



G20 and Global Governance Innovation E-Consultation Synthesis Report

Tuesday, 24 February until Wednesday, 8 April 2026

From December 2025 until December 2026, the United States has, once again, assumed the G20 Presidency. According to U.S. government’s official announcement:¹

Effective today, December 1, 2025, the United States has assumed the 2026 Presidency of the Group of 20 (G20). ...we will return the G20 to focusing on its core mission of driving economic growth and prosperity to produce results. As we usher in these much-needed reforms, we will prioritize three core themes: unleashing economic prosperity by limiting regulatory burdens, unlocking affordable and secure energy supply chains, and pioneering new technologies and innovations.

The G20 Sherpas subsequently met, on 15 and 16 December in Washington, D.C., and launched working groups to develop concrete deliverables for these three themes, along with an additional working group to identify areas of consensus on trade. Since the United States helped to elevate the Group of 20 (G20) to a heads-of-state forum at the November 2008 G20 Washington Summit in response to the 2008-9 global financial crisis, this gathering of the most influential states — *accounting for around 85% of global GDP, over 75% of global trade, and about two-thirds of the world’s population* — has contributed, alongside and in support of Member State-led global and regional organizations, to novel and agile approaches to global and regional decision-making, collective action, and governance.

Since the early 2010s, policy research “think tanks” around the world have been informally organized as the Think Tank 20 (T20) network to offer practical and timely knowledge products for G20 policy-makers. It brings together some of the world’s sharpest thought leaders and policy research institutes to provide *all* G20 members with a global research capacity to drive evidence-based policy-making.

Table of Contents: G20 and Global Governance Innovation E-Consultation Synthesis Report

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction: | 2 |
| Segment 1: Facilitating a New Consensus on Trade and Regulations for Balanced, People-Centered Economic Growth (24 February - 2 March) | 2 |
| Segment 2: Unlocking Affordable and Secure Energy Supply Chains, while Promoting Climate Action (3 - 9 March) | 5 |
| Segment 3: Fostering Technological Innovation, Inclusive AI Governance, and the Fair Trade of Critical Minerals (10 - 16 March) | 8 |
| Segment 4: Renewing the International Financial Architecture, including a UN Tax Convention and upgraded UN Convention Against Corruption (17 - 23 March) | 10 |
| Segment 5: Strengthening the Collective Security and Justice Architecture (24 - 30 March) | 13 |
| Segment 6: Cross-cutting and Missing Themes for the T20/G20 U.S. 2026 (31 March - 8 April) | 16 |
| Annex I: Policy Research/Knowledge Resources Shared by Participants | 19 |
| Annex II: Participants in the G20 and Global Governance Innovation E-Consultation | 23 |

¹ U.S. Department of State, “[United States Assumes Presidency of the Group of 20](#),” December 1, 2025.

Introduction: An E-Consultation to Inform Future T20 Policy Research/Knowledge Products for the G20

The following synthesis report stems from a six-week (24 February - 8 April 2026) moderated “G20 and Global Governance Innovation E-Consultation” e-consultation and details the analytical insights and creative policy and institutional reform proposals of the forum’s participants (found in [Annex II](#)). In particular, the report underscores the findings from consecutive, one-week online dialogues per each thematic concentration area of the proposed T20 U.S. Thematic Workstreams and Advisory Council, plus one, cross-thematic general concluding week discussion. A key focus of each (one-week) segment of the e-consultation is the identification of individual policy research topics to be later explored by the T20 U.S. Thematic Workstreams and the Advisory Council in 2026 (*to receive periodic T20 U.S. updates, visit: <https://ggin.stimson.org/t20-u-s-information-page/>*). Additionally, [Annex I](#) showcases relevant policy research / knowledge resources in connection with the e-consultation’s six segments.

Moderated in a manner similar to in-person, multistakeholder dialogues, this e-consultation yields multiple added benefits, including: a) truly global reach and publicity for the work of scholars and policy research engaged in G20 and wider global governance studies; b) when convenient, scholars/policy researchers could respond thoughtfully (and succinctly), while sharing hyperlinks of their research in response to guiding questions posed by e-consultation thematic session co-facilitators (on a weekly basis); and c) the production of this rich, not-for-personal attribution synthesis report (to encourage more frank, open dialogue) for then use and active follow-up, in particular, by the T20 U.S. Workstreams and Advisory Council in supporting, in 2026, their members’ timely production policy notes, policy solutions, and commentaries.

Addressing the e-consultation’s interconnected set of challenges requires coordinated action across governments, multilateral institutions, private sector actors, and civil society. This includes philanthropic actors, which can play a complementary role within this ecosystem, particularly by supporting innovation, strengthening delivery systems, and helping to bridge fragmented agendas where public and market-based approaches face constraints. In doing so, philanthropy can contribute to policy experimentation, technical assistance, and evidence generation, while supporting inclusive participation and strengthening the enabling conditions for more responsive and effective governance.

In supporting the generation of policy-oriented knowledge products for the G20 U.S.’ four Working Groups, as well as recurring areas of substantive engagement by the T20 policy research network, the following six (one-week each, back-to-back) thematic dialogues were undertaken for the G20 and Global Governance Innovation E-Consultation. Below are the co-facilitators, contributors, guiding questions, summary of contributions, and key takeaways from each segment:

Segment 1: Facilitating a New Consensus on Trade and Regulations for Balanced, People-Centered Economic Growth (24 February - 2 March)

Thank you to the Segment One Co-Facilitators:

Antonio Villafranca (Vice President for Research, Italian Institute for International Political Studies), **Dr. Edna Ramirez-Robles** (Professor of Public International and International Trade Law, University of Guadalajara), **Anna-Katharina Hornidge** (Director, German Institute of Development and Sustainability), **Sani Bala** (Executive Director, Savannah Centre for Diplomacy, Democracy, and Development), **Mahmoud Arbouch** (Senior Economist, Policy Center for the New South), and **Kiyoyuki Seguchi** (Research Director, The Canon Institute for Global Studies).

The first thematic segment of the e-consultation focused on ways to further facilitate and innovate both global multilateral (World Trade Organization - WTO) and plurilateral trade arrangements, to better leverage the potential “win-win” benefits from — while mitigating against any risks or “public bads” associated with — international trade. Furthermore, this thematic priority area assessed regulatory challenges, such as duplicative regulations or high

compliance costs, that may hamper international economic initiatives and cooperation. It explored potential, shared priority areas among all G20 Member States and regional groupings for smarter, more cost-benefit-justified regulations.

Discussions revealed broad agreement that current pressures on the multilateral trading system reflect deeper transformations in the global political economy rather than temporary institutional blockages. Contributors emphasized the growing intersection between trade policy, national security considerations, industrial strategies, sustainability transitions, and digital regulation. Alongside multilateral challenges, participants highlighted domestic regulatory divergence as an increasingly central obstacle to cross-border cooperation. Exchanges also explored how the G20 and related policy networks could support pragmatic pathways toward regulatory cooperation, institutional adaptation, and renewed political buy-in for multilateral trade governance.

Thank you for Segment One contributions from:

Son Nguyen (Partnership for Climate and Nature Governance), **Dr. Alexander Shenderov** (World Futures Studies Federation), **Peter Middlebrook** (Geopolicy), **Anne Simmons-Benton** (W20-USA), **Barry Herman** (Social Justice in Global Development), **Henry Gao** (Singapore Management University), **Dr. Kakha Nadiradze** (Association for Farmers Rights Defense), **Bettina Rudloff** (German Institute of International and Security Affairs), **Gian Cesare Romagnoli** (Università Roma Tre), **Daryl Swanepoel** (Inclusive Society Institute), **Olayinka Kareem** (University of Hohenheim), **Dr. Nanda Kumar Janardhanan** (Institute for Global Environmental Strategies), **Dr. Stewart Nixon** (Institute for Democracy and Economic Affairs), **Salvatore Barillà** (Newcastle University), **Haihong Gao** (Institute of World Economics and Politics, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences), **Luísa Bianchet** (Energy Transition Diplomacy Analyst at E+ Institute), **Dr. Syed Munir Khasru** (The Institute for Policy, Advocacy and Governance), **Hector R Torres** (Centre for International Governance Innovation), **Dr. Saon Ray** (ICRIER), **Jeremie Kasongo** (Global Enviro-Action), **Prince Tanyi Justin Ajinga** (Union Farms of Africa/COFAAA), **Franco Passacantando** (Istituto Affari Internazionali), **Thiago Martinez** (Institute of Applied Economic Research), **Siphamandla Zondi** (Institute for Global African Affairs), **Dr. Zeno Leoni** (King's College London), **Dr. Mia Mikic** (Waikato University), **Dr. Sherry Stephenson** (Pacific Economic Cooperation Council (PECC)), **Françoise Nicolas** (French Institute of International Relations), **Nicolas Buchoud** (Global Solutions Initiative), **Sait Akman** (The Economic Policy Research Foundation of Türkiye), **Aranyam Kashyap** (Independent Civil Society Contributor), **Dr. Alice Odingo** (University of Nairobi), **Mahmoud Arbouch** (Policy Center for the New South), **Maarten Smeets** (Trade and Investment Research Network), **Rose Ngugi** (African Economic Research Consortium), **Joris Larik** (Leiden University), **Fernando Ribeiro** (Institute of Applied Economic Research), **Heather Hurlburt** (Chatham House), and **Dr. Edna Ramirez** (University of Guadalajara), **Dr. Richard Ponzio** (Stimson Center/GGIN), **Suchandrima Chakraborty** (Khushi Baby), **Ishan Ganguly** (Independent Consultant), and **Dr. Celine Kauffmann** (Institute for Sustainable Development and International Relations).

Guiding Questions:

- 1) What are the top one-or-two leading political or structural design problems facing the World Trade Organization, contributing to its failure to impede one of the biggest upheavals in the global trading system in recent history? Similarly, what are the chief regulatory challenges within countries today that may hamper cross-border economic cooperation, limiting the potential to promote balanced, people-centered economic growth?
- 2) Have the WTO's consensus-based decision-making, most-favored nation (MFN) principle, and dispute settlement mechanisms proved adequate in an era of heightened Great Power geopolitical and economic tensions?
- 3) What are one-or-two global governance reform innovations (in the form of proposed institutional, legal, policy, operational, and/or normative changes) that could facilitate a new consensus on trade and regulations for balanced, people-centered economic growth?

Participants pointed to a growing gap between the institutional design of the multilateral trading system and the realities shaping global trade today. Many noted that the WTO was established during a period when trade liberalization could be pursued relatively independently from geopolitical competition, whereas contemporary trade relations are increasingly influenced by national security concerns, industrial policy strategies, and broader geopolitical tensions. Several contributors also highlighted that the system's rulemaking and enforcement functions have struggled to keep pace with these shifts, contributing to declining confidence in the WTO's ability to manage current disruptions in the global trading system. Alongside these structural challenges, participants emphasized that trade frictions increasingly arise

from domestic regulatory frameworks in addition to traditional tariff barriers. Divergent standards, sustainability requirements, digital governance regimes, and complex compliance procedures were frequently cited as barriers that complicate cross-border economic cooperation, particularly for developing economies and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). To reduce compliance burdens, emphasis should be placed on strengthening structured, regular coordination.

Participants generally viewed the core institutional principles of the multilateral trading system as normatively important but increasingly strained under current geopolitical conditions. Several contributors noted that consensus-based decision-making was originally intended to ensure legitimacy and sovereign equality among members, yet in practice it has become difficult to operationalize in a system with more than 160 economies and increasingly divergent strategic interests. Similarly, the most-favored nation MFN principle was widely recognized as a cornerstone of the rules-based trading system, though participants observed that its practical application has been weakened by the growing prevalence of preferential trade agreements, strategic partnerships, and other policy workarounds. The discussion also highlighted the erosion of confidence in dispute settlement and trust among Member States, particularly following the paralysis of the WTO's Appellate Body and the increasing use of unilateral trade measures justified on national security or strategic grounds. Many participants emphasized that these institutional tensions reflect broader geopolitical shifts in which trade policy is increasingly intertwined with economic security, industrial strategy, and domestic political considerations.

Finally, participants emphasized that restoring cooperation in the trading system will require adaptation rather than a return to earlier models of liberalization. Many contributors highlighted the importance of introducing greater procedural flexibility within the multilateral framework, while maintaining core principles such as transparency, non-discrimination, and enforceability. Parallel efforts should be made to restore predictability, reciprocity, and perceived fairness as core foundations of trade governance within the WTO framework. In this context, several responses pointed to plurilateral initiatives as a practical avenue for advancing cooperation among willing members in areas such as digital trade, regulatory coordination, or investment facilitation, while remaining connected to the broader WTO framework. At the same time, participants underscored the need to strengthen transparency and dialogue around subsidies, industrial policy, and regulatory measures in order to rebuild trust among members. Contributors stressed that future trade governance reforms should incorporate development equity and regulatory capacity considerations, so that developing economies and smaller firms can participate more effectively in global trade.

Key Takeaways:

- The structural mismatch between the WTO's design and contemporary trade dynamics is shaped by geopolitics, policy, and economic security considerations.
- There is interest in open, inclusive plurilateral cooperation as a pathway to advance rulemaking within the multilateral system.
- There is an increasing importance of regulatory divergence, including in the areas of sustainability standards, digital governance rules, and compliance requirements, as sources of potential trade friction.
- The disproportionate compliance burdens on developing economies and small and medium-sized enterprises remains a challenge.
- Consensus-based decision-making remains a source of legitimacy, but increasingly contributes to institutional paralysis in a multipolar, global trading system.
- The MFN principle continues to function as a key safeguard against fragmentation.
- The credibility of dispute settlement has weakened due to the WTO's Appellate Body impasse and the expanding use of unilateral trade measures.
- There is support for adaptive reform approaches that preserve core multilateral principles, while introducing greater procedural flexibility.

- Strengthening transparency and dialogue around subsidies and regulatory measures would rebuild trust and predictability.
- Development equity, regulatory capacity-building, and SMEs participation should be integrated into future trade governance reforms (both at global and regional-levels of trade governance).
- The credibility of dispute settlement has weakened due to the WTO's Appellate Body impasse and the expanding use of unilateral trade measures.
- Divergent interests among major actors regarding the scope and substance of the reform process in WTO is challenging.
- There is interest in open, inclusive, plurilateral cooperation as a pathway to advance rulemaking within the multilateral system.
- The G20 constitutes a distinctive forum for achieving cooperation in global trade and has the potential to reduce the transaction costs inherent in multilateral trade negotiations.

Segment 2: Unlocking Affordable and Secure Energy Supply Chains, while Promoting Climate Action (3 - 9 March)

Thank you to the Segment Two Co-Facilitators:

Maja Groff (Executive Director, Climate Governance Commission), **Celine Kauffmann** (Chief Programmes Officer, Institute for Sustainable Development and International Relations), **Vitoria Gonzalez** (Project Coordinator, Plataforma CIPÓ), **Maiara Folly** (Executive Director and Co-Founder, Plataforma CIPÓ), **Eoin Jackson** (Chief of Staff, Climate Governance Commission), **Sheetal Sinha** (Council on Energy, Environment, and Water), **Shuva Raha** (Fellow and Lead, Council on Energy, Environment, and Water), **Rebekah Shirley** (Deputy Director, WRI Africa), **Clem Perry** (Clean Energy Supply Global Lead, WRI) Africa, and **Sarang Shidore** (Director, Quincy Institute).

This second thematic segment of the e-consultation identified the means and mechanisms for reliable access to affordable energy. It also aimed to advance concrete policy and institutional reform proposals on a just green energy transition and the scaling-up of affordable energy infrastructure. Moreover, this thematic area focused on strengthening G20 action commitments on environmental governance and climate resilience, by assessing existing global and regional governance gaps and proposing common action and innovations on policies, institutions (e.g., working with Brazil to further define its UN Climate Change Council proposal, to be considered in 2026 by the General Assembly), and practices to better protect ecosystems, communities, and economies.

Thank you for Segment Two contributions from:

Maja Groff (Climate Governance Commission), **Vitória Gonzalez** (Plataforma CIPÓ), **Luísa Bianchet** (Instituto E+ Transição Energética), **Son Nguyen** (Partnership for Climate and Nature Governance), **Dr. Alexander Shenderov** (World Futures Studies Federation), **Heela Rasool-Ayub** (New America), **Aranyam Kashyap** (Independent Consultant), **Dr. Saon Ray** (ICRIER), **Dr. Alicia Garcia Guerrero** (Bruegel), **Alyn Ware** (WFM/IGP), **Jeremie Kasongo** (Global Enviro-Action), **Justin Snyder** (Global Governance Innovation Network), **Dr. Richard Ponzio** (Stimson Center/GGIN), **Dr. Michael Franczak** (UNU-Centre for Policy Research), **Helene Van Rossum** (IDDRI), **Anna Perez-Catala** (IDDRI), **Dr. Celine Kauffman** (IDDRI), **Dr. Igor Makarov** (HSE University), **Alex Stapleton** (Foreign Policy for America), **Jin Tada** (National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies), **Ishan Ganguly** (Independent Consultant), **Dr. Syed Munir Khasru** (The Institute for Policy, Advocacy and Governance), **Einar Tangen** (Centre for International Governance Innovation), **Sarang Shidore** (Quincy Institute), and **Dr. Mikatekiso Kubayi** (Institute for Global Dialogue/ANUMDI).

Guiding Questions:

- 1) What are the top one-or-two leading political or structural design flaws within the international financial architecture (and solutions for the same) that most constrain developing and emerging economies' access to affordable green technology and clean energy finance, thereby slowing the global energy transition?
- 2) Which major global, regional, and national actors are currently shaping the response to the climate and energy transition challenge, and are their post-COP30 commitments adequate to seize emerging opportunities in clean energy deployment, climate finance reform, and fossil fuel phase-out? How might momentum from COP30 influence progress at the upcoming First International Conference for the Just Transition Away from Fossil Fuels in Colombia, including, among others, consideration of the proposed Fossil Fuel Non-Proliferation Treaty? Moreover, do the current positions of major producers and consumers – or other trends – suggest potential for a meaningful shift toward more binding constraints, or, conversely, the continued fragmentation in global climate governance?
- 3) Building on the [final letter issued by the COP30 President](#), which proposes a form of “two-tier multilateralism” — with a second tier focused squarely on implementation — what concrete institutional, legal, and operational innovations are required to move from high-level climate pledges to enforceable or otherwise effective, finance-backed delivery mechanisms? Would a platform or platforms for more coordinated governance of various priority transition energy sources, such as nuclear or green hydrogen, for example, be helpful, as developing countries look to practically achieve decarbonization goals?

Participants identified structural asymmetries within the international financial architecture as a major constraint on developing and emerging economies' ability to access affordable clean energy technology. Several contributions highlighted that sovereign risk pricing, credit rating methodologies, and currency mismatches between international financing and locally generated revenues contribute to persistently higher costs of capital for renewable energy projects in many developing countries. As a result, economies with significant renewable energy potential often face more expensive financing conditions than economies with greater fiscal space. Contributors also noted that governance structures within multilateral development banks and other international financial institutions continue to reflect historical power distributions that limit the influence of climate-vulnerable economies over lending priorities and risk frameworks. Addressing these constraints was seen as requiring reforms that expand concessional finance, improve risk-sharing mechanisms, revisit sovereign risk assessment models, and create greater fiscal space for transition-related investments in developing economies.

Participants emphasized that the global response to the climate and energy transition is currently shaped by a diverse set of actors, including national governments, multilateral development banks, regional coalitions, subnational authorities, and private investors operating across multiple governance arenas. While recent commitments associated with COP30 have signaled growing political attention to climate finance reform and fossil fuel transition pathways, contributors noted that implementation remains uneven and fragmented, especially between major actors such as the European Union, Brazil, China, India, and the United States, as well as energy-producing states. Several responses highlighted persistent coordination gaps between climate policy frameworks, international financial institutions, and industrial policy strategies, which complicate efforts to translate global commitments into domestic action. These coordination gaps also pervade across under-addressed dimensions of the climate transition, including climate-related migration and the need to more seriously consider justice and community participation in international climate governance frameworks. Some participants observed that emerging coalitions of willing countries and regional initiatives may help to sustain momentum where consensus at the global level proves difficult, but these arrangements also risk reinforcing fragmentation if they remain disconnected from established multilateral processes and institutions.

An additional implementation gap concerns who is able and willing to support locally grounded, justice-oriented transitions over time. This is especially relevant for adaptation, resilience, energy, democracy, and community-centred transition design, where success depends not only on capital flows, but also on social legitimacy, civic space, and sustained engagement with affected populations. Structured Public-Private-Philanthropic-People partnerships offer value as part of the implementation architecture for the energy transition. In such arrangements, public actors help to create

enabling policy frameworks, investment signals, and planning certainty; private actors contribute scale, technical expertise, and execution capacity; and philanthropic actors can play a catalytic role by supporting research, early-stage project preparation, technical assistance, locally trusted intermediaries, community participation in decision-making processes, and forms of risk-sharing that help move priority initiatives toward bankability.

Looking ahead, participants stressed the importance of strengthening mechanisms that translate high-level climate pledges into practical implementation. Contributors emphasized that bridging the gap between ambition and implementation will require stronger coordination between climate policy objectives and financial mandates, clearer metrics for tracking progress, stronger overall monitoring, and more effective mechanisms for mobilizing and deploying climate finance. Several responses also highlighted the potential value of coordinated governance platforms for key transition technologies and energy systems, which could support technology transfer, financing arrangements, and regulatory alignment while allowing countries to pursue diverse pathways toward decarbonization based on their specific economic and resource contexts. Other major proposals included instituting a UN Climate Change Council, a Global Environmental Organization (GEO) building on an upgraded UN Environment Program, and signing and ratifying a UN Fossil Fuel Treaty to address the long-term effects of the climate crisis.

Key Takeaways:

- Structural barriers within the international financial architecture, including sovereign risk pricing, credit rating methodologies, and currency mismatches, contribute to higher costs of capital for clean energy investments in developing economies.
- Governance imbalances within multilateral development banks and international financial institutions are limiting the influence of climate-vulnerable economies over financing priorities.
- Expanding concessional finance, strengthening risk-sharing mechanisms, and revisiting sovereign risk assessment models are potential pathways to unlock greater investment in clean energy infrastructure.
- There is a diverse ecosystem of actors shaping the energy transition, including national governments, multilateral development banks, regional coalitions, subnational authorities, and private investors.
- COP30 commitments are generating political momentum, yet implementation remains uneven across climate, financial, and industrial policy frameworks.
- Emerging coalitions and regional initiatives are sustaining progress but also raising concerns about continued fragmentation in global climate governance.
- There should be greater focus on implementation mechanisms that translate high-level climate commitments into finance-backed projects and infrastructure investments.
- There is interest in “two-tier multilateralism” as a model separating consensus-based rule setting from implementation-focused cooperation.
- Coordinated governance platforms around key transition technologies, such as hydrogen, nuclear energy, and grid infrastructure to support technology transfer and investment mobilization, are urgently needed.
- Philanthropy can act as catalytic capital and implementation support, helping to derisk private capital and unlocking more capital for initiatives centering people and communities.
- Reducing the cost of capital and expanding risk-sharing mechanisms are essential to unlocking clean-energy investment in underserved markets.
- Structured public-private-philanthropic-people partnerships can help to connect policy ambition, investable pipelines, and locally grounded delivery in the energy transition.

Segment 3: Fostering Technological Innovation, Inclusive AI Governance, and the Fair Trade of Critical Minerals (10 - 16 March)

Thank you to the Segment Three Co-Facilitators:

Louiza Odingo (Operations Manager, Lawyers Hub Africa), **Linda Bonyo** (Founder, Lawyers Hub Africa and Director, Africa Law Tech), **Vidisha Mishra** (Director, Global Outreach & Policy, Global Solutions Initiative), **Christian Kastrop** (President and CEO, Global Solutions Initiative), **Paul Samson** (President, Center for International Governance Innovations), **Maria João Rodrigues** (Advisory Board Chair, Reimagined Europa), and **Francisco Segovia Losa** (Programme Officer, Club de Madrid).

The third week segment of the e-consultation centered on advancing the development and diffusion of new technologies (e.g., artificial intelligence, biotech, quantum computing, etc.), including securing trade access and the infrastructure needed for the fair trade of critical minerals that are so central to technological development. It also engaged in regulatory questions around global and regional governance of digital public infrastructure and artificial intelligence (including the UN Global Digital Compact's new Global Dialogue on AI Governance and Independent International Scientific Panel on AI).

Thank you for Segment Three contributions from:

Dr. Alexander Shenderov (World Futures Studies Federation), **Son Nguyen** (Partnership for Climate and Nature Governance), **Dr. Fredrick Ogenga** (Rongo University), **Jin Tada** (University Student Chamber International), **Jeremie Kasongo** (Global Enviro-Action), **Luisa Braga Bianchet**, Instituto E+ Transição Energética, **Dr. Richard Ponzio** (Stimson Center and Global Governance Innovation Network), **Rohit Kumar** (Zedsoftpoint), **Dr. Sandra Tombe** (ACUNS), **Maria João Rodrigues** (Re-imagine Europa), **Dr. Celine Kauffmann** (IDDRI), **Aranyam Kashyap** (Independent Consultant), **Dr. Cornelia Walther** (Sunway University), **Vidisha Mishra** (GSI), **Daryl Swanepoel** (Inclusive Society Institute), **Dr. Christina Turczyn** (Fulbright Association), **Dr. Syed Munir Khasru** (Institute for Policy, Advocacy, & Governance), **Louiza Odingo** (Lawyers Hub), **Einar Tangen** (Centre for International Governance Innovation), and **Adriana Abdenur** (Global Fund for a New Economy), **Sarah Nicole** (Project Liberty Institute), **Linjia Zhou** (DAlpha.ai), **Dr. Saon Ray** (ICRIER), **Dr. Sherry Stephenson** (Pacific Economic Cooperation Council), **Nanda Kumar Janardhanan** (Institute for Global Environmental Strategies), **Lauren S. Power** (Sophia University), **Ishan Ganguly** (Independent Consultant), **Dr. Susan Ariel Aaronson** (GWU), **Dr. Alex He** (Center for International Governance Innovation), and **Francisco Segovia** (Club de Madrid),

Guiding Questions:

- 1) Emerging tech represents opportunities and threats for all countries. What are the most significant barriers — and best policy levers — to appropriately develop and diffuse these technologies within countries and across sectors? As enabling conditions expand to include cloud infrastructure and data, can digital public infrastructure (DPI) help support this ecosystem?
- 2) What trade access, standards, and physical/digital infrastructure are most needed to enable fair, secure, and reliable critical-minerals supply chains that support the development of key technologies? With the United States and China leading the global digital transformation, how can countries design tailored solutions that reflect their unique economic structures, development levels, and sectoral priorities to leverage these supply chains?
- 3) How should governance arrangements for AI and digital public infrastructure evolve? Which global and regional mechanisms are most promising? Should existing initiatives — such as the Global Dialogue for AI Governance and the Independent International Scientific Panel on AI — be complemented by a UN AI agency (or “International Artificial Intelligence Agency,” perhaps modeled on the International Atomic Energy Agency?) to monitor core principles and developments? Could a global platform for exchanging best practices also strengthen practical forms of coordination and cooperation?

Participants emphasized that the diffusion of emerging technologies is constrained by the uneven distribution of digital infrastructure and the capacity needed to support it. In many countries, particularly in the Global South, limited

broadband networks, insufficient cloud and data center capacity, gaps in data and compute access, and shortages of skilled talent make it difficult for firms, universities, and public institutions to adopt advanced technologies. Several contributors noted that these constraints can reinforce technological dependency, unless countries are able to build stronger domestic innovation ecosystems and policies that support experimentation. Digital public infrastructure (DPI) was widely viewed as an important enabler. Interoperable systems, such as digital identity frameworks, payment platforms, open data systems, and localized AI models, can lower barriers to entry for startups and Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs), improve data-sharing, and support more inclusive digital services. Participants also stressed that these systems will only succeed if they are supported by adequate financing, strong public-private partnerships, and governance frameworks that address sovereignty, inclusivity, and transparency.

More inclusive multi-stakeholder platforms can help to strengthen the development and governance of digital public infrastructure and emerging technology ecosystems. In particular, stronger collaboration among governments, private-sector actors, philanthropy, academia, and civil society could help to address persistent financing, skills, and coordination gaps, while widening access for smaller and non-formalised actors to participate in innovation ecosystems. This is especially important in contexts where digital transformation risks reinforcing existing inequalities unless governance arrangements deliberately support local capacity, inclusive participation, and pathways for experimentation.

Participants highlighted that current critical-mineral supply chains often leave resource-rich countries locked into low-value extraction and its effect on the conflict in those regions further limiting their ability to benefit from the technological transformations these minerals enable. Several contributions suggested that emerging technologies, including AI, could help countries move beyond this pattern by supporting technology transfer, skills development, and stronger industrial partnerships that build domestic processing and manufacturing capacity. Diversifying supply chains will also require greater transparency and stronger trade frameworks, alongside sustained investment in energy, transport, and processing infrastructure. Participants also emphasized that supply chain governance must account for broader development and environmental concerns. Ensuring fair distribution of economic benefits, protecting ecosystems, and strengthening participation from local and Indigenous communities were seen as essential for building more legitimate and resilient mineral supply chains. Digital tools that improve traceability and transparency were also identified as promising ways to strengthen accountability across global value chains.

Participants broadly agreed that governance frameworks for AI and digital public infrastructure will need to evolve quickly to balance innovation with safety, accountability, and inclusive participation. Existing initiatives, such as the Global Digital Compact and the newly established Independent International Scientific Panel on AI, were seen as important starting points. Still, many contributors argued that additional mechanisms for coordination and knowledge sharing are necessary. Several participants supported, for instance, the idea of an international platform that could bring together governments, industry, academia, philanthropy, and civil society to exchange best practices, build technical capacity, and improve policy coordination. While some contributors expressed openness to the idea of a UN AI agency, others cautioned that highly centralized institutions may struggle to keep pace with the rapid and decentralized evolution of AI technologies. Across these perspectives, there was strong agreement that effective governance must include greater participation from Global South actors, stronger protections for data sovereignty, and sustained efforts to ensure that AI systems support sustainable development and human rights.

Key Takeaways:

- The uneven distribution of digital infrastructure, cloud computing, and data resources are a core barrier to the diffusion of emerging technologies.
- Persistent gaps in research capacity, digital skills, and financing constrain domestic innovation ecosystems in many developing and emerging economies.

- Digital public infrastructure (DPI) is a key enabler for technology adoption through interoperable systems, such as digital identity, payments, and open data platforms.
- There is a risk of technological dependency where limited infrastructure and capacity reinforce asymmetries in the global technology ecosystem.
- Critical-mineral supply chains continue to concentrate value in downstream processing and manufacturing while resource-rich countries remain locked into low-value extraction.
- There is a need for diversified and resilient mineral supply chains supported by transparent trade frameworks, environmental and labor standards, and infrastructure investment contributing to building domestic capacity and regional stability.
- Technology transfer, industrial partnerships, and skills development are needed to help resource-producing economies move up the value chain.
- There is also a growing interest in digital traceability systems and open data standards to strengthen transparency and accountability in global supply chains.
- AI governance frameworks must balance innovation with safety, accountability, and equitable participation.
- There are further calls for stronger global coordination mechanisms, greater Global South representation, and safeguards for data sovereignty in emerging technology governance.

Segment 4: Renewing the International Financial Architecture, including a UN Tax Convention and upgraded UN Convention Against Corruption (17 - 23 March)

Thank you to the Segment Four Co-Facilitators:

Maiara Folly (Executive Director, Plataforma CIPÓ), **Dr. Sara Pantuliano** (Chief Executive, ODI Global), **Dr. Courtney Lindsay** (Senior Research Officer, ODI Global), **Dr. Mona Barake** (External Research Fellow, ODI Global), **Nic Buchoud** (Fellow, Asian Development Bank Institute; Senior Fellow, Nalanda University, Fellow, Global Solutions Initiative), **Agustina Briano** (Outreach and Development Coordinator, Club de Madrid), **Wanjiru Kanyiha** (Network Coordinator, Global Public Investment Network), **Dr. Simon Reid-Henry** (Founder, Public Interest; Co-Founder, Global Public Investment Network), and **Dr. Richard Ponzio** (Director, Global Governance, Justice & Security Program, Stimson Center).

This fourth segment of the e-consultation focused on innovations for strengthening global and regional financial institutions (e.g., including the cost of capital, representation, taxation, combatting corruption, and debt-management reforms) to become more “fit-for-purpose” for better addressing 21st century global financial and economic challenges, threats, and opportunities. It also gave attention to the interplay between international economic and security issues and the need for mutually reinforcing policy and institutional reforms, to ensure positive, sustained outcomes worldwide.

Thank you for Segment Four contributions from:

Son Nguyen (Partnership for Climate and Nature Governance), **Dr. Florencia Rubiolo** (Insight 21), **Dr. Mikatekiso Kubayi** (Institute for Global Dialogue), **Barry Herman** (Social Justice in Global Development), **Dr. Siphamandla Zondi** (Institute for Pan-African Thought and Conversation), **Amb. Jeremie Kasongo** (Global Enviro-Action), **Einar Tangen** (Center for International Governance Innovation), **Rohit Kumar** (Zedsoftpoint), **Aranyam Kashyap** (Independent Consultant), **Dr. Simon Reid-Henry** (Peace Research Institute Oslo), **Dr. Richard Ponzio** (Stimson/Global Governance Innovation Network), **Dr. Adriana Abdenur** (Global Fund for a New Economy), **Dr. Christina Turczyn** (Fulbright Association), **Dr. Courtney Lindsay** (ODI Global), **Antonio Villafranca** (Italian Institute for International Political Studies), **Jin Tada** (University Student Chamber International), **Dr. Danisha Kazi** (Positive Money), **Ishan Ganguly** (Independent Consultant), **Stefano Manservisi** (Center for International Political Studies), **Mona Barake** (ODI Global), **Stewart Nixon** (Institute for Democracy and Economic Affairs), **Dr. Alexander Shenderov** (World Futures Studies Federation), **Ian Lynch** (Integrity Initiatives International), **Dr. Antonio Marinello** (University of Siena), **Rebecca Shoot** (ImPact Coalition on Strengthening International Judicial Institutions), **Dr. Syed Munir Khasru** (Institute for Policy,

Advocacy, & Governance), **Rafael Morales-Guzman** (University of Saskatchewan), **Tinuade Ojo** (University of Johannesburg), **Chandrima Das** (Stimson Center), and **Patrick Adeyemi Ilori** (Uppsala University).

Guiding Questions:

- 1) How can the emerging UN Tax Convention and the use of AI-driven digital tools help strengthen tax capacity, update revenue systems, and ensure that developing and vulnerable economies are meaningfully integrated into the evolving international tax architecture? Given constraints such as limited administrative capacity, volatile revenues, and restricted access to global financial systems, and the resulting high cost of capital, what concrete mechanisms should be built into the new international tax framework to expand taxing rights in the digital economy while ensuring that global standards do not unintentionally deepen fiscal fragility or development financing gaps?
- 2) With the growing complexity of global economic governance, from international tax reform and debt sustainability to climate finance and the rising cost of capital, there is a growing web of regional and global actors responding, including the G7, G20, OECD, Multilateral Development Banks, Regional Development Banks, International Monetary Fund, and the United Nations. These responses include initiatives ranging from the OECD's work on international tax rules and crypto-transparency to MDB-led debt swaps and IMF governance reforms. Are current efforts sufficiently coordinated and inclusive to address the needs of developing countries — particularly SIDS and climate-vulnerable economies — or do we need a different framework that aligns these actors and builds momentum through upcoming global convenings such as the World Bank Spring and Annual Meetings?
- 3) As global challenges, from taxation and illicit financial flows to climate-driven debt distress outpace existing governance structures, what institutional and policy innovations are needed to change the global financial architecture? In particular, how can coalitions such as the [Future of Development Cooperation Coalition](#) or the [Ubuntu Commission](#), expanded transparency mechanisms like a Global Asset Register, stronger oversight of cryptoassets, and reforms to debt and financing tools be amplified with new governance approaches — the adoption of the Multidimensional Vulnerability Index, greater representation for Small Island Developing States, scalable climate-resilient debt clauses, and innovative funding mechanisms — to create a more inclusive, resilient, and development-oriented system for the decades ahead?

Overwhelmingly, most participants agreed that the current system is both insufficiently coordinated and uninclusive; rather, international institutions such as the IMF/World Bank, UN, and G20 remain fragmented, siloed, and largely unresponsive to the needs of most developing countries. This fragmentation is a structural driver of inequality, not just an administrative hurdle, because it accentuates the challenge of countries – specifically developing ones – in properly assessing and taxing multinational individuals/corporations with large amounts of capital. While frameworks like the [Pact for the Future](#) (especially Actions 47-52 on international financial architecture reform) are viewed as crucial starting points to address this structural challenge, they are widely seen as lacking enforcement, coherence, and real accountability. The next step, potentially anchored in the UN system, would be an integrated framework that aligns tax, debt, climate, and potential other core development agendas through a common lens and overarching approach. Importantly, this new framework must address structural imbalances in power, representation, and data to redesign how decisions and resources are allocated in the international financial architecture.

The relationship between philanthropy and multilateral development banks also deserves greater attention within wider efforts to reform the international financial architecture. MDBs can provide scale, concessional instruments, institutional reach, and links to sovereign and regional policy processes, while philanthropic actors can complement these functions by supporting the enabling conditions that are underfunded, such as early-stage design, technical assistance, local intermediary capacity, civic participation and evidence generation. Together, these complementary roles can help make financing and reform efforts more effective and implementable in practice.

In support of this effort, the UN Framework Convention on International Tax Cooperation, now under negotiation, is still viewed as an inclusive alternative to the current system on international tax cooperation shaped by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD); how this emerging framework is fully developed and then implemented is an essential component of wider international financial architecture reforms. Without proper sequencing,

capacity-building, and flexibility, the new UN Tax Convention could impose additional burdens on already constrained administrations. For example, expanding taxing rights, especially in the global digital economy, must be matched by investments in administrative capacity to maximize fully AI-driven infrastructure. An emphasis on differentiated responsibilities is also needed to allow vulnerable countries to phase in reforms, preserve policy space, and avoid harmful blacklisting practices, while less vulnerable countries should shoulder more responsibility. Separately, participants emphasized the need to strengthen the United Nations Convention against Corruption through improved enforcement, transparency, and innovative tools. There was consensus among participants that focus should be on domestically grounded approaches to anti-corruption, while opinions were split on the idea of an International Anti-Corruption Court (IACC). A majority of participants thought the IACC would have value, but had some concerns about its feasibility and possible unintended consequences. These steps should be taken with the ultimate goal of homogenizing multilateral governance, as loopholes and incidental tax havens will continually be subject to exploitation during the transition phase.

Several participants also advocated moving beyond the historically insufficient incremental, technocratic adjustment approach toward more systemic and equity-centered innovations to change the international financial architecture for the better. Some of the proposed innovations included a Multidimensional Vulnerability Index, a Global Asset Register, climate-resilient debt clauses, and new commissions or coalitions, conditioned on the premise that they are tied to real decision-making power, resource allocation, and inclusive governance. Beyond this, some argued for embedding inequality at the center of reform and innovation efforts in the global economy, transitioning toward Global Public Investment models, leveraging digital public goods and AI to expand access to financing, and increasing data sources and methods for global decision-making. In sum, the importance of meaningful reform was underscored to ensure that global financial and economic governance become more transparent, adaptive, and responsive to the lived realities of all countries and their citizens, especially in lesser-developed and vulnerable nations. This has become increasingly necessary as successive technological (and financial) advances have accentuated inequalities in the absence of a global, consistent, enforced financial code.

Key Takeaways:

- The current international financial architecture is highly fragmented and, therefore, poorly coordinated in reform efforts. This fragmentation and redundancy allows for “creative accounting” by ultra-high net worth individuals to avoid taxation, so new and creative forms of coordination should be introduced to avoid redundancies within and across the multilateral system.
- A key to international financial architecture reform is to judge efforts on their true impact on financing conditions.
- As more financing options are becoming available, yet we see worse financing outcomes due to opportunity gaps, bias in risk-pricing, starkly different public and private financing priorities, and credit problems.
- Sovereign risk ratings should be reformed to include IMF/World Bank guarantees and a climate resilience framework that privileges a blended financing model.
- Governance systems must move past simply recognizing climate vulnerability and employ it as a metric factored into financing decisions, such as lending criteria or debt relief.
- The UN Framework Convention on International Tax Cooperation has the potential to rebalance tax governance and amplify the voices of developing economies. However, the Convention must focus, first and foremost, on streamlining tax regulation and building capacity, especially in digital spaces.
- The opportunity to increase ownership transparency, regulate cryptocurrency, fight money laundering, fairly tax multinational corporations, and erode tax havens should be explored as part of a Global Asset Registry.
- International financial institutions are stuck in “announcement mode” where initiatives are established but often remain aspirational, small-scale, and lack enforcement.
- The lived, local reality of national financial situations is largely overlooked by policymakers and institutions.

- International efforts must be made in tandem with a renewed national commitment to strengthen domestic resource mobilization through tax base expansion, progressive fiscal reform, and steps to avoid illicit financial flows.
- Incremental reforms are no longer sufficient for two distinct reasons: first, historical power imbalances, and secondly, the scale of current crises. Systemic reforms must distribute political and financial power more evenly.
- The Coalition of Governments and International Organizations for Global Public Investment should be supported as a basis to test an alternative approach to ODA based on concrete pilot projects. This supports a beyond GDP analysis to measure progress as well as nature assets as a form of capital.
- Fragmentation across tax, debt, climate finance, and development agendas remains a key constraint. Better coordination across governments, development banks, private investors, and philanthropic actors can help align financing flows and improve responsiveness to developing-country realities.
- Philanthropy and MDBs can play complementary roles in international financial architecture reform, with MDBs providing scale, concessional instruments, and institutional reach, while philanthropy can support catalytic functions such as technical assistance, project preparation, and local intermediary capacity.
- Work is needed globally to remove barriers to mobilising philanthropic capital that obstruct the flourishing of a “culture of giving” at country level. This is done through bank de-risking policies, anti-money laundering regulations and other regulatory barriers faced by accountable, legalised, transparent and effective CSOs and local philanthropies. The T20 engagement group under the Indonesian presidency published a key policy briefing that urged the G20 to strengthen the enabling environment for philanthropy to participate in blended finance.
- G20 governments should work with financial service providers to ensure that CSOs and local philanthropies can set up accounts, process international donations and payments in a transparent way, while reducing regulatory burden, simplifying administrative processes, and creating organisational and legal forms that facilitate a wide spectrum of CSO funding and social purpose activity.

Segment 5: Strengthening the Collective Security and Justice Architecture (24 - 30 March)

Thank you to the Segment Five Co-Facilitators:

Dr. Trita Parsi (Executive Vice-President, Quincy Institute for Responsible Statecraft), **Dr. Zachary Paikin** (Deputy Director, Better Order Project and Research Fellow in the Grand Strategy Program Quincy Institute for Responsible Statecraft), **Dr. (Amb.) Mohamed Chihi** (Executive Director, Global Institute for Strategic Research, Hamad Bin Khalifa University), **Veronica Liu** (Research Fellow, Center for China and Globalization), **Heather Hurlburt** (Associate Fellow, US and the Americas Programme, Chatham House), and **Dr. Joris Larik** (Associate Professor, Comparative, EU, and International Law, Leiden University).

This fifth week segment of the e-consultation was centered on innovations for strengthening global security institutions (including the Security Council, General Assembly, and ICJ/ICC reforms) to become more “fit-for-purpose” for better addressing 21st-century global security and justice challenges, threats, and opportunities. These inputs were built on action plans developed for the September 2024 Summit of the Future (including that same month’s related G20 Foreign Ministers’ Meeting Call to Action on Global Governance Reform) and ongoing discussions in the UN’s Intergovernmental Negotiations on Security Council Reform, the Ad-Hoc Working Group on the Revitalization of the General Assembly, and the 2025 UN Peacebuilding Architecture Review. This segment gave special attention to the interplay between international security and economic issues and the need for mutually reinforcing policy and institutional reforms, to ensure positive, sustained outcomes worldwide.

Thank you for Segment Five contributions from:

Georgios Kostakos (Foundation for Global Governance and Sustainability), **Dan Ciuriak** (Ciuriak Consulting), **Son Nguyen** (Partnership for Climate and Nature Governance), **Dr. Alexander Shenderov** (World Futures Studies Federation), **Gargi Gaur** (Nalanda University), **Jeremie Kasongo** (Global Enviro-Action), **Dr. Christina Turczyn** (Fulbright Association), **Aranyam Kashyap** (Independent Consultant), **Richard Ponzio** (Stimson/Global Governance Innovation Network), **Dr. Peter Hoffman** (The New School), **Jin Tada** (University Student Chamber International), **Dr. Daniel Araya** (East China Normal University), **Patrick Adeyemi Ilori** (Uppsala University), **Einar Tangen** (Center for International Governance Innovation), **Maja Groff** (Climate Governance Commission), **Ishan Ganguly** (Independent Consultant), **Chandrima Das** (Stimson Center), **Mike Liu** (Center for China and Globalization), **Tinuade Ojo** (University of Johannesburg), **Branka Marijan** (Project Ploughshares), **Vesselin Popovski** (O.P. Jindal Global Law School), **Alyn Ware** (World Federalist Movement), **Andrew Hyde** (Stimson Center), **Rebecca Shoot** (ImPact Coalition on Strengthening International Judicial Institutions), **Heela Rasool-Ayub** (New America), **Cristina Petcu** (United Nations Mission in South Sudan), **Dr. Fredrick Ogenga** (Rongo University), **Erin McCandles** (University of Johannesburg), **Dr. Tad Daley** (Americans for Democratic Action), **Dr. Syed Munir Khasru** (Institute for Policy, Advocacy, & Governance), **Liz Hume** (Alliance for Peacebuilding), **Naomi Kilungu** (AI for Peace Africa), and **CJ Pine** (Georgetown University Qatar).

Guiding Questions:

- 1) What are some of the chief underlying causes (i.e., “drivers”) of protracted violent conflict and injustice in today’s hyperconnected world? How have today’s violent conflicts and major sources of injustice evolved since the mid-to-late 20th century, and what role, if any, do environmental and technological factors play today?
- 2) In a multipolar world marked by tensions (including Great Power rivalry and growing North-South mistrust) between effectiveness and representativeness, how can a reformed international order balance inclusive, rules-based global governance with the practical realities of power politics, especially when major actors may disengage from or actively undermine shared global security and justice institutions? Given the gap between the formal global architecture (e.g., the United Nations) and the reality of an order shaped by Great Power and regional dynamics (e.g., the emergence of a new “Board of Peace”), should reform efforts prioritize strengthening centralized institutions or adapting to decentralized, issue-specific coalitions (e.g., through the better integration of regional security mechanisms)? And what would either of these proposed approaches mean for ensuring collective security and compliance with shared norms about global security and justice?
- 3) What institutional, legal, and operational innovations are needed to realign incentives so that states are more likely to comply with international norms and legal obligations, and should reform efforts focus on adapting existing systems or building alternative governance structures? In addition to UN Security Council, Peacebuilding Architecture, and General Assembly reform, how can the United Nations more creatively leverage its existing conflict management and resolution toolkit, such as Special Envoys/Representatives leading Special Political Missions, Peace and Development Advisers, and other UN Charter “Chapter Six” mediation, conflict prevention, and peacebuilding capacities, to better connect normative and legal commitments with on-the-ground efforts to better manage and address the root causes of protracted violent conflict around the world today? How can the global multilateral system better integrate regional security mechanisms and leverage specific global tools, such as ICJ advisory opinions, to rebuild consensus and advance shared peace and justice goals?

Across Segment 5 responses, there was strong agreement that, among the core human drivers of violent conflict, are greed for power, money, or resources, geopolitical maneuvers, identity, and widely perceived injustice. Additionally, today’s conflicts (and, indeed, over the past few decades) are no longer primarily interstate or ideologically bounded, and they operate with a higher risk of cataclysmic knock-on effects that place innocent civilians in harm's way. A major shift that may contribute to these higher stakes is the role of climate stress. This stress is an amplifier of displacement, food insecurity, and social tensions, especially as climate change leads to and occurs alongside ecological degradation and resource scarcity. Another major shift is the technological advances of the last few decades, as AI and cyber have changed the landscape of conflict by encouraging misinformation, asymmetrical warfare, and new kinds of interstate competition. Further, norms around gender inequality have degraded in the last decade, as the Women, Peace and Security agenda is stalled across the globe and women continue to be missing from peace processes and negotiating tables. Decades of research has shown, gender inequality is a predictor of violent conflict. In sum, this

means that conflict and injustice today emerge from complex, but familiar causes that are made more intense by modern amplifiers.

It was emphasized by participants that global security and justice institutional reform efforts should not solely encourage the reform of centralized versus decentralized institutions; rather, concerned international actors should encourage a hybrid and layered approach. Centralized global governance is essential for issues like international legal norms and global public goods, while decentralized governance should be considered for issues needing greater flexibility and faster conflict management response times. In this respect, regional players and South-South cooperation are increasingly important. Furthermore, institutional design will not solely assume responsibility for compliance with shared norms. Rebuilding trust in the international system and between states, and ensuring more equitable institutions at global and regional institutions of governance, requires strong, inclusive, and effective institutions that will shape the realities of political power — instead of letting these complex political realities erode and undermine the functioning of our institutions.

Participants largely favored adapting existing systems compared to building alternative governance structures. They further noted that compliance with international norms is hindered by weak incentives, selective enforcement, and a lack of inter-system trust and credibility. Recommendations focused on reforming reward/incentive structures, which would see compliance more directly linked to concrete benefits, such as access to finance, technology, or trade. To facilitate peace processes, a recommended next step is to integrate state-of-the-art early warning systems and civilian response capabilities into the work of global institutions, such as the United Nations, and regional institutional partners. Doing so would foster a connection between international and local understandings and the realities of peace and justice on the ground in a fragile or conflict-affected country/region. In the legal space, expanded use of advisory opinions and stronger international judicial mechanisms (beginning with the International Court of Justice and International Criminal Court) would clarify norms and reinforce accountability. Some participants argued for far-reaching global and regional governance system reforms, rather than tinkering with the individual operational tools operated by these institutions. Improving international legal compliance requires not only rethinking how we apply the tools of the international order, but a structural shift of incentives, legitimacy, and power internationally to advance the widespread, largely shared goals of universal peace and justice.

Key Takeaways:

- Rather than single causes, conflicts are more than ever shaped by interconnected systems and events, particularly environmental stress, economic structures, and technological developments.
- Existing mechanisms, like international mediation, peacebuilding capacities, women, peace, and security agenda, are important but vastly underutilized and supported.
- Reform must incentivize cooperation and peacemaking to minimize noncompliance.
- The future of global governance must balance the strengths of global and regional power structures; global institutions to enshrine global norms and regional institutions to offer greater flexibility and rapid responses.
- Legitimacy, trust, and fairness must be guiding principles for effectiveness in global governance institutions.
- The Global South offers crucial, diverse voices to global governance, and these voices must be genuinely included and given a sense of ownership of today's global governance systems.
- Current talks about global governance reform and innovation are too incremental relative to the magnitude and speed of today's global risks.
- There is a growing mismatch between knowledge and action — we increasingly know where risks are, but we fail to act on that knowledge effectively.
- Information and narratives are now key dimensions of global governance and conflict dynamics.
- G20 countries should partner with philanthropic actors, who have a convening role, to strengthen civic engagement, with special regard to historically marginalized populations, notably by simplifying communities'

and grassroots organizations’ access to the necessary networks, resources, mentoring, and capacity-building to enhance the impact of their work.

Segment 6: Cross-cutting and Missing Themes for the T20/G20 U.S. 2026 (31 March - 8 April)

Thank you to the Segment Six Co-Facilitators:

Vidisha Mishra (Director, Global Outreach & Policy, Global Solutions Initiative), **Dr. Mikatekiso Kubayi** (Senior Researcher, Institute for Global Dialogue), **Ambassador Sohn Jie-Ae** (Special Advisor, Chey Institute for Advanced Studies), **Laura Chapell** (Associate Director for international Policy, Institute for Public Policy Research), **Sofie Pultz** (Researcher, Institute for Public Policy Research), **Mihir Sharma** (Principal Research Fellow, Institute for Public Policy Research), and **Dr. Richard Ponzio** (Director, Global Governance, Justice & Security Program and Senior Fellow, Stimson Center and Co-Director, Global Governance Innovation Center).

This sixth segment and final week of the e-consultation examined both cross-cutting issues — from the five preceding weeks and their associated sets of thematic priorities — and possible missing themes that merit greater attention by both the T20 policy research network and G20 U.S. in 2026. A spotlight was placed on critical global policy issues, such as Human Rights, Women, Migration, Refugees, Humanitarian Action, Youth, Disabled Groups, Public Health, and more.

Thank you for Segment Six contributions from:

Patrick Adeyemi Ilori (Uppsala University), **Son Nguyen** (Partnership for Climate and Nature Governance), **Jonah Wittkamper** (Global Governance Philanthropy Network), **Dr. Alexander Shenderov** (World Futures Studies Federation), **Dr. Richard Ponzio** (Stimson Center), **Jeremie Kasongo** (Global Enviro-Action), **Jin Tada** (University Student Chamber International), **Aranyam Kashyap** (Independent Consultant), **Dr. Saon Ray** (ICRIER), **Georgios Kostakos** (Foundation for Global Governance and Sustainability), **Dr. Minah Kang** (Ewha Womans University), **Primus M. Tazanu** (Nkafu Policy Institute), **Luisa Bianchet** (Instituto E+ Transição Energética), **Racha Abou Chakra** (ACUNS), **Naomi Kilungu** (AI for Peace Africa), **Amb. Jie-Ae Sohn** (Chey Institute for Advanced Studies), **Dr. David Obura** (Coastal Oceans Research and Development in the Indian Ocean), **Sofie Pultz** (Institute for Public Policy Research), **Michaell Collins** (Institute for Economics and Peace), **Dr. Gulden Turktan** (W20), **Dong-Ho** (Chey Institute for Advanced studies), **Dr. Kakha Nadiradze** (Association for Farmers Rights Defense), **Liz Hume** (Alliance for Peacebuilding), **Angela Joo-Hyun Kang** (Global Competitiveness Empowerment Forum), **Dr. Syed Munir Khasru** (The Institute for Policy, Advocacy, and Governance), **Dr. Salvatore Barilla** (Newcastle University), **Gordon Glass** (Global Leadership Ltd), **Lindokuhle Sibiyi** (Eswatini Youth and Women for Change), **Meredith Preston McGhie** (Global Center for Pluralism), **Aranyam Kashyap** (Independent Consultant), **Ishan Ganguly** (Independent Consultant), **Dr. Njoke Mbanda Lionel Romeo** (GYDA and Model Forest Policy Program), **Jean Maier** (American University), and **Dr. Mikatekiso Kubayi** (Institute for Global Dialogue/ANUMDI).

Guiding Questions:

- 1) Over the last five weeks, this e-consultation has explored issues such as trade, energy supply chains, climate action, technology including AI governance, critical minerals, international financial architecture reform and financing for development, and the future of the collective security and justice architecture. What are the most important “missing themes” (cross-cutting or otherwise) that merit greater attention by both the T20 policy research network and the G20 U.S. in 2026? And what are the principal institutional, political, economic, and other barriers that impede the effective recognition and governance of these missing themes?
- 2) To what extent are existing multilateral institutions — both at global and regional/sub-regional levels — politically equipped and operationally capable of fostering meaningful cooperation on complex transnational challenges, such as those identified in your previous response (as well as perhaps Human Rights, Women, Migration, Refugees, Humanitarian Action, Youth, Disabled Groups, and Public Health)?
- 3) How can the G20 U.S. (and by extension the T20 U.S.) incorporate these underrepresented issues and themes into its agenda, and what diplomatic, institutional, and policy approaches and tools are available to ensure their prioritization across subsequent G20 presidencies? Through what intergovernmental and multistakeholder processes and channels can

these pressing policy issues be elevated onto the G20 agenda from the outset? And further in this regard, what forms of political will, coalition-building, and stakeholder engagement are necessary to effectively advance these “missing themes” beyond the G20 within other, dynamic global and regional institutions (e.g., the UN and IFIs), formal policy frameworks (e.g., 2030 Agenda and Pact for the Future), and informal intergovernmental platforms (e.g., BRICS+ and G7)?

Across the rich and voluminous Segment 6 responses, participants identified several key “missing” themes with cross-cutting dimensions that shape how existing global cooperation priorities are understood and implemented, as showcased throughout this e-consultation – and the broader work of the T20 policy research network and, indeed, the G20 itself. Human security emerged as central to the online dialogue, including attention to human dignity under stress, humanitarian action, and the overall resilience of vulnerable populations. Additional gaps included food systems, technological and energy transitions, nature, and governance of the global commons, alongside the continued under-representation of youth, future generations, and women and girls in decision-making. There was recognition that economic systems are constrained by characteristics of the emerging global information ecosystem, noting the influence of Big Tech, algorithmic control over public discourse, and the urgent need for global frameworks to ensure information integrity and democratic accountability. Taken together, these themes reflect a broader shift toward understanding global challenges as interconnected, systemic, and deeply tied to questions of justice and inclusion.

Participants further identified a range of structural barriers that hinder effective governance of the issues identified above. These include fragmentation across institutions and policy domains, geopolitical rivalries, limited funding, weak data systems, and persistent translation gaps between global frameworks and local realities. An erosion of trust in global governance and the absence of a shared, positive narrative were also highlighted as fundamental constraints. Unequal representation and limited political will are impeding progress, while existing global and regional policy frameworks often reflect shared interests without translating them into coordinated action. In this context, global and regional multilateral institutions were widely seen as struggling to manage overlapping and cross-cutting challenges, constrained by political dynamics, bureaucratic inertia, and outdated governance structures. Some participants pointed to emerging alternatives, including more agile and sometimes better resourced “coalitions of the willing.” There was broad agreement that current systems are not fully equipped to respond to the scale and complexity of contemporary global challenges.

One underdeveloped cross-cutting theme is the role of philanthropy in strengthening participation, continuity, and implementation across G20 cycles. Historically, philanthropy’s engagement in G20 processes has often been fragmented, siloed, and skewed toward larger international actors. A more inclusive approach would recognise the diversity of philanthropy, including local and regional philanthropic actors, and their ability to help connect global agendas with community priorities. This is particularly important where civil society participation is constrained by limited resources, access barriers, and compressed consultation timelines. Philanthropic support for research, convening, travel, coordination, and coalition-building can help to widen meaningful participation, while also contributing to the continuity and institutional memory that annual G20 turnover so often weakens. Strengthening locally led resourcing and development approaches will also require greater alignment between international financing flows and domestic actors, including local institutions, community organizations, and national philanthropic ecosystems. Across multiple sectors, fragmentation between public finance, private investment, and development systems continues to limit effectiveness. Improving coordination across these actors remains a key priority for more coherent and scalable solutions.

In response to these obstacles and perceived risks, participants stressed that the G20/T20 should focus not only on what issues are deemed “priorities,” but how cooperation is structured. This includes embedding cross-cutting priorities into the core architecture of the G20, rather than treating them as add-ons, and adopting more streamlined and coherent approaches that balance breadth and depth. Participants recommendations included: establishing cross-cutting lenses across policy areas, strengthening integration with the UN, international financial institutions, and regional bodies, and

prioritizing implementation through clearer accountability mechanisms, including introducing tracking indicators to innovative financing approaches. Participants also emphasized the need for more networked and inclusive governance models that strengthen coordination across formal and informal platforms, enhance mechanisms to elevate the rights of future generations, strengthen democratic participation in global governance, and develop more flexible platforms for humanitarian and digital cooperation. For example, there were proposals to repurpose the Trusteeship Council in support of Future Generations (e.g., through a Council for Future Generations), establish mechanisms such as a UN Parliamentary Network to enhance democratic participation, and develop more flexible, coordinated platforms for humanitarian response and digital governance. Ultimately, advancing these priorities will depend on stronger alignment across the global multilateral system, sustained political will, and a renewed emphasis on trust, inclusion, and intergenerational responsibility as foundational pillars of effective global governance.

Key Takeaways:

- A more focused, streamlined G20 is urgently needed, and the current moment is an opportunity to test a leaner model that could be used as a blueprint for future presidencies.
- Current global challenges are interconnected, so meaningfully addressing them will require integrated approaches that link economic, social, environmental, and technological domains.
- The main gap requiring consideration by global cooperation/governance experts is not just what issues are prioritized, but how global cooperation is structured and implemented.
- A justice lens is required for understanding distributional impacts of systems and policies.
- Human security remains under-represented in the G20/T20, including the need for greater focus on the issues of food systems, social infrastructure, and representation of youth, women, and future generations.
- Erosion of trust, empathy, and social cohesion is a major constraint placed on global governance institutions and reforms.
- The global information ecosystem is a systemic governance challenge shaping discourse and political dynamics, but this can be remedied, in part, by implementing information integrity frameworks, accountability in digital spaces, and, crucially, recognition of digital systems as public infrastructure
- Continuity and institutional memory are critical gaps in the G20, as annual turnover and changes in the G20 presidency often lead to fragmentation in both decision-making and follow-through.
- G20 and broader global governance reform should focus on integration, representation, and adaptability, and reform efforts should encourage a balance between global, regional, and local actors.
- Political will for implementation is important for achieving real progress and continuity across presidencies, sustained political commitment, and broad, long-lasting coalition-building between countries and across diverse issues areas.
- There is a role for philanthropy in elevating underrepresented voices and supporting more inclusive agenda-setting across global governance processes through civic and intermediary infrastructure needed for trust, participation, and accountability in multilateral cooperation.
- More structured engagement mechanisms could help to strengthen continuity across G20 cycles. This could include consideration of platforms that better integrate philanthropic actors alongside existing engagement groups, where appropriate, to support coordination, knowledge-sharing, and implementation.

Annex I: Policy Research/Knowledge Resources Shared by Participants

- [Mexico approves up to 50% tariffs on China and other countries](#)
- [Mexico's China tariffs show the rise of Trump's trade template](#)
- [Trump's expanded travel ban hits Africa the hardest but reactions are muted](#)
- [UN Approves Sharp Cuts in 2026 Budget Amid Financial Turmoil](#)
- [Beyond Tariffs: Coercive US Trade Deals and Southeast Asia's Clean Energy Future](#)
- [Regulation of Force and Coercion](#)
- [World Bank country classifications by income level for 2024-2025](#)
- [WTO issues new edition of World Tariff Profiles](#)
- [FMG Webinar on MFN Principle](#)
- [Global Governance Innovation Report 2024](#)
- [GGIN Policy Brief: The UN's Our Common Agenda as Inspiration for International Organizations](#)
- [After the Trade War: Remaking Rules From the Ruins of the Rules-Based system](#)
- [US Supreme Court blocks Trump tariffs – but the trade war isn't over](#)
- [‘Status quo is not an option’, says WTO chief ahead of major meeting focused on reforms](#)
- [The “Most Favored Nation” principle of equal treatment of trade partners](#)
- [The IMF and the WTO Need Symmetrical Reforms](#)
- [The WTO stands at a ‘whatever it takes’ moment](#)
- [We can't blame all global trade chaos on Trump](#)
- [\(When\) Can Trade Wars Be Good?](#)
- [Prime Minister Carney announces new trade agreement with Indonesia](#)
- [India and U.K. Strike Trade Deal Amid Global Tariff Upheaval](#)
- [EU-Indonesia Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement and Investment Protection Agreement](#)
- [UAE-Malaysia Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement](#)
- [India, New Zealand wind up FTA talks, set to boost trade](#)
- [Indonesia, Peru sign free trade deal](#)
- [China and ASEAN, hit by US tariffs, sign upgraded free trade pact](#)
- [CPTPP-EU Trade and Investment Dialogue Joint Ministerial Statement](#)
- [EU-Mercosur deal set to be signed, with or without France's support](#)
- [Trump's Congo gamble: Critical minerals and a dangerous new bargain](#)
- [National Lithium Strategy](#)
- [Stainless success, battery lag: Evaluation of Indonesia's resource nationalism in nickel](#)
- [Vietnam Bans Raw Rare Earth Exports to Boost Supply Chain Goals](#)
- [Zimbabwe to Ban Export of Lithium Concentrates from 2027](#)
- [The Alliance of Sahel States: The Road towards Nationalization](#)
- [Energy Technology Perspectives 2024](#)
- [The EV leapfrog – how emerging markets are driving a global EV boom](#)
- [The first evidence of a take-off in solar in Africa](#)
- [India's Renewable Energy Surge: 35 GW Solar Addition In 2025 Signals A Strong Shift Toward A Cleaner Power Mix](#)
- [BRICS Brasil 2025 - Leaders Declaration](#)
- [How BRICS Can Survive ‘America First’](#)
- [Growing BRICS group shows internal rifts as ministers fall short](#)
- [Spheres of Influence Are Not the Answer](#)
- [A U.S. Peace Plan for Ukraine](#)
- [Mediation with Chinese characteristics in the 2025 Thailand–Cambodia border crisis](#)
- [Joint Statement on the Ninth Australia–Indonesia Foreign and Defence Ministers' 2+2 Meeting](#)
- [India's bid to rival the Chinese navy](#)
- [Indonesia's military reorganisation is its biggest this century](#)
- [Why small climate-vulnerable island states punch well above their weight in UN climate talks](#)
- [Singapore, 13 other small-medium countries launch partnership to support open and fair trade](#)
- [T20 Brasil Task Force 04 Statement](#)
- [Twelfth Letter from the President](#)
- [Keeping the lights on](#)
- [Why Barclays Is Warning of Stranded Renewable Energy Assets](#)
- [Financing Climate Action](#)
- [Global Governance Innovation Report 2025–Advancing the Pact for the Future and Environmental Governance](#)
- [Reports by the Governance Climate Commission](#)
- [UNEA Resolution 6/7](#)
- [Earth Governance and the UN Crisis](#)
- [Institute for the Economics of Natural Resources and Climate Change](#)

- [Looking Beyond National Borders: Integrating Consumption-Based Accounting Approach into Climate Mitigation Policy](#)
- [Critical Minerals and the Energy Transition: A Framework for Sustainable Development and Supply Chain Resilience in the G20](#)
- [Thinking about epistemic sovereignty in the course of glocal collective problem-solving](#)
- [Future of International Cooperation Report 2024](#)
- [India Ai Impact Expo 2026](#)
- [Independent International Scientific Panel on AI](#)
- [Governing AI for the Future of Humanity](#)
- [1-3 July 2026: 39th ACUNS Annual Meeting](#)
- [Secure, Responsible and Equitable Critical Minerals Value Chain](#)
- [The Global Solutions Initiative works towards a global economic system that benefits people and planet.](#)
- [Building Digital Infrastructure for the AI Era: Insights from Middle Power States](#)
- [AI Is Bad News for the Global South](#)
- [AI Preparedness Index Shows Global South Is Not Ready for Artificial Intelligence Solutions](#)
- [Understanding Africa's AI Governance Landscape: Insights From Policy Practice and Dialogue](#)
- [South Africa sets its ambitious G20 agenda for digital public infrastructure and AI](#)
- [Continental Artificial Intelligence Strategy](#)
- [AI Watch: Global regulatory tracker - African Union](#)
- [Now More Than Ever, Africa Needs Participatory AI Regulatory Sandboxes](#)
- [Scrutiny grows over DRC-US minerals deal, even as other African nations sign up](#)
- [Africa's mining sector poised for sustained growth driven by critical minerals and policy reforms](#)
- [The UN has moved to close the gap in AI governance. Here's what to know](#)
- [Governing AI for Humanity](#)
- [Round Table on Africa's Critical Mineral Resources](#)
- [Executive summary:Fast-growing critical minerals markets remain turbulent, with prices falling sharply in 2023 following two years of dramatic increases](#)
- [Executive summary: Global Critical Minerals Outlook 2025](#)
- [Big AI: Cloud infrastructure dependence and the industrialisation of artificial intelligence](#)
- [Estimating the GDP effect of Open Source Software and its complementarities with R&D and patents: evidence and policy implications](#)
- [Catalysing Positive Digital Infrastructure Innovation: G20's Role in Advancing Data Agency](#)
- [Building Digital Infrastructure for the AI Era: Insights from Middle Power States](#)
- [The Truth About Blockchain Bridge Hacks, and How Modular Interoperability Fixes It](#)
- [India's pathway to net zero by 2070: status, challenges, and way forward](#)
- [IGES: Critical Minerals](#)
- [ImPact Coalition on Strengthening International Judicial Institutions: Town Hall Meeting](#)
- [Common Security](#)
- [Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe](#)
- [Good Offices](#)
- [International Court of Justice](#)
- [Declarations recognizing the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory](#)
- [The States Parties to the Rome Statute](#)
- [Chapeau](#)
- [Summit of the Future Outcome Documents September 2024](#)
- [People's Pact for the Future](#)
- [International Judicial Institutions](#)
- [Law not War](#)
- [Crime of Agression](#)
- [An International Anti-Corruption Court](#)
- [Legal Limits to the Veto Power in the Face of Atrocity](#)
- [The Veto](#)
- [A Crisis of Neoliberal Peace and Troubles of Peacemaking Today - a Decolonial African Perspective on Resource Politics](#)
- [Economic Rents and the Contours of Conflict in the Data-driven Economy](#)
- [Technological Conditions and the Rise and Fall of the Rules-Based System](#)
- [The US-China Trade War: Technological Roots and WTO Responses](#)
- [Data as a Contested Economic Resource](#)
- [Trading AI and its Value Chain: Rules-Based Trade in the Age of Machine Knowledge Capital](#)
- [Opinion: The WTO should do more of what it's good at](#)
- [The WTO as a Small Claims Court and Other Parables on the Endogeneity of International Governance to Economic and Technological Conditions](#)
- [Climate-Resilience Peace Initiative](#)
- [NextGen SDG Platform](#)
- [N4SM – Nexus for Systems Missions | NextGen SDG Coordination Platform](#)

- [The South Rises: Building Just Climate and Sustainable Development Governance in a Fractured World](#)
- [Variable 1: UN Security Council Reform](#)
- [Is It 1914 in America?](#)
- [Multiplexity 2.0: power and pluralism in the post-liberal age](#)
- [Powering Peace](#)
- [Creating a Rapid Reaction UN Peace Force](#)
- [Global Governance Innovation Report 2023: Redefining Approaches to Peace, Security, and Humanitarian Action](#)
- [High-Level Advisory Board on Effective Multilateralism](#)
- [Our Common Agenda](#)
- [Pact For the Future 2025](#)
- [Future of International Cooperation Report 2025](#)
- [Confronting the Crisis of Global Governance](#)
- [From Reaction to Resilience: Asia's Strategic Transformation in Disaster Risk Reduction](#)
- [Thinking Like the Earth: How Synthetic Intelligence Saves Our Planet: Real Technologies, Real Results, Real Hope](#)
- [Pathways to Planetary Justice: How the Global South Is Building Ecosocialism While the North Debates It](#)
- [The Soul of the Machine: Building Enlightened Organizations in a Turbulent World](#)
- [8.6 Markets and Consumers can shape global policy](#)
- [Global Commons Commission](#)
- [The Singularity of Consumer-Led Global Commons Legal Recognition is Near](#)
- [Legitimacy Lending and Participatory Infrastructure for Global Commons Governance](#)
- [White Paper on the Global Commons and Philanthropy](#)
- [United Nations Secretary-General's report "Our Common Agenda" F](#)
- [Complex Global Shocks, Emergency Platforms, and United Nations Reform](#)
- [Rethinking Global Cooperation: Three New Frameworks for Collective Action in an Age of Uncertainty](#)
- [Declaration on Future Generations](#)
- [Confronting the Crisis of Global Governance](#)
- [Campaign for UN Parliamentary Assembly](#)
- [Global Cooperation and G20](#)
- [UN Security Council Resolution 1325](#)
- [Large-scale humanitarian crises](#)
- [Understanding backlash against gender equality: Evidence, trends and policy responses](#)
- [Women's rights are regressing worldwide, warns UN gender equality chief](#)
- [The Risks of Gender-Blind Conflict Analysis](#)
- [Informal coordinators between the Peacebuilding Commission \(PBC\) and the UNSC - ROK in 2025](#)
- [Informal coordinators between the Peacebuilding Commission \(PBC\) and the UNSC - Japan in 2025](#)
- [Arria-formula Meeting on Cooperation between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission](#)
- [In Hindsight: The Security Council in 2025 and the Year Ahead](#)
- [Lessons for Influence at the UNSC: Be-It Incremental](#)
- [National Prevention Strategies as Building Blocks of Regional Peace](#)
- [How the U.N. Can Show Renewed Leadership on Peace Efforts in 2026](#)
- [United Nations Peacebuilding Week](#)
- [Alliance for Peacebuilding](#)
- [New Data Shows Conflict at Historic High as U.S. Signals Retreat from World Stage](#)
- [Designing AI for Conflict Prevention & Peacebuilding](#)
- [The Climate Change Crisis: Ensuring Integration of Conflict Prevention and Climate Change in U.S. Foreign Policy and Development Assistance](#)
- [Freedom in The World 2025](#)
- [Global Terrorism Index 2026](#)
- [States of Fragility 2025](#)
- [Foreign Aid Is Shrinking - What Happens Next?](#)
- [Starmer Cuts Aid to Fund Increase in Defense Spending](#)
- [Congress Just Clawed Back \\$1 Billion in Foreign Assistance - Here's Where The Cuts are Hitting](#)
- [Multipolarization Munich Security Report 2025](#)
- [The UN Must Take the Need for Reform Seriously](#)
- [Implications of Artificial Intelligence for Peace, Conflict, and Peacebuilding](#)
- [New Start Expires As U.S. Urges Modernized Treaty](#)
- [Newly Unbound, Trump Weighs More Nuclear Arms and Underground Tests](#)
- [The Iran War Risks Triggering a New Wave of Nuclear Proliferation](#)
- [Reforming the WTO through Inclusive and Development-friendly Plurilaterals](#)
- [B20 SA Finance & Infrastructure Taskforce Recommendations](#)

- [C20 Brazil Philanthropy for Sustainable Development Working Group Policy Brief & Recommendations](#)
- [A Strategic Note for Philanthropy: Development Finance Post-Seville by WINGS and Hilton Foundation in collaboration with Alice Albright](#)
- [Statement on Philanthropy's Strategic Support to the Financing for Development 4 Agenda and Beyond](#)
- [ICS/CEBRI paper on Public Development Banks & Philanthropy](#)
- [WINGS Submission to the UNFCCC](#)
- [Philanthropy and the G20: Strategic Insights from South Africa](#)
- [B20 South Africa Business-Philanthropy Legacy Initiative](#)

Annex II: Participants in the G20 and Global Governance Innovation E-Consultation

Dr. Susan Ariel Aaronson, George Washington University & Center for International Governance Innovation (U.S.)
Mohammed El Abbouch, Pan-African Alliance for Citizenship (Morocco/France)
Dr. Adriana Abdenur, Global Fund for a New Economy (Brazil)
Racha Abou Chakra, Academic Council on the United Nations System (Canada)
Dr. Lilian Sally Addo, International Youth Network for UNSCR2250 (U.S.)
Dr. Prachi Agarwal, ODI Global (India, based in London)
Carole Agengo, Co-Chair, UN Civil Society Conference in Support of the Summit of the Future (Kenya)
Nabil Ahmed, Oxfam (U.K., based in U.S.)
Prince Tanyi Justin Ajinga, Union Farms of Africa/COFAAA (Cameroon)
Dr. Iqbal Akhtar, East-West Foundation (U.S.)
Mehmet Sait Akman, The Economic Policy Research Foundation of Türkiye (Türkiye)
Adel Abdel-Sadek Algakha, Arab Center for Cyberspace Research (Egypt)
Enowbachem Agbortanyi, Denis and Lenora Foretia Foundation (Cameroon)
Mona Ali Khalil, MAK LAW/Harvard PILAC/MENARA (Saudi Arabian of Palestinian origin, based in Vienna)
Dr. Daniel del Barrio Alvarez, The University of Tokyo (Spain, based in Japan)
Heba Aly, Article 109 Coalition (Egypt/Canada, based in Geneva)
Dr. El Hadji Amadou, RBM Partnership to End Malaria (Senegal)
Stephanie Amoako, Accountability Counsel (U.S.)
Anthony Antem, Denis and Lenora Foretia Foundation (Cameroon)
Akash Nundlal Appama, Tutwa Consulting Group (South Africa)
Dr. Daniel Araya, East China Normal University (Canada)
Dr. Mahmoud Arbouch, Policy Center for the New South (Morocco)
Bernardo Arce, ODI Global (Costa Rica, based in London)
Dr. Kuniko Ashizawa, American University (Japan, based in Washington D.C.)
Dr. Rym Ayadi, Euro-Mediterranean Economists Association (Spain)
Mudassar Baig, Global Institute of Strategic Research/MENARA (India, based in Doha)
Sani Bala, Savannah Center for Diplomacy, Democracy, and Development/ANUMDI (Nigeria)
Dr. Mona Barake, ODI Global (Lebanon, based in London)
Abdul Hamid Barekzai, Fadayhan I Afghan Party (Afghanistan)
Dr. Salvatore Barillà, Newcastle University (Italy)
Rholyn Barnhart, W20/Teacherhood, LLC (U.S.)
Karen Patricia Bolaño Solano, Sinergy Klelly (Colombia)
Franz Baumann, ACUNS (Germany, based in Vienna)
Dr. Marianne Beisheim, German Institute for International and Security Affairs (Germany)
Dr. Radhouane Ben-Hamadou, Earthna (Qatar)
Dr. Axel Berger, German Institute of Development and Sustainability (Germany)
Embla Bergström, Global Challenges Foundation (Sweden)
Elena Bertozzi, Project Starling (Italy, based in New York)
Hitesh Bhatt, Independent Consultant (India, based in NYC)
Dr. Leonardo Borlini, Bocconi University (Italy)
Michael Borum, Oxfam America (U.S.)
Luísa Braga Bianchet, Instituto E+ Transição Energética (Brazil)
Linda Bonyo, Lawyers Hub (Kenya)
Dr. Colin Bradford, Brookings (U.S.)
Danny Bradlow, South African Institute of International Affairs (South Africa)
Jorge Braga de Macedo, Nova School of Business and Economics (Portugal)
Agustina Briano, Club de Madrid (Uruguay, based in Madrid)
Dr. Henk-Jan Brinkman, International Development Law Organization (Netherlands, based in New York)
Dr. Edward Brown, African Center for Economic Transformation (Ghana)
Nicolas Buchoud, ADBI, Nalanda University, and GSI (France)
Emma Burgisser, Christian Aid (U.K.)
Brock Burton, Center for Climate and Energy Solutions (U.S.)
Kizito Byenkya, Open Society Foundations (Uganda/U.S.)
Dr. Marsha Simone Cadogan, MSC Intellectual Property & Technology Law (Canada)
Nycolas Candido, Plataforma CIPÓ (Brazil)
Dr. Suchandrima Chakraborty, Khushi Baby (India)
Dr. Joni Carley, Pathways To Peace (U.S.)
Laura Chapell, Institute For Public Policy Research (U.S.)
Rebekkah Chatham, Quincy Institute (U.S.)
Dr. Vijay Kumar Chattu, United Nations University (Canada)
Sahlim Charles, Reimagining New Communities (Kenya)
Peter Kiplangat Cheruiyot, Ecosystem and Social Economic Development Organisation (Kenya)
Mohamed Ali Chihi, Global Institute for Strategic Research (Tunisia, based in Doha)
Theodoros Chronopoulos, Charles Stewart Mott Foundation (U.K.)

DongHo Chung, Chey Institute for Advanced Studies (Republic of Korea)

Dan Ciuriak, Ciuriak Consulting (Canada)

Dr. Bernard Colas, Affilia Légal (Canada)

Dr. Stefan Collignonb, London School of Economics (Germany)

Michael Collins, Institute for Economics & Peace (U.K., based in New York)

Dr. Bruno De Conti, University of Campinas (Brazil)

Lilia Caiado Coelho Beltrao Couto, Open Society Foundations (Brazil)

Dr. Tad Daley, Americans for Democratic Action Foundation of Southern California/CGS (U.S.)

Aude Darnal, Consultant (Martinique, based in Washington D.C.)

Chandrima Das, Stimson Center (U.S.)

Dr. Priyadarshi Dash, Research and Information System for Developing Countries (India)

Dr. Elena Davlikanova, Center for European Policy Analysis (Ukraine)

Dr. Adam Day, UN University Centre for Policy Research (U.S., based in Geneva)

Dr. Eleni Diamanti, French National Centre for Scientific Research/Sorbonne University (France)

Rosario Diaz Garavito, The Millennials Movement/Coalition for the UN We Need (Peru, based in New York)

Sandrine Dixson-Decleve, Club of Rome (Belgium)

Ben Donaldson, 1 for 8 Billion (U.K.)

Dr. Caroline Dunton, UN University Centre for Policy Research (Canada, based in New York)

Enoh Ebong, Center for Strategic and International Studies (Nigeria/U.S.)

Dr. Ilaria Espa, Università della Svizzera Italiana (Italy, based in Lugano)

Dr. Ugoji A. Eze, Eng Aja Eze Foundation (U.K.)

Dr. Adib Farhadi, University of South Florida (USA)

Dr. Filippo Fasulo, Italian Institute for International Political Studies (Italy)

Guilherme Faviero, AIDS Healthcare Foundation (Brazil, based in Miami)

Toby Fenton, Good Futures Group (U.K.)

Dr. Michael Franzak, UN University Centre for Policy Research (U.S.)

Maiara Folly, Plataforma CIPÓ (Brazil, based in Washington D.C.)

Ayla Francis Foster, Humanity United (U.S.)

Dr. Andreas Freytag, Friedrich Schiller University Jena (Germany)

Charlotte Friar, Oxfam (U.S.)

Haihong Gao, Institute of World Economics and Politics/Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (China)

Henry Gao, Singapore Management University (Singapore)

Ishan Ganguly, Independent Consultant (India)

Dr. Alicia Garcia Herrero, Bruegel (Spain)

Dr. Alejandro Garofali, European Institute of International Studies (Sweden)

Gargi Gaur, Nalanda University (India)

Dr. Alison Gillwald, Research ICT Africa/University of Cape Town (South Africa)

Francesco Giovanni Lizzi, University of Bologna (Italy)

Gordon Glass, Global Leadership Ltd (U.K.)

Dr. Richard Gold, McGill University/CIGI (Canada)

Javier Gonzalez Gomez, Ethos Innovation in Public Policy (Mexico)

Vitória Gonzalez, Plataforma CIPÓ (Brazil)

Pamla Gopaul, African Union-NEPAD (South Africa)

Dr. Rose Govindaraj, Pondicherry University (India)

Ettore Greco, Istituto Affari Internazionali (Italy)

Maja Groff, Climate Governance Commission (Canada, based in the Hague)

Paolo Guerrieri, PSIA Sciences Po (Italy)

Neshan Gunesekera, World Future Council (Sri Lanka, based in Hamburg)

Abhyuday Kiran Hadal, Arts and Culture ImPact Coalition (India)

Alec Haglund, Positive Money (Finland)

Nassim Hajouji, Policy Center for the New South (Morocco)

Jeff Hall, Open Society Foundations (U.S.)

Humayun Hamidzada, Independent Consultant (Canada)

David Evan Harris, University of California Berkley (U.S.)

Kelsey Harris, Center for Global Development (U.S.)

George Darlington Hashaka, Uganda Peace Foundation (Uganda)

Dr. Alex He, Center for International Governance Innovation (China, based in Canada)

Nella Sri Hendriyetty, Indonesia Ministry of Finance (Indonesia)

Barry Herman, Social Justice in Global Development (U.S.)

Shailey Hingorani, Society for Citizens Vigilance Initiatives (India)

Dr. Daisaku Higashi, Sophia University (Japan)

Ei Hnin Hlaing, Article 109 Coalition (Myanmar, based in Geneva)

Siddhant Hira, NatStrat (India)

Hussein Hirji, Gates Foundation (Canada)

Dr. Peter Hoffman, The New School (U.S.)

Pat Horn, Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing (South Africa)

Dr. Toshihino Hoshino, University of Osaka (Japan)

Jeffery Huffines, Coalition for the UN We Need (U.S.)

Ethel Hui Yan Tan, World Trade Organization/University of St. Gallen (Singapore)

Liz Hume, Alliance for Peacebuilding (U.S.)

Thomas Hurdson, Greenspace Action and Network (Kenya)

Heather Hurlburt, Chatham House (U.S.)
 Dr. Anna-Katharina Hornidge, German Institute of Development and Sustainability (Germany)
 Andrew Hyde, Stimson Center (U.S.)
 Patrick Adeyemi Illori, Uppsala University, Sweden (Austria)
 Eoin Jackson, Climate Governance Commission (Ireland)
 Dr. Nanda Kumar Janardhanan, Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (India, based in Japan)
 Dr. Ken Jimbo, International House of Japan (Japan)
 Mark Johnson, The New School (U.S.)
 Angela Joo-Hyun Kang, W20 (South Korea)
 Renata Juliotti, Geledés Instituto da Mulher Negra/ACUNS (Brazil)
 Wilhelminah Juma, Greenspace Action & Network Organization (Kenya)
 Martina Mnenegwa Kabisama, Southern Africa Human Rights NGO Network Tanzania Chapter (Tanzania)
 Adeel Sultan Kadri, Manzil Pakistan (Pakistan)
 Minah Kang, Ewha Womans University (South Korea)
 Natika Kantaria, Global Governance Innovation Network (Georgia)
 Wanjiru Kanyiha, Global Public Investment Network (Kenya)
 Dr. Olayinka Idowu Kareem, University of Hohenheim (Nigeria, based in Stuttgart)
 Aranyam Kashyap, Independent Consultant (India)
 Jeremie Kasongo, Global Enviro-Action (DRC)
 Christian Kastrop, Global Solutions Initiative (Germany)
 Dr. Celine Kauffmann, IDDRI (France)
 Peter Kayanga, Disability People's Forum Uganda (Uganda)
 Dr. Burcu Kilic, CIGI (U.S.)
 Naomi Kilungu, AI for Peace Africa (Kenya)
 Dr. James Kim, Stimson Center (U.S.)
 Dr. Mikatekiso Kubayi, Institute for Global Dialogue/ANUMDI (South Africa)
 Dr. Ero Ibhafidon, Waterlight Save Initiative (Nigeria)
 Peter Kamau, Infolink Safety Solution (Kenya)
 Dr. Danisha Kazi, Positive Money (U.K.)
 Maria Kisumbi, Humanity United (Uganda/U.S.)
 Ivy Koek, Soka Gakkai International (U.S.)
 Sanoop Sajan Koshy, IIT Madras (India)
 Dr. Georgios Kostakos, Foundation for Global Governance and Sustainability (Greece)
 Dr. Giovanna Kuele, Igarape Institute (Brazil)
 Dr. Aigul Kulnazarova, Tama University/ACUNS (Japan)
 Dr. Fuein Vera Kum, Nkafu Policy Institute (Cameroon)
 Rohit Kumar, Zedsoftpoint (India)
 Bipin Kumar Badri Narayanan, Canadian Science Policy Centre (India, based in Canada)
 Cangül Kuş, Izmir Development Agency (Turkiye)
 Chris Kwaja, Centre for Peace and Security Studies, Modibbo Adama University (Nigeria)
 Gordon LaForge, New America (U.S.)
 Sanata Elisabeth Lahami, Benin Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Benin)
 Hardin Lang, Refugees International (U.S.)
 Dr. Joris Larik, Leiden University/GGIN (Netherlands)
 Ademola Lawal, Savannah Centre for Diplomacy, Democracy, and Development/ANUMDI (Nigeria)
 Dr. Zeno Leoni, King's College London (Italy, based in London)
 David Levai, Iswe Foundation (France)
 Dr. Courtney Lindsay, ODI Global (Trinidad and Tobago, based in London)
 Dr. Joshua Lincoln, Tufts Fletcher School of Law & Diplomacy (U.S.)
 Mike Liu, Center for China & Globalization (China)
 Veronica Liu, Center for China & Globalization (China)
 Tayla Lockman-Fine, Ford Foundation (U.S.)
 Dr. Augusto Lopez Claros, Global Governance Forum (Bolivia, based in Madrid)
 Francisco Segovia Losa, Club de Madrid (Spain)
 Luis de Lossada i Gallart, IE Global Policy Center (Spain)
 Meliana Lumbantoruan, Publish What You Pay (Indonesia)
 Dr. Adam Lupel, Coalition for the UN We Need (U.S.)
 Ian Lynch, Integrity Initiatives International (U.S.)
 Jean Maier, American University (U.S.)
 Aishwarya Machani, London School of Economics (India/U.K.)
 Zine Magadlela, Independent Continental Youth Advisory Council on AfCFTA (South Africa)
 Ruth Wamuyu Maina, Global South Fiscal Governance Initiative (Kenya)
 Dr. Igor Makarov, HSE University (Russia)
 Karim Makdisi, American University of Beirut/MENARA (Lebanon)
 Tracy Mamoun, Southern Voice (France)
 Stefano Manservigi, Center for International Political Studies (Italy)
 Branka Marijan, Project Ploughshares (Bosnia-Herzegovina, based in Toronto)
 Dr. Antonio Marinello, University of Siena (Italy)
 Katherine Marshall, G20 Interfaith Forum (U.S.)
 Angelo Martelli, London School of Economics (Italy)
 Dr. Atse Kambo Martial, Pan-African Think Do African Network of Young Researchers (Côte d'Ivoire)
 Florian Martin-Bariteau, University of Ottawa (Canada)
 Sofia Martínez, Institute for Energy Diversification and Saving (Spain)
 Akshay Mathur, Asia Society Policy Institute (India)
 Frank Mattheis, UNU (Germany)
 Pierfrancesco Mattiolo, University of Antwerp (Italy)
 Roberto Giorgio Mazzolin, CIGI/Rhea Canada Inc/Starion and Nexova Groups Europe (Canada)
 Apiwe Mbutuma, Wits University (South Africa)

Erin McCandless, University of Johannesburg (U.S., based in Johannesburg)

Chloe McDowell, Re-Imagine Europa (U.K.)

Jordan McLean, Southern Transitions (South Africa)

Sameera Mehra, WINGS (India, based in London)

Reon van der Merwe, Worldwide Initiatives for Grantmaker Support (South Africa)

Dr. Mabel Lu Miao, Center for China & Globalization (China)

Dr. Mia Mikic, University of Waikato (New Zealand)

Peter Middlebrook, Geopolicity (U.K., based in Dubai)

Eva Mineur, Global Challenges Foundation (Sweden)

Vidisha Mishra, Global Solutions Initiative (India, based in Berlin)

Michal Mlynar, Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs of the Slovak Republic (Slovakia)

Lerato Mofokeng, Gauteng Provincial Legislature (South Africa)

Ola Mohajer, Transcend AI (Canada, based in U.S.)

Sahar Mohy-Ud-din, VVOB-Education for Development (Botswana)

Tsireletso Mokoaoqo, Wits University (South Africa)

Kesaobaka Nancy Mopipi, South African Institute of International Affairs (South Africa)

Rafael Morales-Guzman, University of Saskatchewan (Mexico, based in Canada)

Jeremia Mosolodi, Youth Policy Lab South Africa (South Africa)

Esaië Muhindo, Farmers' Organization for Sustainable Development (DRC)

Dr. Syed Munir Khasru, The Institute for Policy, Advocacy, and Governance (Bangladesh)

Tim Murithi, University of Cape Town (South Africa)

Savior Mwambwa, Open Society Foundations (Zambia, based in New York)

Justus Lavi Mungau Mwololo, Kenya Small Scale Farmers Forum (Kenya)

Denis Goro Muniu, Global Centre for Policy and Strategy (Kenya)

Dr. Kakha Nadiradze, Association for Farmers Rights Defense (Georgia)

Dr. Pradeep Nair, Central University of Himachal Pradesh (India)

Dr. Jin Nakazato, University of Tokyo (Japan)

Maryam Nemazee, Independent Consultant (U.K.)

Edward Newman, Leeds University (U.K.)

Rose Ngugi, African Economic Research Consortium (Kenya)

Son Nguyen, Partnership for Climate and Nature Governance (Vietnam)

Bonginkosi Ngwenya, Information Regulator (South Africa)

Sarah Nicole, Project Liberty Institute (France)

Francoise Nicolas, French Institute of International Relations (France)

Stewart Nixon, Institute for Democracy and Economic Affairs (Australia, based in Kuala Lumpur)

Bongumusa Walter Ngema, Cape Peninsula University of Technology (South Africa)

Koena Nkhereanye, Harmattan Renewables (South Africa)

Dr. Egede Nkurunziza, Youth Committed to Effective Reconciliation for the Integral Development of Society (Burundi)

Dr. Beatriz Nofal, Argentine Council of Foreign Relations (Argentina)

Daniel Nowack, World Economic Forum (Switzerland)

Kristina Tatiana Nyasangare, Center for International Forestry Research and World Agroforestry (Kenya)

Dr. David Obura, Coastal Oceans Research and Development in the Indian Ocean (Kenya)

Derrick Odidi, Global Affairs Development Union (Kenya)

Dr. Alice Odingo, University of Nairobi/ACUNS (Kenya)

Louiza Odingo, Lawyers Hub (Kenya)

Dr. Fredrick Ogenga, Rongo University (Kenya)

Dr. Tinuade Adekunbi Ojo, University of Johannesburg (Nigeria, based in Johannesburg)

Anja Olin Pape, Global Challenges Foundation (Sweden)

Vitorino Mello Oliveira, UN Mission to Portugal (Portugal, based in New York)

Dr. Odunayo Olowookere, Centre for International Governance Innovation (Canada)

Dr. Alanna O'Malley, Erasmus University (Ireland, based in Rotterdam/The Hague)

Nisha Onta, Governance Lab (Nepal)

Anna Oosterlinck, Article 19 (Belgium, based in New York)

Michael Owuor, Global Center for Policy and Strategy (Kenya)

Zachary Paikin, Quincy Institute (Switzerland)

Sara Pantuliano, ODI Global (Italy, based in London)

Dr. Trita Parsi, Quincy Institute (U.S.)

Franco Passacantando, IAI (Italy)

Dr. David Passarelli, UN University Centre for Policy Research (Canada, based in New York)

Dr. Narendra Patil, Poonawalla Group (India)

Dr. Garth le Pere, Mapungubwe Institute for Strategic Reflection (South Africa)

Rafael Pereira, TINNUTS (India)

Dr. Roshan Perera, Centre for Poverty Analysis (Sri Lanka)

Daniel Perell, Bahai International Community and Coalition for the UN We Need (U.S.)

Clem Perry, World Resources Institute (U.K.)

Sharmini Peries, The Analysis.News (Canada/Sri Lanka)

Cristina Petcu, United Nations Mission in South Sudan (Romania, based in Juba)

Jonathan Violante Pica, European Institute of International Studies (Sweden)

CJ Pine, Georgetown University in Qatar (U.S.)

Marie-Laure Poire, Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (France, based in The Hague)

Dr. Richard Ponzio, Stimson Center/GGIN (U.S.)

Vesselin Popovski, O.P. Jindal Global University Law School (Bulgaria, based in New Delhi)

Keith Porter, Stanley Center for Peace and Security (U.S.)

Lauren S. Power, Sophia University (U.S., based in Tokyo)

Thirukumar Premakumar, International Youth Alliance for Peace (Sri Lanka)

Kaitlin Puccio, Puccio Law (U.S.)

Sofie Pultz, Institute For Public Policy Research (U.K.)

Sanjay Puri, Knowledge Networks (U.S.)

Meredith Preston McGhie, Global Center for Pluralism (Canada)

Shuva Raha, Council on Energy, Environment, and Water (India)

Dr. Edna Ramirez Robles, University of Guadalajara School of Law (Mexico)

Preethi Rao, LEAD at Krea University (India)

Laurel Rapp, Chatham House (U.S., based in London)

Dr. Jessica Rapson, University of Oxford (Canada)

Heela Rasool-Ayub, New America (U.S.)

Maria João Rauch, SDSN Portugal (Portugal)

Dr. Saon Ray, ICRIER (India)

Simon Reid-Henry, Peace Research Institute Oslo (U.K., based in Oslo)

Britta Rennkamp, University of Cape Town (South Africa)

Marianna Richardson, G20 Interfaith Forum (U.S.)

Maria João Rodrigues, Reimagined Europa (Portugal, based in Brussels)

Ana Isabel Fiafilio Rodriguez, Independent Consultant (Peru)

Rafal Rohozinski, SecDev (Canada)

Gian Cesare Romagnoli, Università Roma Tre (Italy)

Dr. Njoke Mbanda Lionel Romeo, GYDA and Model Forest Policy Program (Cameroon, based in Beijing)

Florencia Rubiolo, Insight 21 (Argentina)

Bettina Rudloff, German Institute of International and Security Affairs (Germany)

Hollie Russon-Gilman, Rockefeller Brothers Fund (U.S.)

Syed Nasim Siraj Rudro, International Human Rights Commission Bangladesh (Bangladesh)

Dr. Sabyasachi Saha, Research and Information System for Developing Countries (India)

Otto Saki, Ford Foundation (Zimbabwe/U.S.)

Diego Salama, Leiden University (Bolivia, based in Leiden)

Alimi Salifou, Young World Federalists West Africa (Nigeria)

Natalie Samarasinghe, Global Challenges Foundation (U.K./Sri Lanka)

Paul Samson, Centre for International Governance Innovation (Canada)

Joseph Sany, USIP (Cameroon/U.S.)

Jagjeet Sareen, Dalberg Advisors (India)

Anumita Sarkar, P/ PRABHAVEE - Partner for Social Impact (India)

Karl P. Sauvart, Columbia Center on Sustainable Development (Germany)

Zafar Saydaliev, EduLAB (Germany)

Claudia Schmucker, DGAP (Germany)

Kiyoyuki Seguchi, Canon Center for Global Studies (Japan)

José Siaba Serrate, CARI & Italian Institute for International Political Studies (Argentina)

Lindokuhle Sibiya, Eswatini Youth and Women for Change (Eswatini)

Manish Sharma, Bluwage (India)

Ishaan Shah, Coalition for the UN We Need (U.K., based in New York)

Harshit Sharma, Waymo (Canada, based in Mountain View)

Manish Sharma, Kibbutz Agrispace (India)

Mihir Sharma, Institute For Public Policy Research (U.K.)

Syed Ali Shehryar, Independent Consultant (Pakistan)

Alex Shenderov, World Futures Studies Federation (U.S.)

Sarang Shidore, Quincy Institute (U.S.)

Parousia Shikwambane, Institute for Global Dialogue (South Africa)

Hideaki Shinoda, Tokyo University (Japan)

Rebekah Shirley, WRI Africa (Trinidad and Tobago, based in Nairobi)

Dr. Uttaam Siinghal, TWI (India)

Rebecca Shoot, ImPact Coalition on Strengthening International Judicial Institutions (U.S.)

Anne Simmons-Benton, W20-USA (U.S.)

W.P. Sidhu, New York University (India)

Sheetal Sinha, Council on Energy, Environment & Water (India)

Manisha Sinha, University of Cincinnati (India)

Henrietta Skareng, Tufts University (Sweden, based in Boston)

Dr. Maarten Smeets, Trade and Investment Research Network (Netherlands)

Courtney Smith, Seton Hall University (U.S.)

Rebecca Snyder, Stimson/GGIN (U.S.)

Ambassador Jie-Ae Sohn, Chey Institute for Advanced Studies (Republic of Korea)

Alex Stapleton, Foreign Policy for America (U.S.)

Cristina Stefan, Leeds University (Romania)

Dr. Sherry M. Stephenson, Pacific Economic Cooperation Council (U.S., based in Geneva)

Dr. Peter Stoett, Ontario Tech University (Canada)

Dr. Qingyi Su, Institute of World Economics and Politics, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (China)

HyeeJung Suh, Chey Institute for Advanced Studies (Republic of Korea)

Dr. Suhono Harso Supangkat, Institute Technology Bandung Indonesia (Indonesia)

Javier Surasky, La Plata National University (Argentina)

Dr. Kazuto Suzuki, University of Tokyo/Institute of Geoeconomics (Japan)

Daryl Swanepoel, Inclusive Society Institute (South Africa)

Dr. Mary S Swenson, World Trade Center (U.S.)

Pawel Swieboda, European Policy Centre (Poland)

Florence Syevuo, SDG Kenya Forum/Coalition for the UN We Need (Kenya)

Elias Szczytnicki, Religions for Peace (Peru)

Dr. Yash Tadimalla, Computing Research Association (India, based in Washington, D.C.)

Shakirudeen Taiwo, University of Johannesburg (Nigeria)

Laure Tall, The Institute of Policy Analysis and Research (Senegal)

Ethel Hui Yan Tan, World Trade Organization (Singapore, based in Geneva)

Jin Tanaka, University Student Chamber International (Japan)

Einar Tangen, Center for International Governance Innovation (U.S., based in Beijing)

Dr. Primus M. Tazanu, Nkafu Policy Institute (Cameroon)

Enyseh Teimory, UNA-UK (U.K.)

Charra Tesfaye Terfassa, Open Society Foundations (Ethiopia)

Dr. Martha Thomas, Academic Council on the United Nations System (Trinidad and Tobago/U.S.)

Rachel D. Thrasher, Boston University Global Development Policy Center (U.S.)

Mandeep Tiwana, CIVICUS (India, based in New York)

Hector Rogelio Torres, Centre for International Governance Innovation (Argentina/Italy, based in Waterloo)

Stefan Tschauko, Columbia University (Austria)

Pamela Tshozi, At Vision Ninety Nine (South Africa)

Calder Tsuyuki-Tomlinson, United Nations University Centre for Policy Research (Canada)

Dr. Christina Turczyn, Fulbright Association (U.S.)

Gulden Turktan, Kagider (Türkiye)

Léon Charles Ulrich, Cœur sans Frontières (Congo)

Mariam Umarji, Ford Foundation (Mozambique)

Laura Van Wie McGrory, World Research Institute Africa (U.S.)

Chaitra Vedullapalli, Women In Cloud (U.S.)

Dirk Willem te Velde, ODI Global/SOAS University of London (U.K.)

Dr. Anbumozhi Venkatachalam Anbumozhi, Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia (India, based in Jakarta)

Andrea Vignolo, Ministry of Education and Culture (Uruguay)

Matteo Villa, Italian Institute for International Political Studies (Italy)

Antonio Villafranca, Italian Institute for International Political Studies (Italy)

John Vlasto, WFM/Institute for Global Policy (U.K.)

Betty Wainaina, Pathfinders NYU-CIC (Kenya, based in New York)

Wahid Waissi, Australian National University (Afghanistan, based in Canberra)

Dr. Cornelia Walther, Sunway University (Germany)

Dr. Henry Wang, Center for China & Globalization (China)

Alyn Ware, WFM/IGP (New Zealand, based in Prague)

Sundeep Waslekar, Strategic Foresight Group (India)

Fergus Watt, Coalition for the UN We Need (Canada)

Josh Wells, Project Starling (U.S.)

Anna Widegren, Reimagine Europa (Sweden, based in Brussels)

Maggie Williams, Center on International Cooperation (U.S.)

Jonah Wittkamper, Global Governance Philanthropy Network (U.S.)

Kasumi Yamazaki, Institute of Geoeconomics (Japan)

Liubov Yaroshenko, En+ Group (Russia)

Soon-Young Yoon, Cities for CEDAW History and Futures Project/Coalition for the UN We Need (DPRK, based in New York)

Nudhara Yusuf, Global Governance Innovation Network and Coalition for the UN We Need (India, based in U.S.)

Akram Zaoui, Observer Research Foundation Middle East (Morocco, based in Dubai)

Linjia Zhou, DAlpha AI (U.S.)

Siphamandla Zondi, Institute for Pan-African Thought and Conversation (South Africa)

Zamazulu Zulu, Red Dart Consulting (South Africa)

Ibon Zugasti, Prospektiker/Millennium Project (Spain)