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9:30 COFFEE

9:45 – 10:00 **Introduction**

10:00 – 11:30 **Opening Session: Policy Advice and Trends in Policy Advisory Systems**

**Chair:** *N. Belyaeva (HSE)*

 **Discussant:** *Thurid Hustedt (Berlin)*

***Paper 1***: Policy Advice and Advisory Systems: The Politics of Expertise and Influence

*Michael Howlett (Simon Fraser University, Canada)*

An especially important issue beyond description and classification, pertains to policy advisory system *dynamics*. That is, not only is it important to know how advisory systems operate in specific sectors and jurisdictions and who exercizes influence within them, it is also important to understand how these actors and their relationships change over time (Aberbach and Rockman 1989). This question has not been addressed at all in the existing literature on advisory systems and is the central focus of the special issue. Two specific dimensions of change are highlighted here: “*externalization*” or the extent to which actors outside government exercize influence and “*politicization*” or the extent to which partisan or non-technical aspects of policy forms the content of policy advice and thereby favours actors who deal in this kind of information and knowledge.

***Paper 2***: Policy Advice in Russia in 1990s-2000s: From Shaping Political Discourse to Policy Change

*Dmitry Zaytsev (National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow)*

There are four main theories or approaches to study interaction between knowledge and policy-making: “structural approach” (Weaver 1989, McGann & Weaver 2000, Abelson 2002, 2006, Rich 2004, McGann 2007-2014, McGann & Johnson 2005, McGann & Sabatini 2011); “network approach” (Stone & Denham 2004, Ladi 2005); “policy advisory system approach” (Halligan 1990, 1995, 1998, Howlett & Craft 2012, 2013, Howlett 2014); “boundary work approach” (Wittrock 1991, Hoppe 2002, 2003, 2005, 2009). Despite of collected empirical evidence of policy advise (policy advisors, think tanks, diverse intellectual communities, policy workers, and ideas) importance, and sometimes, power, in policy process, all these theories and approaches do not answer on the main research question raised in this research – To what extents policy advisors have an impact in policy change compared with other factors and actors or drivers of changes? What is their unique combination to make specific public policy successful? The objective of this research project is to model the mechanisms of policy advice impact in policy changes in Russia in 1990s-2000s. We will study the process of policy changes in Russia in 1990s-2000s in education policy, STI policy, and policy towards civil society; will define the power and influence, capacities to build coalitions and networking styles, roles and types, discourses and dynamics of this policy advise; evaluate the impact of policy advisors, necessary and sufficient conditions, and their combinations, which allow policy advisors to have considerable policy impact in policy changes.

COFFEE

11:45 -13:15 **Panel 1: Policy Advice in Transitional Countries and in Russia**

**Chair:** *D. Zaytsev (HSE)*

**Discussant:** *M. Howlett (NUS/SFU)*

***Paper 1:*** Think Tanks or Intellectual Communities? How Different Forms of Self-Organized Policy Analysts Adapt to a Changing Political Regime in the Russian Federation

*Nina Belyaeva (National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow)*

In the case of the Russian Federation, presenting a comprehensive picture of all the analytical centers and organizations providing policy analysis in particular fields is close to impossible as they are too many and the environment is highly unstable. They appear and disappear regularly. During the early 1990s – the ‘golden era’ of think tanks in Russia – such centers 'mushroomed' in response to political developments. At the current time, the opposite trend is evident. Think tanks and small policy research centers are starting to disappear because of ‘unfriendly’ mergers, a lack of clients and funds, and in the worst-case scenario, forced closure resulting from publishing overly critical analysis. In this context, an important cleavage has emerged between the Moscow-based ‘analytical elite’ belonging to stable and well-funded organizations and seeking to influence Federal-level policymaking, and their regional counterparts that serve the interests of local clients such as the regional governor’s office, business associations or political parties.

***Paper 2***: The Rohingya Refugee Crisis: Assessing the Roles of Intergovernmental Expert Organisations in Myanmar

Arnab Roy Chowdhury *(National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow)*

The Rohingyas are Muslim minority population in Myanmar, which is mainly dominated by the Theravada Buddhist majority Bamar population. The Rohingyas were officially made ‘stateless’ by the Myanmar government by mooting the 1982 Citizenship law whereby their ethnicity was de-recognised and they were labelled as ‘illegal migrants’. In the last few fifty years this group has been subject to various human rights abuses, persecution and forced migration. They have taken refuge in neighbouring countries such as Bangladesh, Thailand and Malaysia. A recent violence that broke out in Myanmar in August 2017 brought back the long lingering ‘Rohingya refugee question’ into the discursive and deliberative space of the ‘global civil society’. In a policy driven approach, I compare and evaluate various strategies adopted by two intergovernmental expert organisations dealing with internal displacement and refugee policies; the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and International Organisation for Migration (IOM), to solve this ‘protracted refugee situation’ in an endeavour to provide a ‘durable solution’ in Myanmar.

13:15 – 14:15 LUNCH

14:15 – 15:45 **Panel 2: Institutional Aspects of Policy Advice**

**Chair:** *M. Howlett (NUS/SFU)*

**Discussant:** *Victor Albert (HSE)*

Paper 1: Rethinking Impact in Policy Advice Systems - the case of Australia

*Rob Manwaring (Flinders University, Australia)*

The dynamics of policy advice giving in a policy advisory system (PAS) is complex, multifaceted, and relational. Research on policy advice has shifted from a “first wave” to a “second wave” that places a greater focus on the dynamics of PASs. This article expands our understanding of the impact of advice giving in a PAS by developing a framework that integrates supply, demand, content, and contextual factors. This article introduces a new type of policy actor (the “thinker in residence”) to better understand the relational dynamics of a PAS and compare why some actors achieve greater impact than others.

Paper 2: Organizing for Policy Advice

*Casper van de Berg (Leiden, Netherlands)*

TBC

Paper 3: The role of international organizations in policy advisory systems: technocratic, decisionist or pragmatic?

Caroline Schlaufer *(HSE)*

The policy advice literature has paid little attention to the role of international organizations in policy advisory systems. However, in developing and transitional countries international organizations have been playing an active role in advising policy-makers. As an external advisor, international organizations may provide ‘non-political’ expert advice to national decision-makers. At the same time, advice needs to respond to political priorities at the international and national levels and consider public acceptance. In this paper, I use Habermas’ models of technocratic, decisionist and pragmatist modes of governance to conceptualize policy advice by international organizations. I develop the hypotheses that international organizations take a different approach to advising governments depending on 1) whether advice is given in times of crisis or as a routine, and 2) whether the advised country is characterized by a democratic or authoritarian environment. To test these hypotheses, I propose a comparative research design that compares the recommendations provided by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to a variety of countries as a routine and in times of crisis.

15:45-16:15 COFFEE

16:15–17:45 **Panel 3: Dynamics and Trends in the Politics of Expertise**

**Chair:** *Casper van de Berg (Leiden, Netherlands)* TBC

**Discussant:** *Rob Manwaring (Flinders University, Australia)*

***Paper 1***: Think Tanks and Policy Advice in India. What are they thinking? An exploratory study of think tank policy advice in economic, energy, and environment policy in India

*Nihit Goyal (National University of Singapore)*

The sources who provide policy advice, i.e. advice to policy makers, have diversified over time (Halligan 1995). In particular, actors external to the government, such as academics, consultants, and think tanks, increasingly perform this function (Bakvis 1997). However, the extent of externalization and its form varied by country and policy domain depending on the context (Vesley 2013). Think tanks have witnessed “explosive” growth in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. It is estimated that over 6,500 think tanks operate in 182 countries around the world now. Apart from those identified above, the key factors behind this development are posited to be increases in access to information, the growth in the size and scope of the public sector, globalization and rise of the non-state actor, and requirement for timely analysis (McGann 2014). Though the increase in their number has slowed over the previous decade in some countries and sectors, their importance and influence in others has continued to expand and is expected to do so even in the future. As a consequence, think tanks have received much scholarly attention but this effort has not culminated in a definitive understanding of their role, activities and dynamics.

***Paper 2*** – The Technological Community Impact on Policy Decisions in the Field of the Science and Technology Sector (Case of India and Russia)

*Sanjay Rajhans (National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow)*

This paper examines and explores the role of the technological community in two of the BRICS countries namely Russia and India and their divergent journey in the field of the Science and Technology sector. We take in this context one of the very visible success story in the field of the Information Technology unleashed on the vision of some of the policy advisors in India where the nascent technological infrastructure and a very rigid bureaucracy coupled with an inherent hostility against modernization in the 1980s. It is in this context, the new road map created by a group of policy advisors who created significant change in the one single generation and created through their policy vision overcame the obstacles and the path dependency. Similarly, we take the comparative study of the Russian analytical community in the sphere of technology in years of the USSR in the 1980S that had the necessary scientific basis but failed to transform their policy vision into political decision. Through our paper, we will compare the motivation, self-organization, structure and the capacity of these two-technological community to influence the political decision making.

18:00 DINNER

**Venue:***TBA*

**Day 2: 13 October 2017**

NRU HSE, Myasnitskaya, 20, Moscow

9:45 am COFFEE

10:00-11:30

**Panel 1: Expertise vs the Public? Ideologies and Political Advice**

**Chair:** *Thurid Hustedt (Berlin)*

**Discussant:** *Sanjay Rajhans (HSE)*

***Paper 1***: Ideologies, beliefs and power: lay and expert perspectives in participatory fora in Santo André, Brazil

*Victor Albert (National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow)*

Drawing on a long-term study of participatory institutions in Santo André, Brazil, I examine how lay and expert participants rationalize their conduct and unequal relations of power in a number of participatory institutions. These participants critically assess and measure the conditions they encountered in the institutions against broader participatory and governance ideals. For despite the shared experience of participation, there were quite divergent interpretations about the role of state officials and the possibilities for participation. The realisation of ideals of participatory democracy was, that is, in constant and dynamic tension with other beliefs – beliefs about the exigencies of governance, the (in)competence of popular actors, and the sincerity of the administrative commitment to citizen participation. There were also points of ideological overlap, convergence and consonance, among the tensions. In this presentation I chart this ideological terrain through examining the narratives of participants, as they critically reflect on their practical experiences in the institutions. It thus provides insights into the way that state structures, and the moves of state-based actors, are rationalised, supported and critiqued, both by lay participants and from within the administration itself.

***Paper 2***: The State, the Expert Community and the Public in Shaping Anti-Corruption Agenda: The Contemporary Russian Case

*Sergey Parkhomenko (National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow)*

The anti-corruption policy in Russia has been experiencing a massive transformation since 2008, when the federal anti-corruption legislation was enacted. These changes influenced not only the ethical infrastructure of civil service – it became much more complex and difficult to follow. At the same time the system of interaction among different participants of anti-corruption policy-making and policy-implementation was evolving. The formats and content of such interaction among the Government, civil servants, expert community, and the public were transformed and by now it is possible to formulate the key trends and to determine the possible scenarios for the near future development of the anti-corruption policy. The first trend is the search for formalization and bureaucratization of anti-corruption efforts. On the one hand it is introducing anti-corruption component into the rules of game in the bureaucratic routines. On the other hand it exaggerates the mechanistic nature of the anti-corruption policy and makes it vapid and thus less flexible and efficient. We can observe development of anti-corruption rituality of contemporary public service in Russia, which has not much to do with the real changes in cognitive or behavioral patterns of civil servants. The second trend can be formulated on the basis of analysis of attempts to monopolize the anti-corruption agenda by the state. Such evidences include the reaction of the state to the cases of recent anti-corruption investigations by independent actors, the cases of mass protests, etc. The third trend is the introduction of additional restrictive and control mechanisms for the expert community and the society. Some of them are claimed to be for anti-corruption purposes, some for national security, etc. But they have a very important side effect – undermining the potential for collective action against corruption. Taken together, these trends describe a very challenging and controversial situation for anti-corruption policy in contemporary Russia.

11:30 -13:00 **Panel 2: The Limits of Policy Advice: Absorptive Capacity**

**Chair:** *Sergey Parkhomenko (HSE)*

**Discussant:** *Caroline Schlaufer (HSE)*

***Paper 1***: Urban transportation policies in Moscow and Beijing from 2010s: policy advice in an authoritarian environment

*Artem Uldanov (National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow)*

Fighting traffic problems seems to be the main principle of urban transportation policies in developing countries, such as China and Russia. Large and fast-growing cities like Beijing and Moscow playing around urban transportation development strategies that focus mainly on combating traffic congestion and modernizing existed infrastructure, but problems usually a quite wider. (Blinkin) Air pollution, safety on roads, parking issues and public transport are also playing a major role in creation of sustainable transportation policy (Gakenhaimer, Buehler, Peng). In these conditions, effectiveness of the policies strongly rely on authorities’ capacity to absorb innovative proposals, quality of cooperation with expert community and financial priorities. In this paper we will analyse how policy advice in particular sphere – public transportation, are working on practice in specific authoritarian environment and how experts could shape decision-making process in such circumstances.

***Paper 2***: The Politics of expertise in the European Union: Applying Policy Advisory System approach

*Anastasia Rogacheva (National University of Singapore)*

The paper applies the Policy Advisory System approach to examine *the* role of experts in policy formulation in the European Union. Evidence-based policy has entered the centre stage of discussions on how to improve public policy effectiveness in the recent decades. Consideration of expert knowledge by policymakers has been deemed likely to improve policy decisions and decrease the risk of policy failures. Therefore, how and why the role and influence of experts varies in policymaking is an important research topic. The literature suggests that different approaches have been used to understand variations in the influence of experts (e.g. examining knowledge transmission and utilisation aspects). This paper suggests a new way to look into the politics of expertise by using the policy advisory system (PAS) approach. Applying the PAS approach seems to have potential as much of the existing literature focuses on producers and consumers of expertise in isolation from other advisory actors. However, by focusing on a particular type of actor in isolation from others, one reads out how the actor’s influence is shaped within an ongoing interaction between a broader set of actors. This paper argues that the role and influence of experts cannot be considered independently from other advisory actors. To account for how and why experts rather than other actors are influential in policy formulation, a framework that takes into account experts’ interactive relationship with other advisory actors is required. Applying the PAS approach has been considered to have an explanatory potential as one of the central features of the approach is the synergistic view of policy advisory actors as interlocked elements of a system with its own dynamics. The EU has been considered an interesting case for investigation as the EU policymaking relies on a well-developed policy advisory system. Furthermore, existing research is heavily focussing on Anglo-Saxon countries, whereas there are fewer studies on jurisdictions grounded in other political-administrative traditions.

13:00-13:15 SHORT BREAK

13:15-14:00 **Closing Session: Roundtable Discussion and Future Plans**

**Chair:** *Convenors*

14:00 Casual Lunch

End of Programme