Nurturing new actions to shape tomorrow’s world
OUR VISION OF THE WORLD
BIG PICTURE: THE NEED TO
REINVENT MULTILATERALISM
The Covid-19 crisis has become the largest economic and human shock ever recorded outside of wartime. The virus has infected 40 million people, caused more than one million deaths, and already inflicted USD 7 trillion in global economic losses. While science is progressing at unprecedented speed to understand this virus, many uncertainties remain, including with regard to the pandemic’s possible long-term effects.

The pandemic is lasting longer than planned. As the crisis seems set to last years rather than months, what was initially a sprint is turning into a marathon. However, the resources required to complete such a long-distance race risk beginning to run out: the political acceptability of preventive measures is declining, as are the financial resources of support plans in some economies.

With few exceptions (in particular countries previously affected by SARS), this crisis was poorly anticipated. Numerous states, which found themselves scattered and alone in facing the pandemic, had to create emergency responses from scratch: ensuring supplies of sanitary equipment in a context of shortage and blocked international supply chains, defining a doctrine and an acceptable political balance between preservation of the economy and protection of public health, drawing up massive budgetary plans in a matter of weeks to save the economy at the cost of a sudden increase in debt («whatever it takes»), and establishing themselves as a last resort money lender to prevent a large number of economic sectors and companies from going out of business.

The pandemic therefore began with a long period during which major political decisions were nationally relocated, with little or no international cooperation, and pre-existing global challenges were relegated to the background.
State of play: The pandemic as an indicator of deep crises

More than a disruption, the shock of Covid-19 accelerated and exacerbated pre-existing political trends. In terms of international politics, multilateralism was the first victim. Most major conferences were postponed, and the institutions at the center of international cooperation were either paralyzed (UN Security Council) or did not play their role as consultation or coordination organs (G7 and G20).

Faced with an unprecedented, sudden, massive, and global crisis, not only has the multilateral system failed to regain its appeal, but it has accelerated its collapse. We are now at the end of a long cycle during which multilateralism was built and grew in the aftermath of two world wars, thrived until the late 1990s, then stagnated before collapsing to a historic low point with the lack of coordinated response to the Covid-19 crisis.
This lack of coordination resulted in an immediate divergence of narratives, with each model believing its crisis management to be proof of its superiority. Democracies claim to have responded better through information sharing and deliberation, while authoritarian regimes believe they were better equipped to make faster and more effective decisions. At the same time, neither side has resisted pointing out the shortcomings of the competing model. Democratic systems are said incapable of making decisions, and authoritarian regimes are accused of unnecessarily restricting freedoms and reducing the effectiveness of responses by refusing to share information.

Furthermore, the harsh blame game between the United States and China and their reciprocal aggressiveness have only further weakened the faltering international order. Everywhere, tensions and frictions have arisen, for example, over access to medical equipment (masks and ventilators at the beginning of the crisis, future vaccines, and therapeutics), and supply chains.

In the movements existing deep within societies, the reactions to the pandemic have accelerated the return of the anthropological myths specific to each human group, a phenomenon that has been at work for years, fostered by combined economic, identity, security, and migratory crises. By revealing existential questions about the meaning and modalities of constituted communities, the pandemic has refocused discussions on political issues in their original sense. It has also resurrected dissonant reactions between countries and regions on the relationship to risk, the interrelation between the individual and the collective, the balance between freedom and security, the relationship to the state, or the order of social priorities. Humanity was simultaneously affected by the same virus, and instead of providing a single common reaction, further accentuated the fragmentation of its representations and myths. This divergence complicated any form of mutual understanding or cooperation.

Finally, this crisis has put significant additional pressure on social contracts in the many countries where they were already weak, with new grievances being added to existing ones, at the risk of a breach of trust in political systems. Nations are built and prosper on the belief that institutions protect their people from disaster, ensure stability, and allow them to project themselves into the future. By the time the pandemic is over, several of these institutions will have been perceived as failing, which will undoubtedly lead to political debates. In the social and political aftermath of the crisis, the reactions of the losers of the recovery will also need to be anticipated, as will new pressures on democracies already undermined by well-known flaws and difficulties in responding to major challenges such as environmental degradation and generational and territorial divides.
Where are we headed? What is known and what is unknown

Navigating the various possible scenarios requires distinguishing the relatively certain trends, which will form the backdrop of these orientations, from uncertainties and variables that could define several alternative scenarios. The main backdrop remains the growing tension between geopolitical dynamics and economic and technological processes: we are witnessing both an acceleration of interdependencies due to technological and capitalist expansion and political withdrawal fueled by the disruptions these movements cause to the cultural, social, and anthropological frameworks of societies.
The result is a fundamentally unstable system, where several phenomena will continue to coexist.

A systemic fragility of the international order, with no guardians (de-Westernization of the world, declining influence of America’s power while China’s is progressing) nor balance perceived as legitimate (spectacular reassertion of national sovereignties and objectives concurrent with an increasing rejection of globalization).

International architecture is no longer held up by hegemonic stability (pax romana, pax americana... or pax sinica) or by the stability of balance (as is the case with traditional Westphalian bipolarity or multipolarity). Therefore, the recognition of the legitimacy of the international order is left solely to its actors and is severely lacking in the current situation.

The risk of dangerous rivalries is therefore high, and scenarios such as the famous «Thucydides Trap» (where a dominant power refuses to share power and an emerging power refuses to consider the current framework as legitimate to develop its ambitions) are likely to be repeated. At the same time, the reconstruction of large spheres of influence (US-CN) required for a new «traditional» balance is thwarted by a «global political awakening» as described by Brzezinski: the rehabilitation of sovereign power and the specific wills of each community fosters fragmentation and removes the prospect of the world ultimately accepting to bend to a new bipolarity.

At the same time, we are witnessing an acceleration of the interdependence of these sovereignties, mainly due to the continuous expansion of the technological and capitalist process.

The Covid-19 crisis will not lead to deglobalization, as was initially feared (or hoped), if only because the cost of large-scale relocations or massive simplification of production chains appears far too high for the actors involved in their implementation. However, globalization will certainly undergo reorganizations: value chains will be diversified, with greater emphasis on their resilience («just in case» rather than «just in time»); populations will request better protection (as opposed to protecting only producers), leading to the strengthening of precautionary standards («precautionism»), at the cost of increased friction in trade.

Rather than slowing down its expansion, these reorganizations will result in a marginal adjustment of capitalism, allowing it to pursue its development in a slightly different way: a little more resilient, a little less risky, a little slower, a little less efficient. As a result, we can undoubtedly expect less structural growth, except if the hope-inspiring green recovery and circular economy manage to steer economies towards new trajectories. Will these reorganizations enable capitalism to produce growth that will be more easily translate into well-being? The question remains unanswered.
At the same time, technological acceleration will continue at a historically unprecedented pace. We have entered an era of technological breakthroughs (AI, climate technologies, biotech, genetics, etc.) that feed off each other and accelerate the pace of discoveries. The dissemination of scientific information is faster and more globalized than ever, at the price of frictions, which increase the geopolitical rivalries and competitions between states locked in a race for technological supremacy. In the United States, this competition should push the agenda of a technological decoupling from China. However, this decoupling will remain structurally impeded by the cost stakeholders will have to bear and should not lead to a decoupling of either state from the rest of the world. On the other hand, the political and social disruptions due to the destabilizing effects of technological advances on existing political and economic structures will continue to be felt, thereby challenging societies’ and their political institutions’ ability to control these shocks effectively.

**In these tensions between geopolitics and geo-economics**, the impact of issues with a directly global scope will continue to increase. In the short term: global warming and its consequences (extreme climatic events, disruption of local ecosystems). In the medium term: the increasingly rapid occupation and exploitation of outer space; climate engineering and the prospects for large-scale controlled modification of global climatic parameters; genomic advances and the potential transformation of the genetic heritage of humanity taking control of the evolutionary trajectory of our species. These issues are considered risky, and in some cases, existential. They will require significant cooperative capacities to be mastered, with no guarantees regarding the outcome.
Uncertainties are spread across two main axes:

**One axis is the degree of cooperation.** At one end of this axis, power rivalries take over. We live in a tougher world where societies tribalize under the protection of their leaders. An isolationist model spreads, led by personalities considered strong enough to protect the people from an outside enemy. This goes hand in hand with an exacerbation of nationalist responses by states caught in a more brutal competition for access to scarce resources. Nationalist and authoritarian surges grow stronger. In this scenario, international law is less and less respected. At the other end of this axis, powers accept the reality of political interdependence and, while continuing to push their interests, seek reasoned cooperation. This first truly global event, affecting the entirety of humanity, leads to a realization of our shared vulnerability. Politically, this goes hand in hand with a renewed capacity of peoples to project themselves into the future in a more optimistic manner than before, thereby putting an end to a period of crisis and intense fear. The virus and the prospect of death it carries bolsters social bonds, fosters a longing for a healthier relationship with nature, and renews trust in science. In turn, these consequences help tip the balance towards a more reorganized collective and contribute to preventing the collapse of internal social contracts.

The second axis relates to the degree of transition (ecological, energy, digital) states will commit to as the crisis ends. At one end of this axis, reinvestment in public goods and infrastructure through stimulus plans play a significant role as an accelerator for transitions, driven by governments benefiting from unprecedented advantages in their relationship with economic players (conditionality). These transitions take place quickly, carried by technological developments. At the other extremity of this axis, the pressure to restart as quickly as possible on the basis of pre-crisis economic criteria is the strongest. As a result of either deliberate will (the comparative advantage of recovering before the others) or inertia (the absence of pre-established transition plans that can be mobilized and implemented over a short period), this pressure triggers no transitions whatsoever.
These axes outline four typical scenarios, with numerous variations in between:

A scenario lacking both cooperation and transition. This would be an immediate threat to peace. While not the most likely, such a scenario cannot be ruled out.

A scenario with little cooperation and high friction between countries and regions, where the crisis would nevertheless produce strong enough incentives for everyone to seek to initiate or accelerate a transition. This scenario is one of brutal competition for technological and commercial supremacy: digital gunboat diplomacy. This is currently the riskiest trend. It would lead to an increase in potential conflicts (leading to uncertainties on how to control them) and a sub-optimal overall balance.

A scenario with a surge in cooperation but no acceleration of transitions. This scenario seems unlikely. Current signals point more to a spontaneous collapse of existing coordination and dialogue mechanisms rather than their preservation, let alone resurgence. Moreover, cooperation without a shared ambition would be relatively fragile.

A scenario with revitalized cooperation, taking new forms and including sovereign and non-sovereign actors, accelerates varying degrees of transition. According to this scenario, new governance may gradually emerge, starting with the construction of solutions for global public health, climate, digital technology, and specific biotechnologies.

The first set of scenarios, involving little cooperation, is not the least likely at this stage. However, it is faced with a temporal actualization issue: our societies have become too complicated, exploiting resources to too great a degree, relying on technological systems that are too sophisticated to survive attempts to permanently unravel the links and complexities that enclose them. In the long term, new forms of coordination are required, in the interest of every actor intent on retaining control of their real sovereignty. But the world may very well go through a potentially long phase of faltering dialogue, conflicts, and even chaos, before finally being reborn.
An anthropological analysis should be added on top of these scenarios. This analysis also raises questions – all the more so as there is little serious research at this stage to shed light on the subject, human sciences being little used to short-term frameworks. Indeed, the strengthening of specific interests and values that we have seen at work for years should continue, in reaction to the transition period the world is experiencing. Sovereign politics, in their capacity as collective life-or-death decision-making organs that ensure the existence and permanence of a community, are taking over. They are accompanied by a growing demand for order and authority in reaction to social upheavals and anxieties. Consequently, specific and sometimes archaic cultural myths continue to grow. This growth is driven by the desire to find simple rules and operating methods for weakened communities, which in turn leads to increasingly difficult interactions between them. In democracies where the shock has been poorly anticipated, its impact is bound to leave economic, political, and social consequences.

For the time being, cooperation is still hampered by various factors of which geo-economic competition (i.e., recovering first is a comparative advantage), geopolitical competition (i.e., finding a balance between a demonstration of power and the opportunity to forge new alliances), responses to the legitimate demands of domestic policies (i.e., protection populations), and opportunistic attempts by many actors to promote their agendas in the post-Covid-19 world. Uncertainties regarding the pandemic itself (i.e., the reappearance of successive waves) and the time it will take for the virus to disappear should also be taken into account.

The world’s balance is thus caught between rising geopolitical and geo-economic tensions and the rise of global issues and challenges (environment, cyberspace, health, precautionism). We should aim to accelerate the immense transition we are experiencing. This objective is possible, desirable, and undoubtedly obvious over the long term. In the short term, it will require facing a strong current, emphasizing the need for cooperation, proposing new frameworks and processes, and building alliances. None of this will come naturally or easily. These are the missions to which the Paris Peace Forum wishes to contribute.
THE PARIS PEACE FORUM IN ACTION
The third edition of the Paris Peace Forum will open on 11 November in the early afternoon. On this occasion, many heads of state and international organization will meet, both on-site in Paris and online. They will be joined by leaders from civil society, foundations, corporations, intellectuals, and the media, from the Global North and Global South. In the 21st century, bringing policymakers together is no longer enough to create an impact, build coalitions, and bridge the gap between actions and words. It requires the commitment of non-governmental organizations (NGOs), businesses, academic institutions, major cities, amongst many others.

If it keeps its promises, on the evening of 13 November, as the Paris Peace Forum comes to a close, the world will not be exactly the same.
What is the Paris Peace Forum?
A place where new responses to global problems can grow

The Paris Peace Forum was founded on a simple premise: cooperative solutions are essential to meet global challenges and ensure lasting peace.

Today, this mission is more critical than ever. The Covid-19 crisis has widened the gap between the multilateral order that has existed since the end of the two world wars and the world’s geopolitical evolution. We are witnessing a rapid and dangerous aggravation of geopolitical tensions, a deterioration of the instruments of international dialogue and multilateral action, and the onset of a massive economic and social crisis that can only further deteriorate an already alarming economic situation, growing inequalities, and ultimately, ever-increasing pressures on democracy.

The world’s capacity to respond to crises at the international a rarely been so low. This comes just as the worst economic and health crisis since the modern international system’s creation looms. The temptations of playing zero-sum games complicate the coordination needed for the world to emerge quickly from this pandemic.

Most international events have either been reduced (UNGA, G20) or canceled (G7, COP26, World Economic Forum), leaving the Paris Peace Forum as THE occasion to rebuild the coordination of the post-Covid-19 world. The Forum will be held immediately after the US elections, the outcome of which will undoubtedly shape the international architecture to come.
The solution: Multistakeholderism in action

With actors increasingly out of alignment and global challenges radically different from those which institutions were initially created to address, a new architecture is needed to halt the decline of multilateralism. This can only be achieved by including more actors, including private and civil society stakeholders, in a multi-stakeholder approach, as pointed out by UN Secretary-General António Gutteres: “Many of the cross-border challenges we face today, from the climate crisis to rising inequality and cybercrime, involve interest groups, businesses, organizations and entire sectors that are outside traditional concepts of global governance. These challenges cannot be addressed effectively by states alone. We need to broaden our idea of global governance, to take in businesses, civil society, cities and regions, academia, and young people. International conventions are not the only way to reach binding agreements for the common good. We need flexible mechanisms in which different stakeholders come together, adopt protocols and codes of conduct, define red lines, and create conditions for successful cooperation, which is particularly relevant in the digital world.”

This is precisely the purpose of the Paris Peace Forum.

From 11 to 13 November, the Forum will demonstrate that, in the face of these immense challenges, action is not only necessary, but possible. The result of months of effort and negotiation among a wide range of actors, the Forum will provide a crucial platform to align vaccine policies, countercyclical economic policies, and cyberspace regulations, and share perspectives for the post-Covid-19 world.

Since it was created three years ago, the Paris Peace Forum has established itself as one of the key events to rebuild a multilateralism of deeds. In the past, too many statements have failed to be followed by commitments. This approach must change. “I, for one, believe in this multilateralism of deeds, more than of words. It is why I’m inviting you to meet in the coming months at the Paris Peace Forum […], and anywhere we can usefully work together, to put this multilateralism into practice.” (Emmanuel Macron).
HEALTH AND VACCINES

Coordinating the stakeholders of the global response to the coronavirus pandemic
The challenge

- Once a vaccine or treatments against Covid-19 have been developed, the main challenge facing the international community will be to increase production and distribution to ensure the vaccine and treatments are universally and immediately accessible.

- No issue is currently more critical than this one. Every month saved on access to, and delivery of vaccines and treatments will save tens of thousands of lives, preserve millions of jobs and incomes, and prevent hundreds of billions of dollars in economic losses. The issue is of the utmost urgency, and the challenge is commensurate with the greatest crisis the world has ever experienced outside of wartime.

- However, cooperative solutions are currently failing to prevail. Most countries are responding through national measures, which, while legitimate (each government has a duty to protect its population), are nevertheless leading to an accumulation of mechanisms that will be inadequate at the global level. This is particularly true for low- and middle-income countries, where the advance purchase of vaccines, logistics, and distribution infrastructure is much less advanced. There can be no worse prospect than a world where some - the rich, the white, and some Asians - have access to vaccines, while others are left behind, aggravating economic disparities, and causing severe geopolitical tensions. Nevertheless, this is the situation in which we are likely to find ourselves in a few months’ time.

- Unequal access to vaccines, within and between countries, will fuel internal and international tensions that are particularly dangerous for the international order as well as each country’s social peace. Similarly, a full resumption of international trade and economic activity will not be possible as long as certain countries, populations, and regions remain affected by the virus. «Vaccine diplomacy», much like the early pandemic’s «mask diplomacy», is set to dominate the multilateral agenda in coming months. Influence struggles are increasing, leaving lasting impact just as geopolitical balances are being shaken.

- Solutions will not be found by states alone. Multi-stakeholder diplomacy is needed. The world already found itself in this situation when faced with the AIDS epidemic. As is the case today, actors lacked coordination; states were caught between rivalry and cooperation, and pharmaceutical groups hesitated between pursuing public goods or profits first. The AIDS epidemic that devastated countries was brought under control thanks to a multi-actor coalition of governments, scientists, NGOs, and international organizations. Only similar multi-stakeholder initiatives or coalitions can win the battle to develop, produce, and distribute Covid-19 vaccines and treatments globally. This is what the Paris Peace Forum is working towards.
How the Forum helps

1 - A catalyst for ACT-A.

Access to Covid Tools (ACT) Accelerator is a groundbreaking global collaboration to accelerate the development, production, and equitable access to Covid-19 tests, treatments, and vaccines. Launched in late April 2020 by the WHO, the President of the French Republic, the European Commission, and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, ACT-A brings together governments, scientists, companies, representatives of civil society, philanthropists; and most of the world’s health organizations (CEPI, Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance, the Global Fund, Unitaid, the World Bank).

183 countries representing 93% of the world’s population are now part of or associated with this unprecedented collaboration. COVAX, the vaccine pillar of the ACT-A Accelerator, has the short-term objective of developing approximately 10 vaccine candidates, ensuring they are affordable, and distributing 2 billion doses to participating countries by the end of next year.

Reaching this objective requires significant mobilization, clearly defined organization principles, and fundraising.

For several months, the Paris Peace Forum has been working hard to support ACT-A, bringing together stakeholders, proposing solutions, and catalyzing progress.

Two of the Paris Peace Forum’s high-level sessions will be dedicated to ACT-A. They will highlight the culmination of these efforts and open a new phase to ensure that vaccines and treatments be considered global public goods. As such, they will be quickly and easily made accessible to hasten the end of the pandemic.

2 - Launch of the «One Health» High-Level Expert Council

The virus that caused the pandemic was transmitted from animals to humans. Having never been exposed to the virus, humans did not have the immune defenses to respond to it.

This crossing of the species barrier serves as a stark reminder of the relationship between health and the environment. Experts have warned that, due to large-scale deforestation in particular, unprecedented encounters between wildlife and humans, and thus the spread of new viruses, will become increasingly frequent.

It is no longer possible to preserve human health without taking into account animal infections and environmental degradation.

The Paris Peace Forum will organize the launch of the «One Health» High-Level Expert Council by a ministerial meeting of the Alliance for Multilateralism. This Council will aim to gather and disseminate reliable information on the links between human, animal, and environmental health in the context of biodiversity loss.
Related projects

Under the Mask: A Free Society (project by the American Friends Service Committee - AFSC): Human and civil rights are under assault, as are the fundamental values of equality, pluralism, and democracy that underpin them. Civic space continues to shrink. Activists on the frontline against authoritarianism are subject to harassment, while peacebuilding and humanitarian services are stifled through government restrictions in the name of «counter-terrorism». Since the Covid-19 crisis began, governments and authorities have used emergency measures to contain the virus. While some measures are necessary, it is essential to track them and ensure they are a genuine response to the pandemic, rather than implemented to contain voices of dissent. AFSC’s Under the Mask project explores how to protect civil society engagement and expression by convening civil society organizations and activists from around the world to discuss challenges, share learning and ideas on how best to respond.

The Coronavirus Facts Alliance (project by the International Fact-Checking Network): The #CoronaVirusFacts Alliance is the largest collaborative fact-checking project ever seen. It is led by the International Fact-Checking Network and unites 99 fact-checking organizations worldwide in publishing, sharing, and translating facts surrounding the novel coronavirus. Launched in January 2020, when the spread of the virus was restricted to Asia but already causing rampant misinformation globally, the Alliance now proves that by lowering competition and working together, fact-checkers are stronger, and their work has more impact. Collaboration remains one of the best ways to fight misinformation.
CYBERSPACE AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Better regulating the digital space and artificial intelligence (AI) (fight against infodemics, digital bills of rights, cybersecurity)
The challenge

The pandemic is accelerating the digital transition while also emphasizing the questions it raises. The crisis has not so much raised new questions about the impact of technology on democracy as it has reinforced many actors’ sense of urgency regarding the need to find solutions and act. Furthermore, before the crisis even began, the digital revolution was already profoundly changing the way we live and interact.

How the Forum helps

Since its creation in 2018, the Paris Peace Forum has made digital regulation one of its priorities.

By design, advances in the digital field cannot be fully effective in traditional inter-state diplomatic frameworks. The private sector, which produces and distributes these technologies, bears the main responsibility for securing the networks on which our societies and economies depend, and therefore cannot be left out, any more than the main research centers and civil society, which is particularly active on these issues.

The Forum is active across three pillars:

1. Establishing a unique and innovative framework for cybersecurity

During the pandemic, the number of cyberattacks dramatically increased. The prospect of cyberattacks on hospital networks, power grids, or dams causing many casualties or considerable damage is not hard to imagine.

During its first edition in 2018, the Forum launched the Paris Call for Trust and Security in Cyberspace. This initiative quickly became the reference framework for cybersecurity, gathering more than 1,100 signatures worldwide, including from 78 states and 650 of the industry’s largest companies. It ushers
in a new method for establishing norms and limitations around acceptable behavior by modernizing the existing international governance architecture.

The third edition of the Forum will be an opportunity for the Paris Call community to take stock of the progress made during these first two years. With the initial phase of gathering and convergence of the actors now over, orientations will be set for the next phase, one of growth and consolidation. To this end, the many Paris Call stakeholders will structure their actions around six working groups that will strengthen the Call’s impact, particularly on existing multilateral processes, notably at the United Nations.

2. Fighting against infodemics

Misinformation, polarization, and divisions prevent our responses to the crisis from being as effective as they should and could be. In particular, so-called infodemics flourished as the pandemic developed, and the scientific community struggled to reach a consensus regarding this new virus.

We now know that this pattern is likely to be repeated. The Paris Peace Forum considers that social media can serve the democratic ideal by allowing individuals to have access to unprecedented freedom of communication, but only if regulation provides the stability needed to address the dangerous effects of polarization, the spread of hate speech, and the weakening of democratic frameworks.

During a ministerial meeting of the Alliance for Multilateralism, the Paris Peace Forum will propose a new initiative to develop a framework for restoring the trust required for democracy to operate adequately. This meeting will be an opportunity to present the report by the Forum on Information and Democracy’s infodemics working group and to reassert the right to reliable information.

3. Towards a framework for algorithmic governance

AI is still in its early days. As algorithms become more widespread and powerful, they will affect our lives more profoundly and shape our societies’ future.

Delegating an increasing number of tasks and decisions to algorithms provides almost infinite accuracy, efficiency, and cost benefits. This opens vast possibilities in every field, from medicine to energy, food, transportation, law, and finance. It enables the rapid development and generalization of many services that would otherwise have been considered too complex or costly to implement. But who will hold responsibility in a world that will be increasingly automated? What will happen if the decisions made by these algorithms do not always correspond to the values and principles we hold dear?

In contrast to their effectiveness, algorithms have been criticized for reinforcing existing social and economic structures and aggravating discrimination (especially against women and minorities). The new information flows managed by algorithms have revolutionized the dissemination of information and allowed many voices to be heard, but also accelerate echo chambers, the spread of misinformation, and the polarization of societies.
The spread of algorithmic decision-making has significant effects on society, institutions, and democracy, which need to be better controlled, debated, and regulated.

What does this world of increasingly automated decision-making mean for individual freedom and autonomy? These systems continually ingest and synthesize new data until they have a nuanced and dynamic understanding of how individuals respond to certain stimuli. They can be infinitely useful in helping us make better choices. But human perception, which leans on cognitive biases and judgment, can also be manipulated by sophisticated algorithms.

These are the questions we must address. They are currently rarely discussed with the main concerned stakeholders in frameworks allowing for answers to be provided. This third edition of the Forum will launch a new global initiative bringing together policymakers, the private sector, civil society, and researchers to address the key issues raised by algorithmic governance, particularly their impact on civil liberties, political rights, and individual autonomy. It will identify possible consensuses or compromises in developing a Digital Bill of Rights that will progressively draw the outlines of a digital social contract.

Related projects

*Digital Democracy Charter (project by Luminate):* This project is based on the idea that our democracies are awash in digital disinformation. Only a combination of policies – all of which are necessary and none of which are sufficient by themselves – will show results over time. Over the past 18 months, this project consisted of developing a policy agenda, the Digital Democracy Charter, built on the foundations of research sponsored by the Omidyar Network and already well received by several governments.

*Solar Media Bag (project by Tespack):* Tespack has created an all-in-one solution that combines hardware and software to provide access to education and humanitarian assistance in rural regions. Tespack’s Solar Media Bag (SMB) solution, developed in collaboration with Plan International, can turn any room into a fully-equipped classroom by incorporating power electronics, solar panels, and IoT software to tracking devices and energy generation. With Tespack’s SMB, agencies can provide high-quality educational content while creating energy to charge all their equipment. By tracking energy generation and battery health and lifespan, agencies can reduce CO2 emissions while providing easier technical maintenance and supporting circular economy and battery refurbishment. GPS tracking and anti-kidnapping features also enable off-grid personnel to be kept safe.
GREEN RECOVERY

Coordinating the economic recovery and global public investments (Finance in Common Summit)
The challenge

The health crisis has not stopped the climate crisis. While greenhouse gas emissions will have decreased this year due to the pandemic, the long-term impact on Earth’s temperature will remain undetectable (as it is affected by the accumulation of CO2 in the atmosphere over time rather than the emissions of a year). Greening and decarbonizing our lifestyles and long-term economic models therefore remains crucial.

To date, investments for this transition represent only about 1% of the $12 trillion currently pledged by major economies to recover from the recession caused by the pandemic. Accelerating this transition is imperative for the future of the planet.

How the Forum helps

The Finance in Common Summit

The Paris Peace Forum will host the first-ever gathering of all public development banks from around the world. These actors, major players in economic development, are responsible for 10% of annual global economy investments. Their ability to steer the economic recovery is thus substantial. A coalition of public development banks can contribute to the transformation of the financial system.

However, there was no platform for dialogue and exchanges among these actors, enabling them to coordinate their strategic priorities and investments. It is such a platform that the Agence Française de Développement and the Paris Peace Forum are building today.

The Finance in Common Summit will be held with world leaders and development banks from around the world. It will launch a new coalition of actors promoting a collective dynamic within the global response to shared challenges to redirect financial flows towards the objectives of the Paris Agreement and Sustainable Development Goals.
Public development banks have been addressing major local and regional challenges for years. As such, they could become vital elements in the new global equation for a green transition and the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. They will play a crucial role in reconciling short-term responses with sustainable recovery measures that will have a long-term impact on the planet and societies.

By bringing together and organizing such a global community with considerable financial capacity, the Finance in Common Summit will significantly contribute to the success of the UN Secretary-General’s «Decade of Action».

**Related projects**

**Sustainable Cities Program (project by the Sustainable Cities Institute):** The Sustainable Cities Program (SCP) works to build awareness and mobilize Brazilian cities to adopt and implement a sustainable agenda. The SCP takes a pioneering role in implementing and municipalizing SDGs in Brazil through a comprehensive set of indicators across 13 thematic axes. It addresses public administration via an integrated perspective, including social, environmental, economic, political, and cultural dimensions. It also provides cities with inspiring practices. The program covers 215 committed cities, representing 61 million people in Brazil. As part of the process, the governor/mayor pledges to develop a diagnosis and present a Goals Plan for the four years in office, ensuring participation, transparency, and commitment towards sectoral plans and policies. It aims to change the political culture to ensure the full implementation of rights to reduce socio-territorial disparities.
**AI for Climate (project by C MINDS):** AI for Climate aims to help the human family achieve climate stability and stop biodiversity loss by harnessing the power of AI. How? Firstly, by installing monitoring technology in hundreds of natural reserves around the world and analyzing the data with AI. Secondly, by creating a knowledge-sharing platform through global forums to foster the cross-pollination of solutions. Thirdly, by creating a global Data Trust that fast-forwards solutions. In just seven months, AI for Climate has gathered the support of over twenty institutions, companies and foundations, resources, and two nature reserves to perform the project’s pilots. One in the desert, to protect 300-year-old cactuses, and one in the mangroves to protect many bird and reptile species. AI for Climate will also create new value chains powered by data that goes from the communities in and around nature reserves towards the cities.

**Textile Equitable : Partenariat pour une filière textile mondialisée et durable (project by Max Havelaar):** The Fairtrade certification already benefits 1.7 million vulnerable producers & workers in 1,700 producing organizations, representing 10 million direct and indirect beneficiaries in 74 developing countries. About 2,000 companies (hundreds of SMEs and some multinationals) are involved with us: based on a win-win partnership (SDG 17), the Fairtrade standards ensure sustainable, socially responsible, and reliable supplies in terms of quality. Textile Equitable aims to extend this to the textile sector, which is emblematic of irresponsible globalization. Textile Equitable aims to deploy an innovative partnership model capable of providing a pragmatic and directly deployable soft law framework in order to enhance voluntary commitments that have proven to be too heterogeneous and inefficient.
OUTER SPACE
The challenge

On 22 September, the International Space Station had to perform an evasive maneuver when its orbit risked crossing that of a Japanese launcher debris. Earlier the same month, LUCH, a Russian variable orbit satellite, came dangerously close to an Intelsat geostationary satellite, raising as much concern as suspicion in the space community regarding a potential spying operation. In this industry more than elsewhere, the absence of a global governance system integrating all the players leads to additional costs for all as well as risks for their operations.

Although space may seem far away, its civil and commercial uses nevertheless have very concrete influences on our daily lives. According to Morgan Stanley, the space market currently represents an economy of approximately 350 billion dollars and could reach more than 1,000 billion dollars by 2040. More than the exploration and even exploitation of space resources, the outer space El Dorado is banking on the evolution of the space market towards a data economy: telecommunications, broadband internet, satellite guidance, connected objects are all applications for a rapidly growing market.

This economic boom is driven by the changing industrial ecosystem, with the arrival on the market of private players with expertise across the entire value chain – from shuttle launches to the use of spatial data, as well as satellite construction and management – and inspired by the business model of the digital giants. The so-called NewSpace has disrupted the space market just as many emerging countries are beginning to look to the stars. China, the United Arab Emirates, Japan, Nigeria, Egypt... Numerous countries with different means and ambitions have recently set up significant space programs. The traditional space powers, first and foremost, the United States, will soon have to come to terms with this new plurality of actors determined to claim their right of access to space.

But while more and more actors are active in outer space and a new space race seems to be underway, concerns are emerging. The long-term viability of a commons that, by definition, everyone likes to exploit without anyone being formally responsible for its maintenance or regulation, is called into question. To date, there are 5,500 satellites in orbit around Earth, with just under 2,800 stakeholders. Starlink, the SpaceX mega-constellation designed to develop a global broadband Internet network, has obtained launch authorization from the American government for no less than 12,000 satellites. The risks of congestion in Earth orbits exist, primarily since many debris, resulting from past human operations, is already circulating at some 28,000 km/h (i.e., 7.8 km per second), and is forcing the various satellite operators to perform increasingly regular circumvention maneuvers.
How the Forum helps

Towards efficient standards for responsible behavior in outer space

In contrast to cyberspace, outer space has been subject to many normative projects to ensure its use was sustainable and peaceful from the very beginning of its exploration by human beings. However, only the 1967 Outer Space Treaty currently has the force of law, as all the successive international agreements have failed to reach consensus or, more subtly, have not been ratified. As for private or civil society initiatives, their conceptual and practical strength is faced with divergence, if not outright opposition from various actors: traditional space industries facing NewSpace actors, space agencies, which are both commercial and regulatory players in their national markets, and states fearful of the intentions of their foreign counterparts.

Most of the effective normative body is thus composed of a juxtaposition of national frameworks, the interoperability of which is not always guaranteed and which sometimes prove to be openly opposed. However, it is clear to all outer space users – states, private companies, public operators, agencies, and civil society organizations – that better governance is essential to ensure the safety of operations in a rapidly growing space market.

Based on the work carried out in 2018 for the adoption of the Paris Call for Trust and Security in Cyberspace, the Paris Peace Forum intends to gather all relevant actors to build a shared normative reference framework for the security of space operations together. The 2020 edition of the Forum will be an opportunity to take stock of each stakeholder’s priorities, identify bottlenecks, and determine the topics on which a core group of actors will move forward with the Forum with the aim of drawing up a preliminary declaration.
**Related projects**

*Space education (un projet de la Society for Space Education, Research and Development):*

This project provides and promotes space education and encourages its teaching in Indian schools. It aims to educate young people in space science and technology, develop their skills, and encourage them to pursue careers in the space sector. Courses on space topics have been delivered to over 10,000 students since 2016, complemented by the development of an online space education module. The project is being implemented in India and will continue to develop strategic partnerships to expand beyond the Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Mauritius.

Among the space powers, so-called emerging countries are more and more numerous to aim for autonomous access to outer space and to develop ambitious programs to do so. Among them, India is by far the most advanced country with a developed civil industry and, more recently, a theorized national space strategy. Education on space topics and related skills is a development issue all the more critical as the market is one of the most promising over the coming decades.