomic Scientists	Chicago	Non-proliferation
24. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace	Washington	Non-proliferation
25. CISAC/Stanford University	Palo Alto	Non-proliferation
26. Global Security Institute	Pennsylvania	Non-proliferation
27. CNS/Monterey Institute	Monterey	Non-proliferation
28. Nuclear Threat Initiative	Washington	Non-proliferation
29. Avoided Deforestation Partners	Berkeley/Washington	REDD+
30. Center for Clear Air Policy	Washington	REDD+
31. Conservation International	Washington	REDD+
32. Forest Trends	Washington	REDD+
33. The Nature Conservancy	Washington	REDD+
34. The Woods Hole Research Center	Woods Hole, MA	REDD+
35. Rainforest Alliance	New York	REDD+
36. Global Witness	Washington	REDD+
37. Clinton Climate Initiative	New York	Climate change
38. German Marshall Fund of the United States	Washington	Climate change
39. The Atlantic Council	Washington	Peace and reconciliation
<b>Some important United States partners with MFA development aid funding</b>		
The Carter Center	Atlanta	Election monitoring, global health
National Democratic Institute	Washington	Democracy building
Clinton Health Access Initiative	New York	Global health
International Partnership for Microbicides	Washington	Global health
International Crisis Group	New York	Peace and reconciliation
Aspen Institute/Middle East Investment Initiative	Aspen, Colorado	Middle East economic development
<b>Suggested key prospective partners</b>		
1. Peterson Institute of International Economics	Washington	International finance/economic development
2. Humphrey Institute	Minneapolis	Human rights, misc
3. Baker Institute	Houston	Strategic energy, peace and reconciliation, Middle East
4. RAND Corporation	Los Angeles/Washington	Defence issues, security issues

# 1. Partners with framework agreements

## 1. *The Brookings Institution*

Washington, DC

**About:** The Brookings Institution is a non-profit public policy organisation based in Washington, DC. Its mission is to conduct high-quality, independent research and, based on that research, to provide innovative, practical recommendations that advance three broad goals: (1) strengthen American democracy, (2) foster the economic and social welfare, security and opportunity of all Americans and (3) secure a more open, safe, prosperous and cooperative international system.

**Description of agreement with MFA:** Broad framework agreement for three years 2009–2012. Renewal 2012.

Includes research on:

Managing global order (MGO): Project studying shifts in the balance of influence in the international system, with emerging powers playing a larger role. MGO engages in high-level dialogue around this topic and has successfully sponsored two dialogues in Abu Dhabi with high-level participation from India, Brazil, China and the United States, as well as middle-power representatives.

Middle East: Facilitating a dialogue and networking between experts from Brookings, Norway and the Middle East. The Israeli–Palestinian conflict, including advancing the stalled peace process, U.S. and European roles in peacemaking, policy options for Gaza.

Afghanistan and Pakistan: NATO's efforts in Afghanistan, tracking progress in these countries using economic, social, political, and security indicators, including surveys of well-being and other quality-of-life indicators. Counter-insurgency and counter-narcotics activities, prospects for normalisation of Pakistan–India relations.

Revolutions in the Arab World: Impact of unrest and reform on the transitioning states, effects on regional stability.

Iran: Iran's role in the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan. New diplomatic strategies for dealing with the challenges posed by Iran, particularly those focused on ensuring Iranian compliance with the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. The future of Iran's energy sector.

Iraq: Implications of a withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq. The role of the UN and the international community in Iraq.

Asia: Managing relations with China and India. Examining Asian regional security.

Transatlantic security: Examining the regional and international role of Turkey. Managing relations with Russia. Future of NATO and European security.

Latin America and the Caribbean: Managing relations with Latin America, with a focus on Brazil, Mexico and the Andean region. U.S. policy towards Cuba.

Energy security and climate change: Policies for greater energy efficiency. The Arctic North. The geopolitics of energy in South Asia.

The role of the developing world in climate change

Peace and reconciliation processes: Lessons learned from previous experience (e.g. Israel–Palestine). The role of Track II diplomacy. Building national, regional and multilateral capacities.

Human rights and humanitarian affairs: United Nations human rights system. Protection of civilians.

Humanitarian system reform: The role of military and other non-traditional actors.

**Funding:** Framework agreement 2009–2011: 3 million NOK per year. This amount was increased to 5.6 million NOK in 2011. New framework agreement to be renegotiated in 2012.

Brookings also receives separate funding for two other projects:

*Disarmament:*

1.6 million NOK for 2011/2012 for project focusing on India and Pakistan, a disarmament perspective.

*Climate change:*

The Brookings climate policy initiative receives support for scholar exchange and research through cooperation with CICEP (previously CICERO): 500,000 NOK in 2010. The Brookings–CICEP Scholar Exchange Program funds research visits of 3–12 months’ duration for Fellows at Brookings to one of the CICEP research partners in Oslo (CICERO, Dept. of Political Science and FNI), and for researchers from the CICEP research partners in Oslo to the Brookings Institution. All exchanges will be linked to work on specific projects.

**Funders:**

Peace and Reconciliation section of MFA (framework agreement).  
Disarmament and Non-proliferation section (disarmament program).  
CICEP UiO (not MFA) (climate project).

**2. Center for Global Development (CDG)**

Washington, DC

**About:** Established in 2001, the Center for Global Development works to reduce global poverty and inequality through rigorous research and active engagement with the policy community. An independent, non-partisan, and non-profit think tank, CGD combines world-class research with policy analysis and innovative communications to turn ideas into action. It produces an annual index of commitment to development.

**Description of agreement with MFA:** Aims to provide MFA and embassy with access to experts on U.S. development policy and on the development debate in Washington. Funding also used to support CDG’s following and influencing actors in U.S. international development policy field, strategic investing in global public goods, global health work, women and children’s health, natural resource management, exploring innovative ways to promote demand for sound income and

expenditure management. Technology transfer, mobile telephony remittance research in Kenya. Challenges of development in Pakistan.

**Funding:** Framework agreement 2010–2013, 6 million NOK (2 million per year).

**Funder:** Development Policy section, MFA.

**3. The Center for International Cooperation (CIC)**

New York

**About:** Based at New York University, the NYU Center for International Cooperation works to enhance multilateral responses to global problems, including conflict, humanitarian crises and recovery; international security challenges, including weapons proliferation and the changing balance of power; and resource scarcity and climate change. Staff members have provided direct policy support to a range of high-profile multilateral initiatives. CIC examines existing multilateral institutions, building especially on a strong relationship with key players in the United Nations Secretariat and Permanent Missions; in the World Bank; in regional organisations such as the European and African Unions and NATO; and in key governments, ranging from established powers such as the United States, and emerging economies such as Brazil and India, to fragile states themselves.

CIC also works in close contact with the Foreign Policy program at the Brookings Institution (where CIC Director dr. Bruce Jones is a Senior Fellow).

**Description of framework agreement with**

**MFA:** Agreement was established in 2007 and is based on annual submitted work plans and proposals. Funding varies year by year depending on proposals.

CIC publishes annual review of Global Peace Operations, which is an important reference document for the UN. This is supported through the framework agreement.

**Funding:** 5 million to 10 million NOK annually depending on proposals. 4.6 million NOK 2011/2012 as part of three-year agreement:

1. Peacekeeping and crisis management (2,723,763 NOK/\$490,000).
2. Peace and reconciliation (1,222,914 NOK/\$220,000).

3. Climate and scarcity  
(944,976 NOK/\$169,999,50).

**Funders:** UN section in cooperation with Peace and Reconciliation section.  
Embassy in Kabul to follow up Afghanistan funding.

#### 4. International Peace Institute (IPI)

International Peace Institute is an institute for policy-relevant research. Individuals from within and outside the United Nations who believed that a thoroughly independent institution could provide a unique contribution in the multilateral system founded it in 1970. IPI aims to contribute to preventing armed conflict within and between states, and works closely with the UN and regional organisations. It provides research, briefs and expertise as well as a venue for UN-related conferences and events.

##### Description of framework agreement with MFA:

The MFA has been a key contributor to IPI for a number of years. Since 2006 a framework agreement has been in place.

The agreement aims to:

- promote IPI and MFA's joint interest in development, nation building, peace and reconciliation;
- strengthen IPI and MFA's capacity to play an active role in the abovementioned fields with a focus on the UN.

Activities:

- Coping with conflict, crisis and change: The United Nations and Evolving Capacities for managing Global Crises (CWC) -
- Papers and research on underdevelopment, resource scarcity, and environmental degradation, transnational organised crime, weapons of mass destruction, global terrorism, small arms and light weapons, biosecurity, conflict prevention and the responsibility to protect, mediation and peace processes, peace operations, peacebuilding, strengthening the United Nations and its partners.
- Middle East programme: *Middle East Peace Process Compendium*; Middle East dialogue forum: *Moving forward in the ME*; *The Lebanese–Syrian–Iranian–Israeli Rectangle*

*of Conflict of the Iran Dilemma: New Approaches.*

- Seminars and conferences. IPI has received between 3 million and 5 million NOK annually in recent years to hold seminars and conference on its core topics of research.

##### Funding:

11 million NOK annually 2007–2009.  
8 million NOK annually 2010–2011.

**Funders:** UN section, Peace and Reconciliation section, Humanitarian Issues section.

#### 5. Global Financial Integrity

Washington, DC

**About:** Global Financial Integrity (GFI) is a think tank tied to the Center for International Policy in Washington, DC. GFI promotes national and multilateral policies, safeguards and agreements aimed at curtailing the cross-border flow of illegal money.

##### Description of agreement with MFA:

The aim of the project is to reduce the amount of illicit financial flows out of developing countries as a way to increase resources available for economic development.

The purpose of the project is, through federating, research, studies, campaigns etc., to influence public and political opinion globally about the effects of illicit financial flows on development; increase knowledge of the phenomenon; strengthen international cooperation in the area; improve communication and information sharing; advocate increased transparency; and promote increased technical assistance in developing countries.

**Funding:** three-year agreement 2009–2011.  
7 million NOK 2009.  
7 million NOK 2010.

**Funder:** NORAD, Civil Society Department.

#### 6. World Resources Institute

Washington, DC

**About:** The World Resources Institute (WRI) is a global environment and development think tank that works with governments, companies and civil society to build solutions to urgent sustainable development challenges. WRI does 80 per cent of its work in developing countries

and describes itself as a “do-tank”, a think tank focused on action. WRI publishes the annual *World Resources*, which surveys the state of the world’s resources and which is partly funded by Norway.

**Description of agreement with Norway:**

WRI receives support from both NORAD and the MFA.

Its current agreement with NORAD is titled: “Making REDD Work for People and the Planet: Improving the Governance of Forests”.

The Governance of Forests Initiative (GFI) aims to support and strengthen the institutions responsible for the management and restoration of forests particularly in the context of reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation or increasing sequestration (REDD+) in developing countries.

**Outcomes of the project:**

Strengthened research and analytical capacity of civil society organisations (CSOs) in Brazil, Indonesia, Cameroon and Guyana to diagnose gaps and identify needed improvements in forest governance in the context of REDD+ and other relevant national policies.

Strengthened advocacy and communications capacity of CSOs in these countries to raise awareness at the national and sub-national levels about the importance of improving governance for REDD+ and other relevant initiatives, and to engage credibly and constructively with their governments to design policies and measures that address governance-related drivers of deforestation and degradation.

New capacity and improved performance of CSOs to carry out independent monitoring of their governments’ efforts to implement REDD+ and to improve forest governance in a manner that promotes the broad participation and ownership of all stakeholders.

Governments and multilateral institutions involved in REDD+ design and implementation at the global, national and sub-national levels adopt emerging best practices and options for designing REDD+ policies and measures that

strengthen governance of forests in collaboration with civil society.

In 2009 and 2010 WRI also received funding from the MFA section for Environment and Sustainable Development to produce the report *World Resources* and for other climate and forest programmes.

**Funding:**

From NORAD: 15.3 million NOK 2010–2013. From MFA: 8.4 million NOK 2009; 1.7 million NOK 2010.

**Funders:** NORAD Civil Society Department and section for Climate, Global Health and Sustainable Development.

**7. Rights and Resources Initiative (RRI)**

Washington, DC

**About:** The Rights and Resources Initiative (RRI) is a global coalition of organisation working to encourage forest land tenure and policy reforms and the transformation of the forest economy so that business reflects local development agendas and supports local livelihoods. RRI works at the country, regional and global levels, collaborating on research, advocacy and convening strategic actors.

The RRI Coalition is formed by a group of core partners who work in areas of their regional and thematic expertise. Partners also engage with a wide group of collaborators who participate in and support RRI activities. Our 14 partners and 120-plus collaborator organisations are directly engaged in land and forest policy reforms in close to 20 countries throughout Africa, Asia and Latin America. Together, we are working to encourage greater global commitment and action on pro-poor tenure, policy and market reforms.

RRI works primarily in developing countries, but has its main office in Washington, DC. Much of its work is advocacy related, but, as it also conducts significant research on the REDD +/ deforestation agenda, it is included here.

**Description of agreement with NORAD/MFA:**

RRI has received core support for its operations from NORAD since 2007.

It has also received project funding from the MFA Deforestation project since 2009 for two projects: Supporting Effective Investments and Interventions in Climate Change Mitigation (2009) and Supporting Effective Investments and Interventions in Climate Change Mitigation in Forest Areas while Promoting Rights and Development (2010–2012).

**Funding:**

From the MFA deforestation project: 6.8 million NOK in 2009.

8.6 million NOK annually 2010–2012.

From NORAD: 5 million NOK in 2010.

15 million NOK in 2011/2012.

**Funders:** NORAD’s Civil Society Department and MFA deforestation project.

**8. Feinstein International Center (FSI)**

Medford, Massachusetts

**About:** The Feinstein International Center is based at the renowned Tufts University near Boston. Its research focuses on the politics and policy of aiding the vulnerable, on protection and rights in crisis situations, and on the restoration of lives and livelihoods. It feeds into both its teaching and its long-term partnerships with humanitarian and human rights agencies.

**Description of agreement with MFA:** FSI has received support from the MFA for a three-year project studying the relationship between aid and security. This major research project has focused on Afghanistan, where five provinces have been compared. Within the same agreement, FSI has received support from the MFA for an aid effectiveness study comparing Afghanistan and the Horn of Africa.

**Funding:** 9 million NOK 2009–2011.

**Funders:** Section for Humanitarian Affairs. Asia section.

**9. Conflict Prevention and Peace Forum (CPPF)**

New York

**About:** The Conflict Prevention and Peace Forum (CPPF) was created in October

2000 to help the United Nations strengthen its understanding of conflicts: their causes, dynamics and possible solutions. It aids the UN in producing country reports and expert meetings in the areas of peace negotiations, peace building and operational capacity. CPPF is an important resource for the UN as it knows its system well and is a small and flexible think tank, which can easily take on projects of urgency.

**Description of agreement with MFA:** Has had framework agreements with MFA since 2007.

These are broad agreements seeking to aid CPPF in a flexible way so that it can provide the UN system with the analysis needed on miscellaneous countries and conflicts.

**Funding:** 2 million NOK per year since 2007.

**Funder:** Peace and Reconciliation section.

**10. International Center for Transitional Justice**

New York

**About:** The International Center for Transitional Justice is an international non-profit organisation specializing in the field of transitional justice. ICTJ works to help societies in transition address legacies of massive human rights violations and build civic trust in state institutions as protectors of human rights. In the aftermath of mass atrocity and repression, the ICTJ assist institutions and civil society groups – the people who are driving and shaping change in their societies – in considering measures to provide truth, accountability and redress for past abuses.

**Funding:** 17.3 million NOK 2009.

13.8 million NOK 2010.

**Funder:** Section for Human Rights and Democracy.

**2. Partners with project funding**

The MFA and NORAD funds a number of partners in the United States on a project basis.

**11. Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS)**

Washington, DC

**About:** CSIS, established in 1962, provides strategic insights and policy solutions to decision

makers in government, international institutions, the private sector and civil society. CSIS conducts research and analysis and develops policy initiatives in defence and security, energy and climate change, global trends and economic development among other areas.

**Cooperation with MFA:** CSIS cooperates with MFA on a project-by-project basis. It is a leading U.S. research environment doing research on Arctic and high north issues.

It has received some funding from MFA in recent years. Most of its funding has come from the Norwegian Research Council and from the Ministry of Defence through CSIS cooperation agreement and scholar exchange with Norwegian IFS, but it has also received small amounts from the Peace and Reconciliation section at MFA.

CSIS is currently trying to raise funds for a Nordic Arctic Chair and for new research on the Russian Arctic.

**Funding:**

1 million NOK 2009.

300,000 NOK 2010.

**Funder:** Peace and Reconciliation section.

*REMARK: CSIS seems somewhat underfunded compared with other partners of the MFA in Washington when one takes into account the assistance it provides to the Embassy in Washington and the MFA.*

## 12. United States Institute of Peace (USIP)

Washington, DC

**About:** The United States Institute of Peace is the independent, non-partisan conflict management centre created by Congress to prevent and mitigate international conflict without resorting to violence. USIP works to save lives, increase the government's ability to deal with conflicts before they escalate, reduce government costs and enhance U.S. national security.

**Cooperation with MFA:** Being a federal U.S. institution, USIP cannot take contributions from foreign governments. The MFA has supported USIP's work through partnerships with NUPI (project on Iraq peace dialogue) and PRIO and CMI (Afghanistan peace dialogue).

PRIO has also worked with USIP on a project on Women, Peace and Security.

**Funding:** 3.6 million NOK 2010 (2.2 million NOK for Women, Peace and Security project).

**Funder:** Peace and Reconciliation section.

## 13. Independent Diplomat

New York

**About:** Independent Diplomat (ID), founded in 2004 by the former British diplomat Carne Ross, is an innovative venture in the world of international relations. Independent Diplomat's staff comprises experienced former diplomats, international lawyers and other experts in international relations. Independent Diplomat works with a broad network of individuals and organisations, including law firms, commercial consultancies and universities, which support and assist our work on a pro bono basis.

**Description of agreement with MFA:**

Independent Diplomat received its first support from Norway in 2011/2012. This is core support aimed at aiding the group in its many activities in conflict zones, from aiding Southern Sudan in its entry into the UN system to the reconciliation process in Sri Lanka. The MFA wishes to work with Independent Diplomat on other issues as well.

**Funding:** 2.6 million NOK 2012/2012

**Funder:** Peace and Reconciliation section.

## 14. New America Foundation

Washington, DC

**About:** The New America Foundation is a non-profit, nonpartisan public policy institute that invests in new thinkers and new ideas to address the next generation of challenges facing the United States. The Foundation emphasises work that is responsive to the changing conditions and problems of our twenty-first-century information-age economy – an era shaped by transforming innovation and wealth creation. MFA support for the New America Foundation is given through Flynt Leverett and Hillary Mann Leverett, former U.S. diplomats and members of the National Security Council.

**Agreement with MFA:** Support for project titled "Iran, the United States and Post Conflict Stabilization in Afghanistan". This focuses on the

regional dimensions of the Afghanistan conflict, especially Iran. The project aims at finding ways to get Iran to understand that a power-sharing agreement between groups in Afghanistan can take into consideration fundamental Iranian interests.

**Funding:** 580,000 NOK 2011

**Funder:** Peace and Reconciliation section.

## *15. Search for Common Ground*

Washington, DC

**About:** Founded in 1982, Search for Common Ground works to transform the way the world deals with conflict – away from adversarial approaches and towards collaborative problem solving. It works with local partners to find culturally appropriate means to strengthen societies' capacity to deal with conflicts constructively: to understand the differences and act on the commonalities. Using innovative tools and working at different levels of society, Search for Common Ground uses media production – radio, TV, film and print – mediation and facilitation, training, community organising, sports, theatre and music. It works in 26 countries. Search for Common Ground is more of an NGO than a think tank, but is included here because much of its work is classified as peace and reconciliation work.

**Agreement with the MFA:** Receives financial support from the MFA for a number of projects: a U.S.–Syria dialogue working group, a Western Sahara secretariat, a project in Nepal.

**Funding:**

1.7 million NOK 2010.

6 million NOK 2009.

**Funders:** Peace and Reconciliation section, Middle East section, embassies in Nepal and Angola.

## *16. Center for Global Engagement*

Santa Fe

**About:** Former governor and Secretary of Energy Bill Richardson is in the process of setting up this think tank in Santa Fe with some Norwegian project support for work on Cuba and North Korea.

**Agreement with MFA:** Received its first funding in 2011.

**Funder:** Peace and Reconciliation section.

## *17. Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars*

Washington

**About:** The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars was established as part of the Smithsonian Institution by an act of Congress in 1968. Named in honour of President Woodrow Wilson (the only President of the United States with a Ph.D.), its mission is to commemorate the ideals and concerns of Woodrow Wilson by providing a link between the world of ideas and the world of policy; and fostering research, study, discussion and collaboration among a full spectrum of individuals concerned with policy and scholarship in national and world affairs.

**Agreements with MFA:** The Center has received support for research on comparative peace processes in Latin America and for a leadership-training initiative in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

**Funding:** 3.5 million NOK 2010.

**Funder:** Peace and Reconciliation section.

## *18. Interamerican Dialogue*

Washington, DC

**About:** The Inter-American Dialogue is the leading U.S. centre for policy analysis, exchange and communication on issues in western hemisphere affairs. The Dialogue brings together public and private leaders from across the Americas to address hemispheric problems and opportunities.

Funding: 300,000 NOK in 2007 for social report card project.

**Funder:** Latin America section.

## *19. Center for American Progress*

Washington, DC

The Center for American Progress is one of Washington's leading think tanks for advocating domestic and international aspects of the Democratic Party's progressive political agenda. It was founded in 2003 by John Podesta to provide long-term leadership and support to the progressive movement.

**Agreement with MFA:** CAP receives support for its just jobs agenda and to provide an international network for discussing this agenda globally.

**Funding:**

900,000 NOK 2009.

400,000 NOK 2010.

**Funder:** Section for Global Initiatives and Gender Equality.

## 20. *Columbia University*

New York

**About:** Columbia University is an American private Ivy League research university located in New York City, New York, United States. Columbia is the oldest institution of higher learning in the state of New York, the fifth oldest in the United States, and one of the country's nine Colonial Colleges founded before the American Revolution. Today the university operates seven Columbia Global Centers overseas in Amman, Beijing, Istanbul, Paris, Mumbai, Santiago and Nairobi.

**Agreements with MFA:** Columbia has received/is receiving funding for projects in global health (Ministerial Working Group on scaling-up for health systems) and for studies on peace processes in Columbia and energy legislation.

**Funding:**

2.4 million NOK 2008

4 million NOK 2009

**Funders:**

Peace and Reconciliation section (Columbia research).

Section for Global Initiatives and Gender Equality (health research).

Embassy in Angola.

## 21. *Harvard University*

Cambridge, Massachusetts

**About:** Harvard University is an American private Ivy League research university located in Cambridge, Massachusetts, United States, established in 1636 by the Massachusetts legislature. Harvard is the oldest institution of higher learning in the United States.

**Agreements with MFA:** Brundtland Health Capacity Building Scholarship and other global health research.

**Funding:**

1.8 million NOK 2009

1.9 million NOK 2010.

## 22. *The Institute of Inclusive Security (Hunt Alternatives Fund)*

Washington, DC

**About:** The Institute of Inclusive Security organises the NGO Working Group (NGOWG) on Women, Peace and Security, which advocates for the equal and full participation of women in all efforts to create and maintain international peace and security. Formed in 2000 to call for a Security Council resolution on Women, Peace and Security, the NGOWG now focuses on implementation of SCR 1325 and all other Security Council resolutions that address this issue. The NGOWG serves as a bridge between women's human rights defenders working in conflict-affected situations and policy-makers at UN headquarters.

**Agreement with the MFA:** Support for project establishing the Women's Caucus of the Assembly of Sudan's Government of National Unity (the "Caucus") and the Coalition of Women Leaders (the "Coalition").

**Funding:** 3 million NOK 2010.

**Funder:** Section for peace and reconciliation.

## Disarmament/non-proliferation partners:

In 2005 Norway initiated the seven-country initiative, which aims to strengthen the international disarmament and non-proliferation regime. As an instrument in following up this initiative, the MFA in 2006 initiated partnerships with a number of international think tanks and research institutions. This initiative has been expanded since and has some 30 partners today, of which a significant number are based in the United States.

**Funder:** Disarmament section.

## 23. *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*

Chicago

**About:** The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists informs the public about threats to the survival and development of humanity from nuclear weapons, climate change and emerging

technologies in the life sciences. It was established in 1945 by scientists, engineers and other experts who had created the atomic bomb as part of the Manhattan Project.

**MFA support:** Has received support of develop publications and an international publication platform to strengthen the network and recruit new experts in developing countries within the fields of nuclear energy, disarmament and sustainable development.

**Funding:**

1 million NOK 2010.  
3 million NOK 2011.

## *24. The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*

Washington, DC

**About:** The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace is a private, non-profit organisation dedicated to advancing cooperation between nations and promoting active international engagement by the United States. Founded in 1910, it is one of the United States' first think tanks and its work is non-partisan and dedicated to achieving practical results.

**MFA support:** Has received support for establishing a network for:

- north–south disarmament dialogue between China, Brazil, Turkey and Pakistan;
- researching the consequences of a nuclear explosion in Asia;
- research and advocacy regarding challenges regarding nuclear energy and new threats of proliferation.

**Funding:**

2.6 million NOK 2008.  
2 million NOK 2009.  
1.2 million NOK 2010.  
800,000 NOK 2011.

## *25. Center for International Security and Cooperation CISAC*

Palo Alto, California

**About:** Based at Stanford University, CISAC is this top university's hub for research tackling some of the world's most pressing security and international cooperation problems.

**MFA support:** Has received funds for research on Pakistan's geopolitical situation among other issues.

**Funding:**

3.6 million NOK 2008.  
1.5 million NOK 2009.

## *26. Global Security Institute*

Pennsylvania (offices in New York and Washington)

**About:** The Global Security Institute (GSI) is dedicated to strengthening international cooperation and security based on the rule of law, with a particular focus on nuclear arms control, non-proliferation and disarmament. GSI was founded by Senator Alan Cranston, whose insight is that nuclear weapons are impractical, unacceptably risky and unworthy of civilisation.

**MFA support:** Has received support for maintaining the network Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and the Middle Power Initiative. Activities are especially focused on parliamentarians in developing countries.

**Funding:** 500,000 NOK 2011.

## *27. Monterey Institute of International Studies, Center for Non-Proliferation Studies*

Monterey, California

**About:** The Center for Non-Proliferation Studies (CNS) combats the spread of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) by training the next generation of non-proliferation specialists and disseminating timely information and analysis. Works globally. Strong networks in Russia.

**MFA support:** CNS has received funds for a number of projects since 2006, including:

- education, research and networking to strengthen the implementation of non-proliferation commitments in developing countries, strengthening the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), creating nuclear-free zones;
- training and engaging diplomats in Africa, the Middle East and south-east Asia, and creating think tanks in the field of disarmament.

CNS also does extensive work with Russia.

**Funding:**

2.8 million NOK 2008.  
2.8 million NOK 2009.  
0.5 million NOK 2010.  
1.2 million NOK in 2011.

## 28. Nuclear Threat initiative

Washington, DC

**About:** The Nuclear Threat Initiative (NTI) works to strengthen global security by reducing the risk of use and preventing the spread of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons and to work to build the trust, transparency and security that are preconditions to the ultimate fulfilment of the NPT's goals and ambitions. The think tank was founded by Ted Turner and Senator Sam Nunn.

**MFA support:** Developing regional leadership networks in Asia-Pacific, Latin America and the Middle East.

**Funding:**

1.3 million NOK in 2008.

3 million NOK 2011.

## REDD+/Climate Change Partners

In 2009, the Norwegian government started its international deforestation project to stop the deforestation in rainforests globally. A number of U.S.-based institutions has received research funding through this project.

## 29. Avoided Deforestation Partners

Berkeley, California/Washington, DC

**About:** Avoided Deforestation Partners brings together key voices in the tropical deforestation solutions discussion including NGOs, business leaders, governments, scientists and representatives of forest communities. It is a network organised under the think tank Center for International Policy. Its goal is to help advance both private and public initiatives that will effectively protect the world's remaining tropical forests and thereby significantly reduce carbon emissions.

**MFA cooperation:** Community Involvement and Benefit Sharing in REDD Program.

The goal of the project is development to advance local experience with, and global understanding of, successfully involving local and indigenous peoples in reducing greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries ("REDD") programmes. The goal is to be achieved by further investing in the design and integration of community involvement in three priority REDD demonstration projects in

Indonesia, Bolivia and Papua New Guinea.

**Funding:**

3.5 million NOK 2009.

1.6 million NOK 2011.

**Funder:** NORAD Civil Society department.

## 30. Center for Clean Air Policy

Washington, DC

**About:** CCAP is a think tank established in 1985. It helps policy-makers around the world develop, promote and implement innovative, market-based solutions to major climate, air-quality and energy problems that balance both environmental and economic interests.

**MFA cooperation:** Miscellaneous research and development projects on REDD in developing countries.

**Funding:** 4.9 million NOK 2010.

1.5 million NOK 2010.

**Funder:** NORAD Civil Society Department and MFA section for Environment and Sustainable Development.

## 31. Conservation International

Arlington, Virginia

**About:** Conservation International (CI) is a non-profit environmental organisation. Its mission is to protect nature, and its biodiversity, for the benefit of humanity.

CI is one of the largest conservation organisations headquartered in the United States. It has 900+ employees, more than 30 global offices and more than 1,000 partners around the world. Since its inception in 1987, CI has contributed to the protection of more than 260 million acres of land and sea, including places such as the Phoenix Islands Protected Area, the largest UNESCO World Heritage Site in the world.

From its origins as an NGO dedicated to protecting tropical biodiversity, CI has evolved into an international organisation with influence among governments, scientists, charitable foundations and business.

**MFA cooperation:** Climate and Forest Initiative, work in Guyana and Brazil.

**Funding:**

3.6 million NOK 2009.

9.2 million NOK 2010.

**Funder:** NORAD Civil Society Department and section for Environment and Sustainability.

### 32. Forest Trends

Washington, DC

**About:** Forest Trends is an international non-profit organisation that was created in 1999 by leaders from conservation organisations, forest products firms, research groups, multilateral development banks, private investment funds and philanthropic foundations. Forest Trends' mission is four-fold: to expand the value of forests to society; to promote sustainable forest management and conservation by creating and capturing market values for ecosystem services; to support innovative projects and companies that are developing these markets; and to enhance the livelihoods of local communities living in and around those forests.

**MFA cooperation:** Accelerating REDD readiness through the Katoomba Indicator.

**Funding:**

6.8 million NOK 2009.

1.8 million NOK 2010.

**Funder:** NORAD Civil Society Department.

### 33. The Nature Conservancy

Washington, DC

**About:** The Nature Conservancy is a U.S. charitable environmental organisation that works to preserve the lands and waters on which all life depends.

Founded in 1951, the Nature Conservancy works in more than 30 countries, including all 50 states of the U.S. The Conservancy has over 1 million members, and has protected more than 119 million acres of land and 5,000 miles of rivers worldwide. The Nature Conservancy also operates more than 100 marine conservation projects globally. The organisation's assets total \$5.64 billion as of 2009.

The Nature Conservancy is the Americas' third largest non-profit by assets, and its largest environmental non-profit by assets and by revenue.

**MFA cooperation:** Developing an effective international REDD mechanism.

**Funding:**

5 million NOK 2009.

3.9 million NOK 2010.

12 million NOK 2010–2013.

**Funder:** NORAD Civil Society Department.

### 34. Woods Hole Research Center

Woods Hole, Massachusetts

**About:** The Woods Hole Research Center (WHRC) is a private, non-profit research organisation focusing on environmental sciences. Its scientists combine analysis of satellite images of the Earth with field studies to measure, model and map changes in the world's ecosystems, from the thawing permafrost in the Arctic to the expanding agriculture regions of the tropics.

**Agreement with MFA:** The Forum on Readiness for REDD: Partnerships for Long Term Capacity in REDD Design and Implementation. The Goals of the Project are:

- to build the capacity of developing country governments and civil society stakeholders to participate meaningfully in REDD policy design and implementation;
- to increase Southern leadership and representation in global REDD readiness agendas;
- to engage and inform indigenous peoples in REDD initiatives, foster their institutional strength and to improve information sharing between national and international REDD processes, and local and regional indigenous networks;
- to share lessons learned from Forum activities and perspective.

**Funding:** 18 million NOK for project period 2010.

**Funder:** NORAD Civil Society Department.

### 35. Rainforest Alliance

Washington, DC

**About:** The Rainforest Alliance is an (NGO) with the published aims of working to conserve biodiversity and ensure sustainable livelihoods by transforming land-use practices, business practices and consumer behaviour. It is based in New York City, and has offices throughout the

United States and worldwide.

**Funding:** 3.5 million 2009.

**Funder:** NORAD Civil Society Department.

### 36. *Global Witness*

Washington, DC (headquarters in London)

**About:** Global Witness is an international NGO, established in 1993, that works to break the links between natural resource exploitation, conflict, poverty, corruption and human rights abuses worldwide. The organisation has offices in London and Washington, DC. Global Witness states that it does not have any political affiliation. In 2003 it was co-nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize for its work on conflict diamonds.

**MFA cooperation:** Guiding REDD through Copenhagen to 2012 and beyond.

**Funding:**

2.5 million NOK 2009.3.5 million NOK 2010.

**Funder:** NORAD Civil Society Department.

### 37. *Clinton Climate Initiative*

New York

**About:** President Clinton launched the Clinton Foundation's Climate Initiative (CCI) in 2006, with the mission of applying the Foundation's business-oriented approach to fight against climate change in practical, measurable and significant ways.

CCI is working with 40 of the world's largest cities to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions through a variety of large-scale programmes.

The William J. Clinton Foundation is a foundation established by the former President of the United States Bill Clinton with the stated mission to "strengthen the capacity of people throughout the world to meet the challenges of global interdependence." The Foundation focuses on four critical areas: health security; economic empowerment; leadership development and citizen service; and racial, ethnic and religious reconciliation.

**MFA cooperation:** REDD+ actions in developing countries.

**Funding:**

3.5 million NOK 2009.

6 million NOK 2010.

**Funder:** NORAD Civil Society Department.

### 38. *The German Marshall Fund of the United States*

Washington, DC

The German Marshall Fund of the United States (GMF) is a non-partisan American public policy and grant-making institution dedicated to promoting greater cooperation and understanding between North America and Europe. GMF policy initiatives bring together people and resources from both sides of the Atlantic to address how the United States and Europe can work together on common interests and shared challenges. They are designed to increase transatlantic cooperation and decrease tension around difficult issues and are carried out by both GMF and partner institutions. Such initiatives include the Climate & Energy Program.

**MFA cooperation:** A Renewable Energy Transition Forum: this is created to create a space for business and policy leaders to gather and engage in frank dialogue about the current state of the renewable energy market, the challenges it faces, and ideas on how to drive a paradigm shift to a global economy increasingly powered by renewable energy.

**Funding:** 1.5 million NOK 2011.

**Funder:** Section for Climate and Sustainable Development

### 39. *The Atlantic Council*

Washington, DC

**About:**

**MFA cooperation:** The Atlantic Council is used as a resource base for experts and research on defence issues. It received funding for a dialogue project in 2009 and might apply for new funding in 2011.

**Funding:** 700,000 NOK 2009.

**Funder:** Peace and Reconciliation section.

### 3. **MFA development aid recipients in the United States**

The MFA cooperates with U.S. development assistance providers too. They are key partners

of Norway, which double as important contacts and thus resources for Norway in the United States.

## *The Carter Center*

Atlanta, Georgia

**About:** The Carter Center is an NGO run by former President Jimmy Carter and his wife. It is associated with Emory University. The Center works in three primary areas: peace building and conflict prevention; human rights and democracy promotion; and global health.

**Description of agreement with MFA:** The Carter Center does not have a framework agreement, but it has for many years received funds from the MFA for many different activities including:

2 million NOK for monitoring peace process in Nepal from embassy in Kathmandu.

12 million NOK in development assistance funds to implement broad project for election monitoring in the Sudan.

Funds for Global Health Work in eradicating the guinea worm.

**Funding:** 9,6 mill NOK 2009

3 mill NOK 2010

**Funders:** East and Central Africa Section, Embassies in Khatoum and Katmandu

## *The National Democratic Institute*

Washington, DC

**About:** The National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI) is an organisation created by the United States government by way of the National Endowment for Democracy (NED) to channel grants for furthering democracy in developing nations. It was founded in 1983, shortly after the U.S. Congress created the National Endowment for Democracy.

Taxpayer funding is provided by the federal government, both directly from the United States Agency for International Development and the Department of State and indirectly through the National Endowment for Democracy. Additional funds are raised through voluntary donations from foreign governments, multilateral institutions and private foundations.

NDI is loosely associated with the Democratic Party.

**MFA-supported aid projects:** NDI receives large funds from the MFA for several democracy-building projects, most notably in Haiti, Kenya, Angola, Sri Lanka and Afghanistan.

**Funding:** 22.5 million NOK 2010

**Funders:** Miscellaneous embassies, Africa section, Peace and Reconciliation section.

## *Clinton Health Access Initiative*

New York

**About:** The Clinton Health Access Initiative (CHAI) is a global health organisation committed to strengthening integrated health systems in the developing world and expanding access to care and treatment for HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis. As of 1 January 2010, the Clinton HIV/AIDS Initiative, an initiative of the Clinton Foundation, became a separate non-profit organisation called the Clinton Health Access Initiative (CHAI).

**MFA-supported projects:** Has received funding from the MFA for work on maternal health and other issues in several African countries.

**Funding:**

51.4 million NOK 2009.

39 million NOK 2010.

**Funder:** NORAD.

## *International Partnership for Microbicides*

Silver Spring, Maryland (Washington, DC)

**About:** The International Partnership for Microbicides (IPM) works to provide women with affordable and self-initiated HIV prevention strategies they can use to protect their own health. Founded in 2002 as a product development partnership (PDP), IPM has become an important partner in the microbicide field.

**MFA-supported projects:** General support to the International Partnership.

**Funding:**

25 million NOK 2009.

20 million NOK 2010.

**Funder:** NORAD Research and Education Department.

## *International Crisis Group*

New York (headquarters in Brussels)

**About:** The International Crisis Group was founded in 1995 by the World Bank Vice-President, Mark Malloch Brown, former US diplomat Morton Abramowitz and Fred Cuny, an international disaster relief specialist. Their aim was to create an organisation, wholly independent from any government, to assist governments, intergovernmental bodies and the international community at large in preventing deadly conflict.

The ICG gives advice to governments, and intergovernmental bodies such as the United Nations, European Union and World Bank, on the prevention and resolution of deadly conflict. Its primary goals are a combination of field-based analysis, policy prescription and aggressive advocacy, with key roles being played by a senior management team highly experienced in government and by a highly active Board of Trustees containing many senior diplomats.

**MFA-supported projects:** Balkans programme, Nepal programme and core grant.

**Funding:**

5.2 million NOK 2009.

5.2 million NOK 2010.

**Funders:** Embassies, Peace and Reconciliation section.

## *The Asia Foundation*

San Francisco

**About:** The Asia Foundation is a non-profit NGO committed to the development of a peaceful, prosperous, just and open Asia-Pacific region. The Foundation supports Asian initiatives to improve governance and law, economic development, women's empowerment, the environment and regional cooperation. Drawing on nearly 60 years of experience in Asia, the Foundation collaborates with private and public partners to support leadership and institutional development, exchanges and policy research.

**MFA cooperation:** Media sponsoring of female parliamentary candidates (Afghanistan), Increasing female political participation (Indonesia).

**Funding:** 5.3 million NOK 2010.

**Funder:** Norwegian embassies in Jakarta, Islamabad, Kabul and Dhaka.

## *The Aspen Institute (Middle East Investment Initiative)*

Aspen

**About:** The Aspen Institute is an international non-profit organisation founded in 1950 as the Aspen Institute of Humanistic Studies. The organisation is dedicated to “fostering enlightened leadership, the appreciation of timeless ideas and values, and open-minded dialogue on contemporary issues”.

**MFA cooperation:** The Aspen Institute runs the Middle East investment Initiative (MEII). This is a public-private partnership of the Aspen Institute, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and the Palestinian Investment Fund. MEII's Loan Guarantee Fund is a \$228 million loan guarantee programme for small and medium-sized businesses in the Palestinian Territories. MEII has also developed a viable mortgage finance marketplace enabling low-income households to purchase homes. It also financed the purchase of 10,000–12,000 housing units on Palestinian-owned land for such projects as the Rawabi housing project, north of Ramallah.

**Funding:** 6 million NOK per year 2006–2010.

**Funder:** Middle East section.

## **4. MFA prospective partners**

The MFA has a large number of diverse partners in the United States, as this report clearly shows. However, a very few strategically important partners should be added to the MFA portfolio because they operate in geographical areas of key interest to Norway or because they are leading environments in certain key fields.

At this point in time, Houston is the city in the United States with the largest community of Norwegian citizens and partners. With its 6500 Norwegians, the community around the U.S. petroleum capital represents the largest number of Norwegians anywhere outside Norway. Strengthening links to this region is important for the MFA and through this project a dialogue has been launched with the Baker Institute of Rice University, frequently ranked as one of the United States' top 30 think tanks. This link will be enhanced through the Norwegian Science Week in Houston in 2012.

If Houston represents the new Norwegian hub in the U.S., Minnesota is the old centre of Norwegian America. Through this project research has also been done in the academic environments there, as partnering with institutions in Minnesota could prove another strategic advancement for Norway. The Midwest is still influential in U.S. politics and of key importance to strengthen Norwegian contacts in the U.S. Congress.

One very key think tanks in Washington have also been added below because they may prove useful additions to the MFA list of partners.

### *The Baker Institute*

Houston, Texas

**About:** The James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy is a think tank on the campus of Rice University in Houston, Texas. Founded in 1993, it has become a notable centre of public policy research. It is named after James Baker, former United States Secretary of State and Secretary of the Treasury. The institute's founding director, Edward P. Djerejian, is the former United States Ambassador to Israel and Syria and Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs. The institute's board of advisors include William Barnett (Chair), Colin Powell, Madeleine Albright and David Leebron, President of Rice University. The institute employs scholars and researchers from a variety of backgrounds. The institute concentrates on the public policy questions of the day. It is an integral part of Rice University, and the university's faculty and students are involved in its research programmes and public events.

**Potential for MFA cooperation:** A dialogue has been started, as a result of this consultancy process, to identify common interests between the Baker Institute and the MFA.

Peace and reconciliation-related research in the Middle East is one potential area of cooperation. Energy security is another.

*A meeting with the founding director of the Baker Institute, Edward Djerejian, was part of this study.*

### *The Humphrey School of Public Policy*

Minneapolis, Minnesota

**About:** The Hubert H. Humphrey School of Public Affairs (formerly the Humphrey Institute) is a graduate public affairs school located at the University of Minnesota, ranking among the top 15 professional schools of public affairs at public universities in the country. It is named after Hubert H. Humphrey, former Vice President of the United States and presidential candidate. Its programme concentration in non-profit management ranks fifth in the nation. The school is widely recognised for its role in examining public issues and shaping public policy at the local, state, national and international levels, and for providing leadership and management expertise to public and non-profit organisations.

**Potential for MFA cooperation:** Dialogue with the embassy in Washington is under way to identify areas of cooperation. The Humphrey School has strong links to the U.S. Congress and their Midwestern delegations, and teaming up to carry out joint activities in Washington with the Norwegian Embassy is being discussed. *A meeting with the Dean of the Humphrey School, Eric Schwartz, was part of this study.*

### *The Peterson Institute for International Economics*

Washington, DC

**About:** The Peter G. Peterson Institute for International Economics is the leading think tank in Washington working on economic development and global financial issues. It is a private, non-profit, non-partisan research institution devoted to the study of international economic policy. Since 1981 the Institute has provided timely and objective analysis of, and concrete solutions to, a wide range of international economic problems. It is one of the very few economics think tanks that are widely regarded as non-partisan by the press and neutral by the U.S. Congress, and the quality media cite its research staff more than those of any other such institution.

**MFA cooperation:** The Peterson Institute has asked the MFA for support and said it cannot accommodate requests from Norway until it receives some funding.

*A meeting with the Vice President of the Peterson Institute, Anders Aslund, was part of this study.*

## 5. How the MFA can become a more strategic actor in the U.S. foreign policy environment

Norway is currently one of the largest foreign government contributors to U.S. foreign policy research. This role creates great opportunities, but it also carries with it a responsibility for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The United States' foreign policy research environment is perhaps the world leader, and the MFA can benefit greatly if it awards its contributions wisely and strategically in this environment.

However, U.S. think tanks are also world-class fundraisers. They are very professional at attracting funding and used to dealing with funders who require much more cumbersome application and reporting requirements than the MFA does.

The MFA could benefit from becoming a more demanding funder with a more transparent application and review process without becoming overly bureaucratic.

At the current time, the MFA is a larger funder in the U.S. than even the ministry staff are themselves aware of. The most difficult task in this project has been to acquire a complete overview of all MFA funding to the U.S. This goes to show that it is important to improve coordination of the ministry's activities in the U.S.

Three questions could help guide the MFA in a process to improve its funding practices in the United States.

**Question 1: What does the MFA want to achieve through funding U.S. foreign policy research?**

**Question 2: How can MFA staff become better-coordinated grant makers?**

**Question 3: How can the funding of U.S. partners produce even more results and synergies for the MFA?**

*Question 1: What does the MFA want to achieve through funding U.S. foreign policy research?*

### **Flexible policy influence**

According to interviews conducted as part of this study, the objective of the MFA's contributions to foreign policy research in the United States is to advance the priorities of Norwegian foreign policy. The think tanks and research institutions supported are not providing consultancy services. They are carrying out research and policy implementing activities in areas of special concern to the MFA; research that might not have been produced without the funding from Norway.

The MFA contributes to U.S. institutions because they are leaders in their fields globally; they are global agenda setters that can assist the MFA in developing and promoting a Norwegian foreign policy agenda. They can help the MFA in developing current strategies and foreign and security policy tools.

One example is following the use of stabilisation operations (such as Afghanistan), where the trend currently is a diminishing willingness to deploy large forces to solve security challenges. A question to ask in such a situation is what other tools the international community has and how the Norwegian government would like to influence the discussion about these. Such tools are of crucial importance for the international community in dealing with, for example, the Arab Spring and Syria. When the tools and policies have been developed, Norway can, in partnership with its think tank partners, promote these perspectives globally. This gives the MFA a significant role.

In addition, the U.S. institutions are important to the MFA because they can give the ministry access to experts and events in U.S. foreign policy making.

MFA staff indicate that the ministry does not wish to fund large research projects in the same way the Norwegian Research Council or a large foundation would. The ministry instead aims to keep its grant making somewhat flexible. At the MFA, contributions to think tanks/

research institutions are seen as “seed money”, which can be given with some flexibility to projects of importance for Norwegian foreign policy priorities. The MFA sees the framework agreement format as a useful tool in this regard, as it allows general agreements to be set up with partners allowing for some flexibility.

#### **Assistance for embassy and MFA staff**

Some of the MFA partnerships in the United States seem quite important for Norwegian foreign policy-makers and provide many opportunities for both the embassy in Washington and the MFA in Oslo. The partnerships give Norway access to key experts, and in some cases policy-makers, in the United States who would otherwise not have been accessible.

In Washington, it is difficult for a small country to gain access to powerful politicians, bureaucrats and experts. Funding powerful think tanks is one way to gain such access, and some think tanks in Washington are openly conveying that they can service only those foreign governments that provide funding.

Some diplomats interviewed for this report even emphasise that the level of funding a government such as Norway’s provides will determine what level of access it gets.

For the MFA, the significant contribution to the Brookings Institution is the clearest example of this. Norway is, after Qatar and the UAE, the largest foreign government contributor to Brookings, and Norwegian funding is less restricted than that of the two Arab partner countries. This is of great benefit to Norwegian delegations visiting Washington, and the flexibility of the framework agreement makes it possible to have Norway influence policy on many levels.

Another example is the MFA’s decision not to fund the Peterson Institute of International Economics, which is Washington’s leading think tank on international financial issues/financial crisis etc. By deciding not to contribute to this influential think tank, the MFA has removed itself from a partnership with one of the most influential think tanks in finance globally in a

period when crucial Norwegian interests such as the global energy markets and the Norwegian sovereign wealth fund require close monitoring of global financial trends..

This being said, it is important for the Norwegian MFA not to see funding as its only means of power in the U.S. foreign policy environment. Norway has considerable soft power in this environment in other ways. It is seen as a force in international peacebuilding and climate policy, and American policy-makers repeatedly state that Norway is punching above its weight. Norway is respected and listened to. The MFA should therefore be a demanding funder and use financial contributions to U.S. foreign policy research in combination with other tools. This will be easier if the MFA sets clearer priorities for which foreign policy priorities it wants to pursue by funding American foreign policy research.

Norwegian diplomats at home and abroad should also use the networks created by the cooperation in the U.S. more actively and to build stronger political cooperation with the think tanks and other partners. Resources should be set aside by the MFA for this purpose, and some clear aims should be set for each MFA/U.S. partnership. Questions to ask could be: What political output does the MFA want the partnership to produce? What activities should the partnership produce?

The Peace and Reconciliation section of the MFA has its annual Oslo Forum, at which mediators from all over the world (most of whom receive financial support from Norway) gather to interact with Norwegian diplomats working in the field of mediation. Perhaps networking events like this could be beneficial in other topical fields. Fellowship agreements, whereby Norwegian diplomats are offered short-term fellowships at a think tank to work on a specific topic, might be another option. The MFA had such an arrangement with Harvard in the past, but it was discontinued.

Keeping issues warm

In the United States, the MFA contributes financially to research in these main areas: peace and reconciliation, REDD+, climate change/global warming, disarmament and

non-proliferation, economic development/aid efficiency and, to a lesser extent, global health and women in peace and security.

In most of these areas Norwegian contributions seem vital in keeping issues on the international agenda when it is difficult to attract funding from other sources. Several of the think tanks funded by the MFA state that they would not have been able to do certain aspects of their work without Norway's contribution. Norway has become known for funding areas in which resources are scarce and it is hard to attract funding from other sources. Some examples are:

- Disarmament/non-proliferation work, for which the MFA helped keep the U.S. research environment vibrant during the years of the Bush administration when non-proliferation was not high on the agenda.
- The REDD+ agenda, which has been kept alive and has advanced through Norwegian contributions. Many partners in this field state that it would not have been possible for them to do much without Norwegian funding.
- Peacebuilding research in Afghanistan through the Center for International Cooperation and the United States Institute of Peace in partnership with PRIO, which has received praise and attention.
- In some areas Norwegian contributions may have been able to influence U.S. policy.

Examples:

- High North research funding to the Center for Strategic and International Studies.
- The Brookings Institution's funding to study the Arab spring. The flexibility of the broad framework agreement with Brookings has at times made it possible to time key research to coincide with visits from Norway.

The Norwegian MFA receives praise for its role as a funder of "forgotten issues". However, Norway should be careful not to become the sole funder of too many projects. Funding should at all times be kept current and relevant to Norwegian and global policy.

There should be a debate within the MFA to determine what should be the main focus of contributions in the United States.

## ***Question 2: How can MFA staff become better-coordinated grant makers?***

The leading challenge for the MFA in its funding role in the United States is the lack of coordination/information sharing in Oslo and between the ministry and its partners in the United States.

Many partners are asking for easier access to information about application and follow-up procedures. However, there are no joint procedures for applying and reviewing funds today. Different sections of the MFA have their own systems, and partnerships often start by personal contact between MFA officials and think tank/research institution representatives.

The MFA might not want a rigid and bureaucratic system governing its funding practices. However, its grant-making activities are now so extensive that some type of transparent system is called for.

When designing such a system, it is important to take into account that there is continuous and frequent staff rotation at a ministry of foreign affairs, and that this requires procedures that can easily be transferred from one civil servant to the next.

A few simple steps could make the grant-making activities at the MFA more transparent and better coordinated:

- A Web tool/portal to share application information and best practices. Information about how to apply for funding from Norway is not well coordinated and collected in one place. Internet-based tools for external and internal use could also highlight some of the important research the MFA is involved in as well as Norway's foreign policy priorities. In addition, it could help create synergies and possibilities for links around the world and prevent overlap as partners are receiving support from different sections of the MFA for similar work.
- Checklists and joint guidelines for grant follow-up and renewal. This should include checklists and easily

transferable tools for following up grants and ensuring that they are producing the desired results.

Different sections of the MFA and NORAD should also be given the opportunity to share experiences and learn from each other.

- **A Database with contact information and details about U.S. partners.** This database could be maintained at the embassy in Washington, DC, and would provide all needed information for officials keeping in touch with the think tank partners. All the tools described above could be created in a follow-up exercise to this report.

### ***Question 3: How can the funding of U.S. partners produce qualitatively better results and synergies for the MFA?***

The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs could become more strategic, gain more influence and enjoy greater benefits from its funding of U.S. think tanks by:

- **Funding fewer and more strategically important partners.** The MFA is currently aiming very wide. Few partnerships have been discontinued in the last six years while many have been added. Renewed funding should not be automatic, and all partnerships should be thoroughly evaluated. Many partnerships started through personal contacts between MFA staff and U.S. researchers/experts. At this point, the MFA should look thoroughly at all funded projects and ask if they benefit Norwegian foreign policy and policy making. Partnership agreements should ask for more specific outcomes of greater gain for the MFA.
- **Involving Norwegian institutions.** The MFA could benefit by encouraging partnerships/ joint projects between Norwegian foreign policy research institutions and excellent think tanks in the United States. Norwegian institutions could be partners in more agreements between the MFA and leading U.S. think tanks. In this way Norwegian access to key experts and research could be utilised in more ways in Norway. Some partnerships of this sort have already been quite successful. PRIO and the United States Institute of Peace have collaborated on an

Afghanistan peace dialogue project that has been quite successful. NUPI has also been involved in similar projects. The Norwegian institutions should be challenged to propose joint projects, and in some cases triangular agreements could be of benefit.

- **Looking beyond Washington.** Norwegian interest in the United States stretches far beyond the U.S. capital and the UN capital, New York. Today, the largest contingent of Norwegian expats in any city outside Norway can be found in Houston, Texas. Partnering with excellent foreign policy research institutions there and in other key environments for Norway, such as Minnesota, would be beneficial for the MFA in the United States. In some cases links could be made between the MFA's foreign policy research funding and other research funding provided by the Norwegian Research Council etc. to create synergies for research cooperation between Norway and the United States. For the last few years a Norwegian Science Week has not as been held in different cities in the United States. In 2012, when this event is to be held in Houston, the plan is to add a foreign policy component. This type of project will help highlight Norwegian foreign policy and the MFA's important contribution to specific foreign policy research in the United States.
- **Creating global synergies.** Many of the MFA's partners in the United States have excellent partners around the world and especially in key countries such as China, India, Brazil and Turkey as well as in the Arab world. The MFA could use its U.S. partners to create synergies/partnerships in these strategically important countries for Norway. Partnerships with research institutions in these countries could be set up, linking them to key Norwegian partners in the United States. Conferences, events and visits could also benefit from this kind of partnership. Some of Norway's partners in the U.S. already have their own centres in the global South (for example the Brookings Doha centre and planned research centres in Delhi and Beijing). Given how large a donor Norway has become, it should expand its reach by exploring these synergies and drawing on its U.S. partners where it is beneficial.

### *How to proceed*

If the MFA wishes to become a more professional donor, a process should be started to explore this topic. The MFA could benefit by seeking advice from U.S. foundations, which are the largest funders of U.S. institutions.

Creating a better system for grant making, coordination and follow-up could be done through an advisory process using consultants who know the U.S. grant-making environment. This process could be organised and funded by NOREF.

## 6. Concluding remarks and acknowledgements

This report is not an evaluation, but a survey and a collection of thoughts indicating how the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs might steer its cooperation with foreign policy research institutions in the United States in the future. The report would not have been possible without extensive help and advice from several key people.

I would like to extend sincere thanks to Mariano Aguirre, Director of NOREF, for strategic advice and for generously sharing his own extensive knowledge of how the U.S. funding environment for foreign policy research operates.

Several diplomats at the embassy in Washington have generously taken time out of their busy schedules to provide information and input and to discuss ideas for the future. A special thanks to DCM Johan Vibe and Minister Counsellor Berit Enge for their very important advice and monitoring. Ambassador Wegger Strømmen's advice has also been greatly appreciated and key for the success of this project.

At the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Oslo, several people have helped.

Thanks especially to staff at the Peace and Reconciliation section, who have a lot of experience with contributions to U.S. actors.

The NORAD statistical team has generously helped to pull out necessary data that were not always easy to find.

In the United States, key experts at many partnering think tanks have kindly shared their ideas and data with me. A special thanks to the consultant Christopher Harris, who has helped with direction and strategic thinking.

It has been an exciting exercise to get immersed in the role Norway is playing in U.S. foreign policy research. It is my clear observation that the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs has achieved a lot through this activity, but can reach even further if this project is followed by a more practical and strategic follow-up exercise.

Washington, DC, May 2012

## Appendix 1: List of partners interviewed

Institution	Location	Point of contact	Receives MFA funding
The Baker Institute	Houston	Ryan Kirksey Allen Matusow	No
The Brookings Institution	Washington	Jaqueline Geis Martin Indyk	Yes
Center for American Progress	Washington	Sabina Dewan	Yes
Center for Global Development	Washington	Todd Moss	Yes
Center for International Cooperation	New York	Jake Sherman	Yes
CSIS	Washington	Heather Conley	Yes
Global Financial Integrity	Washington	Raymond Baker	Yes
Clinton Health Initiative/Clinton Climate Initiative	New York	Ami Desai James Baker	Yes
Conflict Prevention and Peace Forum	New York	Bill O'Neill	Yes
The Heritage Foundation	Washington	Mike Gonzales	No
The Humphrey School of Public Policy	Minneapolis	Eric Schwarz Sherry Grey	No
Independent Diplomat	New York	Carne Ross	Yes
International Peace Institute	New York	Francois Carrell-Billiard	Yes
National Democratic Institute	Washington	Kenneth Wollack Matt Dippell	Yes
Nobel Peace Prize Forum	Minneapolis	Maureen Reed	No
Monterey Institute of International Studies	Monterey, CA	William Potter	Yes
The Oslo Center Foundation	Minneapolis	Orlyn Kringstad	
Peterson Institute of International Economics	Washington	Anders Åslund	No
Rand Corporation	Los Angeles	Lindsay Koburg	
Rights and Resources Initiative	Washington	Andy White	Yes
United States Institute of Peace	Washington	Andrew Wilder	Yes (through PRIO)
World Affairs Council	Houston	Chip Ray Shara Fryer	No
World Resources Institute	Washington	Leo Horn-Phathanothai	Yes
PRIO	Oslo	Kristian Harpviken	Yes
NUPI	Oslo	Ulf Sverdrup Iver Neumann	Yes