Salutation

Dear High Representative Inzko,

Dear Minister Möllring,

Dear presidents and representatives of national academies,

Dear rectors and scientists,

Excellencies,

Dear participants,

I would like to welcome you to the 1st Joint Science Conference “Perspective Europe: Building Future with Science,” which is being organised in the framework of the Intergovernmental Initiative Western Balkans (IIWB).

At the beginning, I would like to outline the background and principal aims of our conference.

Background

[Yesterday evening I already gave you brief information on this]

[I] First, what is the Intergovernmental Initiative Western Balkans? [also known as the “Berlin Process” or the “Western Balkans Process”]

On the invitation of the German Federal Chancellor Angela Merkel, an intergovernmental conference on the Western Balkans took place in Berlin on 28 August 2014. This high-level meeting was the beginning of a wider initiative to reconfirm the European commitment to the Western Balkans and to consolidate the various efforts to integrate the region into the European Union.

The next conference in this framework will take place in August 2015 in Austria (Vienna); in 2016 the conference will go to France and in 2017 to Italy.

[II] Second, how can the outcome of the political conference in Berlin, in 2014, be summarised?

The political outcome was reflected by a strong commitment from the countries involved to implement measures in order to strengthen the connectivity within the Western Balkans, to support the EU-dimension and the prospect of EU-integration of the region.

Three major priority areas were defined:

(1) the resolution of open political questions (on bilateral and regional level – regional meaning South-Eastern Europe),
(2) the economic development of the region by – among other priorities – improving the regional infrastructure, and

(3) the enhancement of scientific and societal cooperation.

The latter priority area – which is basically our field of work – emphasises the cooperation in education, science and research, as well as the (re)setting of a framework for the science-policy-society dialogue – by bringing unbiased expertise into the strategic process of European integration.

This should be done not exclusively for the purpose of the EU-accession of the Western Balkan countries, but also for supporting Europe as an inclusive construct. Therefore, it intends to find tangible formats for intensifying cooperation within South-Eastern Europe; formats which are feasible and have good chances to be implemented.

[III] Third, what is the Joint Science Conference (JSC)?

After the launching of the political initiative, the Leopoldina as national academy took over the initiative in the field of education, science, research and societal dialogue – in agreement with the German Federal Government. Being aware of the importance of such an undertaking for a European prospect for the Western Balkans, we have decided to invite key stakeholders of the science systems to an opening conference in Germany – to the 1st Joint Science Conference.

The meeting today is intended to be starting point for a series of joint consultations and, hopefully, other forms of cooperation between 2015 and 2018 (and beyond).

You are attending this conference as representatives of the national academies, of the rectors’ conferences and as scientists. I welcome also the representatives of the embassies of the countries involved in the Western Balkans Process.

Participants from 12 countries are taking part: Albania, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, France, Germany, Italy, Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, Slovenia.

I am particularly glad, that together with the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation – and here I warmly welcome Mr Hesse [Deputy Secretary-General of the AvH] – we were able to invite several distinguished scientists from South-Eastern Europe, as participants ad personam.

With this framework we offer a forum for the articulation of diverse opinions, of balancing the discussions and stimulating brainstorming – which we hope, will enrich the outcome.

The title we have chosen reflects our approach towards giving a more substantial “voice” to science in the spotlight of the processes mentioned here: “Perspective Europe: Building Future with Science”. Scientists and science need to be a reliable anchor for sustainable future developments, on different scales, facing various challenges and identifying suitable solutions.

Therefore, they need to get involved and to interact. With this conference, we are providing the suitable setting for this. The results from the conference will be fed into the consultations of the political level. That is why I call upon you to actively engage in the deliberations, background discussions and negotiations. The success of the conference will depend on our exchange of opinions, our analysis, our ideas and our determination.

Conference aims

Ladies and gentlemen,

What are the intentions of this conference?
We want to provide a framework for exchange and cooperation between key stakeholders of the science system under the umbrella of the Western Balkans Process.

We intend to assess the main integration challenges in Europe on an institutional, political and societal level, articulating the point of view of science.

Further on, we should reflect on the strategic role of science in the process of EU-integration of South-Eastern Europe, including needs/possibilities for inserting scientific expertise into strategies for future development.

Let us consider concrete means for enhancing cooperation and connectivity, both within South-Eastern Europe and from a broader European perspective.

We also need to discuss the geometries of interaction between science, politics and society and to explore possibilities for new agenda settings and better mutual dialogue.

Also – we intend to draft a joint resolution, containing main conclusions and recommendation for the next political meeting of the Western Balkans Process in August 2015, in Vienna.

And last, but not least, let us agree on a forthcoming agenda for future collaboration, let us anchor the Joint Science Conference as a significant part of the Western Balkans Process.

**Some technical remarks on the conference set-up**

Our conference will encompass four steps:

(1) After my opening remarks, we will listen to three plenary keynotes on major challenges.

(2) Then, the proceedings will continue in two collaborative roundtables, which will cover the main objectives of our conference and the Western Balkans Process. Three facilitators for each roundtable will moderate the discussions. They will also contribute to drawing the main conclusions from the two roundtables.

(3) After the roundtables, the stakeholders will break-out into seven consultations groups: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, EU-member countries, Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro, and Serbia. Each group will have the possibility to retreat in a separate room. Afterwards, the plenum of the conference will re-unite and deliberate on the forthcoming agenda.

(4) Tomorrow, the participants will have the opportunity to exchange opinions with political stakeholders involved in the Western Balkans Process. Key findings and recommendations from the first day of the conference – from today – can be presented there. We have arranged a work meeting at the German Federal Chancellery, where the ambassadors/embassies of the participating countries will also attend.

**Concluding remarks**

In the end, I would like to thank to our partners in the organising committee: the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, the German Federal Chancellery (Mr Heusgen), the German Foreign Office, the Prussian Heritage Foundation (Mr Parzinger) and the Austrian Embassy in Berlin – we all worked together in an efficient and productive manner.

I would also like to express our gratitude to the moderators, for accepting this role.

Also, I would like to particularly thank our two invited keynote speakers: Ambassador Inzko, the High Representative of the international community to Bosnia and Herzegovina – and, Mr Anastasakis,
Director of St Antony's College European Studies Centre and of the School of South East European Studies at the University of Oxford.

I am sure that our conference will be a promising starting point for scientific cooperation in the framework of the Western Balkans Process.

Thank you for your attention.

Pass over to Mr Hesse and Minister Möllring (in speaking order)

Thank you Minister Möllring and Mr Hesse, for your welcome addresses we will be hearing now. The floor is yours.

Keynote I: Megatrends – Challenges for Science Advice (Science-Society-Policy Triad and Science Diplomacy)
Professor Jörg Hacker, President of the German National Academy of Sciences Leopoldina
09:30 – 10:00
Leopoldina Headquarters Halle

Salutation
Ladies and gentlemen,

Introduction
The topic of my talk is science-based policy advice and some of the challenges it encounters today. Let me state from the beginning that the Leopoldina is the institution that has formed significantly my understanding of science-based policy advice – so I will say a few words on how the Leopoldina delivers advice to policy and society.

I will then characterise science-based policy advice by outlining its basic functions and principal aims. I will conclude my talk by making some remarks on science diplomacy at its role.

Some remarks on the work of the Leopoldina
Ladies and gentlemen,

Founded in 1652, the Leopoldina is one of the oldest academies of science in the world. It is dedicated to the advancement of science for the benefit of humankind and to the goal of shaping a better future. With some 1,500 members, the Leopoldina brings together outstanding scientists from Germany, Austria, Switzerland and many other countries – among them, currently 30 Nobel Prize holders.
The Leopoldina was appointed as the German National Academy of Sciences in 2008. In this capacity, it represents the German scientific community in international committees and speaks out on social and political questions, providing a nonpartisan, factual framework for discussion. Under the auspices of the Leopoldina, interdisciplinary groups of experts publish policy-guiding statements on issues of current interest.

The Leopoldina also releases joint statements with other German, European and international academies. It promotes scientific and public debate, supports young scientists, confers awards for scientific achievements, conducts research projects, and campaigns for the human rights of persecuted scientists.

Ladies and gentlemen,

**What are the basic functions of science-based policy advice?**

The German National Academy was founded with the aim of creating a legitimised institution that would work scientifically and independently of economic or political interests, in order to address key issues of significance for the future of society. The National Academy shares its findings with policymakers and the public, and puts these issues up for discussion on a national and international level. In the Leopoldina, we are concentrating these activities under the heading “science-based policy advice.”

*What do we mean by “science-based policy advice?”*

Science-based policy advice fulfils three functions.

1. First, it provides political decision-makers with state-of-the-art scientific knowledge that is reliable, relevant and transparent.
2. Second, it can systematically analyse policy options relevant for society and evaluate their feasibility.
3. Third, it contributes to public debate on policy and legislative goals.

In democratic systems, citizens who are interested in the consequences of science and technology can freely speak out on public policies. This usually results in a broad spectrum of opinions that are discussed in the public sphere and taken into consideration in decision-making. The pluralism of legitimate interests voicing their diverse views is a fundamental characteristic of democracies. Science-based policy advice can make a strong contribution to fulfilling those needs.

Ladies and gentlemen,

The wide-ranging expertise of its members allows the Leopoldina to voice its opinions on significant developments and the most pressing challenges of our time. In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, these primarily concern climate change, energy supply, disease control and health, demographic change, global economic systems, conflict research and the use of natural resources.

The Academy’s statements and recommendations provide policymakers with scientific analysis and evaluation on the most urgent issues facing society today. A further key aspect of the Academy’s work is early identification of major scientific developments that are likely to become important to society in the future, and providing analysis and recommendations accordingly. In this way, the Leopoldina helps to set policy-making on the right course.

The Leopoldina is free to choose its research themes and does so based on the scope of its scientific work, which is defined by its members, the Presidium and its standing committees. It can also decide
to respond to policymakers’ requests, and is equally independent in appointing researchers to the working groups that produce the respective statements and recommendations. The working groups are interdisciplinary and the Leopoldina calls on further independent experts for the peer review process.

**So, what are the principal aims of science-based policy advice?**

Reflecting on the experience of the Leopoldina, two general aims have emerged.

1. The first is to offer scientific advice to help evaluate distinct policy options. A general aim of science-based policy advice on such options should be to enhance cooperation between all stakeholders. Main instruments to reach that aim are communicating the best available scientific information about what we know and what could be done, as well as evaluating the options for action.

2. The second – perhaps more fundamental – general aim of science-based policy advice is to help provide a forum to discuss different positions and to explore the room for compromise. Given the need to define policy goals, it is necessary to support the negotiation of compromises – on a consensual basis.

Science-based policy advice needs to respect the division of labour between politically responsible decision-makers and advisers who want to help find reasonable ways of defining and implementing public policies.

Winston Churchill reportedly once said, “Scientists should be on tap, but not on top”. ‘Expertocracy’ or technocracy must, therefore, not become the future direction for science-based advice.

**Science Diplomacy**

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Louis Pasteur once said:

“Science knows no country, because knowledge belongs to humanity, and is the torch which illuminates the world. Science is the highest personification of the nation because that nation will remain the first which carries the furthest the works of thought and intelligence.”

Pasteur captures quite nicely that there does not exist any contradiction between two aspects of science. On the one hand, the values of science are universally valid and scientific knowledge is a global public good. On the other hand, all scientists and science systems strive to be excellent. Some more than the others.

Both aspects of science – its universal aspiration and its competitive nature – are supporting each other if scientists work internationally together in the spirit of mutual benefit.

This is also true when scientists are giving advice to politicians and the public. From my point of view, what we call “science diplomacy” is merely the continuation of science-based policy advice on the international and global level.

To make clear what I understand by “science diplomacy,” I would like to cite a report of the Royal Society that was published under the title “New Frontiers in Science Diplomacy” in 2010:

“Science diplomacy” is still a fluid concept, but can usefully be applied to the role of science, technology and innovation in three dimensions of policy:

1. informing foreign policy objectives with scientific advice (*science in diplomacy*);
(2) facilitating international science cooperation (diplomacy for science);

(3) using science cooperation to improve international relations between countries (science for diplomacy).”

These three aspects of science diplomacy exactly mirror the different uses of science in science-based policy advice. For the Leopoldina and many other national academies, activities in science diplomacy – such as today’s conference – are thus a natural consequence of our commitment to providing expertise.

Science diplomacy is an unparalleled opportunity to address global challenges (political, societal, environmental, economic etc) – the real challenges, which cannot be tackled exclusively on a national level.

Science is global and thrives on the free exchange of ideas. So, it must not have any fear of dialogue and must be able to overcome even the most difficult barriers. Where word and political actions have failed or are less promising, science must step in. It is about keeping and opening alternative communication channels – an “introvert”, isolated science is an oxymoron.

Using the language of science keeps channels of communication, progress and reconciliation always open. Universal values of science (objectivity, rationality, transparency, freedom of research etc.) establish a common language – this “way of speaking with each other” forges cooperation, but also competition and mutual understanding.

Science is both about details and about the big picture – in diplomacy it is the same.

Science diplomacy is about raising the really important questions: what kind of Europe we want for the future, what kind of Europe we leave behind? And Europe is not confined at the external borders of the EU! Europe is much more than institutions, crisis, finances or national interests. It is up to science diplomacy to shape the meaning of “more”.

**How to make use of the “soft but persuasive power” of science on the international parquet?**

Let me try to give some answers:

By strengthening national science-based advice, by equipping decision makers in politics and opinion makers in society with factual, research-based knowledge.

For that, we need to establish mechanisms, institutionalised formats, and formalised practices for the interaction in the triangle science – societies – politics. In this way, we can assure mutual appreciation and create actual synergies – whether it is in any capital city or in Brussels or on UN-level.

By communicating scientific findings and achievement in the best way possible, by science journalism, social media, research marketing, brokerage, information dissemination, interactive formats of all kind – we need to keep up with the rapid digitalisation of social communication.

Last, but not least, such high-level meetings of stakeholders of the science systems like our conference, should concentrate their efforts in order to overcome the existing problems and to shape a sustainable and inclusive future – on local, regional, national, supranational and global scale.

**Concluding remarks**

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Thank you very much for your attention.