

# ESF RESEARCH CONFERENCES

## Rapporteur Report

Partnership:	ESF LiU
Conference Title:	The Responsibility to Protect
Dates:	8-12 June 2010
Chair:	Prof Nollkaemper
Rapporteur:	Dr Mansfeldova

### General Comments

Any general comments you might have concerning the conference, your role, the scientific area covered by this conference, etc.

General evaluation – very successful conference from the scientific and organisational point of view.

One small mistake: the conference was funded through long-term partnerships between ESF and University of Linköping. It's a pity that there was neither somebody from the University presenting the University to the participants nor a University leaflet in the folder.

### Quality of Scientific Programme, Presentations and Discussion

Comments on the balance and scope of the scientific programme, the scientific quality of the presentations and discussions.

The scientific quality of the programme was outstanding. The participants involved – the paper givers are among the best in the area. There was quite high concentration of VIP persons, I mean four participants in the position of ambassadors. The topic was not in my field of research, but according my informal discussion with several participants the quality of presented papers (18) including key note address was highly evaluated. The presentation of papers was every day mixed with short talks (each 10 minutes) delivered mostly by younger scholars. There was possibility for discussion after each paper and a series of short talks. The discussion was to the point and the chairs tried not to limit the discussion. As a consequence there were sometimes problems with the time management.

Here was extensive poster session (9 posters); all poster authors got a time slot of 3 minutes for a short presentation in front of the audience and than posters were displayed for the rest of the conference. It gives enough opportunity for continuation of discussion which was plentifully used.

### Informal Networking and Exchange; Atmosphere

Was the schedule and the atmosphere conducive to an easy exchange of information? Was there time and space for an informal discussion? Were younger researchers integrated?

The atmosphere was very friendly. It was easy to exchange information not only among young scholars and among senior researchers, but also between these two groups thanks to informal atmosphere during breaks and city excursion. Valuable contribution in my opinions was the presentation of the documentary film by Daniel Goldhagen

“Worse than War”, followed by his lecture and intensive discussion, formal and informal.

### **Balance of Participants**

Was there an appropriate balance between young and senior participants? Was a balance of national groups and researchers from different (sub)fields achieved?

There was appropriate balance between young and senior participants. The question of balance of national groups is not so easy to answer. There was more balance in the sense of national origin of the participants and less balance in sense of country of institutional affiliation (strong representation of USA and UK). The composition of the programme created a good balance of different subfields, in my opinion.

### **Outlook and Future Developments**

Will new collaborations emerge from this conference? (How) could the conference outcomes be utilized further? Are there suitable (ESF) programmes or instruments to further the work of the conference?

There was about one hour time slot reserved for ‘Forward Look Plenary Discussion’ about future developments in the field at the end of the programme. The organisers plan to publish series of conference proceedings. I have discussion with the organizers and some participants about the ESF instruments and suitability of some of them for the future development of the research on this topic or sub-topics, but in the time of conference there were no plans to apply for some ESF programme in the future. On the other hand there was a good potential for the new collaborations.

### **Follow-up**

What immediate and long term follow-up would benefit collaborations and dialogues that may have begun at the conference?

The immediate follow-up activity was the creation of blog ([www.thebrokeronline.eu/r2p](http://www.thebrokeronline.eu/r2p)) managed by Julia Hoffmann from Amsterdam Centre for International law, Univ. of Amsterdam, where participants and guest could provide analyses of the discussions and opinions voiced at the conference; first contributions appeared since the first day of the conference. The organisers have promised to summarise the discussion on the blog and inform ESF about the results.

### **Organisation and Infrastructure**

Were venue, catering and accommodation appropriate for this conference? Were participants satisfied with the on-site administration and support?

The venue, catering and accommodation were appropriate for this conference. The city excursion was a welcomed contribution to the programme and informal atmosphere. The administration and on-site support was very good, Ms. Alessandra Piccolotto did and excellent job.

### **Summary & Overall Assessment**

Was the conference successful; were its aims achieved?

The aim of the conference *R2P: From Principle to Practice* was to discuss selected aspects of R2P with a view to identify the added value of R2P as well as the challenges

for the practical application of R2P. This aim was achieved. The conference brought together many internationally renowned experts, academics, eminent public intellectuals as well as policy makers and practitioners from all region of the world. The conference contributed to the development of the R2P concepts and provided policy-makers with concrete and useful ideas.

### **About ESF Research Conferences**

#### **The Scheme**

This conference is part of the European Science Foundation's (ESF) Research Conferences Scheme. The Scheme aims to promote scientific excellence and frontier level research throughout Europe and the rest of the world. Conferences aim to provide leading scientists and other participants, including young researchers, with a platform to present their work, to discuss the most recent developments in their fields of research and to network.

#### **Conference Format**

The core activities should be based on lectures by invited speakers, who are leaders in their respective fields, followed by extensive discussion periods. An informal exchange of ideas, both inside and outside the lecture room, should be encouraged, and the number of sessions in the daily timetable should be limited in order to allow sufficient time for interaction between the participants. Time should be reserved for a 'Forward Look Plenary Discussion' about future developments in the field.

Participants can take all their meals together to encourage further contact and networking, which can be particularly beneficial to younger researchers who may be less outspoken in the formal lecture room setting. In order to gain optimum benefit from the conference, both the speakers and the participants are asked to stay for the whole duration.

#### **Division of Tasks**

The Conference Chair is responsible for ensuring the quality of the scientific programme through the selection and invitation of speakers, and through the selection of participants.

The ESF Conferences Unit is responsible for managing all the logistical aspects of the conference organisation, including the provision of an on-site secretariat.

Further information: [www.esf.org/conferences](http://www.esf.org/conferences)