8 Modes of knowledge mobilization by/for international bureaucracies throughout international policy processes

Cecilia Cannon

- **What we know about knowledge mobilization and what we don't**
- **Modes of knowledge mobilization by/for bureaucracies across the international policy process**
- **Discussion—four types of knowledge mobilization**
- **Conclusion**

International relations (IR) scholars have shown that experts, through epistemic communities, can influence policy decision-makers' preferences in the way they define and frame issues. By doing so, they highlight one important mode of knowledge mobilization evident in the early phases of international policy processes—the policy formation phase. To better understand where and how expert knowledge is produced, and how it travels from its locus of production to international bureaucrats and decision-makers, I survey the different ways scholars and experts, and the knowledge they have produced, are mobilized by/for international bureaucracies throughout the various phases of international policy processes—from the issue identification phase; through agenda-setting; policy negotiation; policy implementation; and monitoring, review and enforcement. Four distinct modes of knowledge mobilization are identified: 1) knowledge mobilized through *advocacy*, whereby scholars/experts proactively mobilize the knowledge they have produced and directly engage with international bureaucracies in policy processes; 2) *technical/applied* knowledge mobilization, whereby scholars/experts are solicited by international bureaucracies to fill a knowledge or technical function; 3) knowledge mobilized as a *policy tool/resource*, whereby scholars proactively make their knowledge accessible to international bureaucracies by translating it into policy language, publishing it on accessible platforms, and inviting international bureaucrats to executive education and training sessions; and 4) *old school* knowledge mobilization, whereby

international bureaucracies reference research findings found in traditional academic publishing platforms—journal articles, books, and at academic conferences.

What we know about knowledge mobilization and what we don't

Most of what we know about how, when, and by whom knowledge is mobilized in international policy processes stems from the literature on epistemic communities,[1] in addition to recently published edited volumes that compile the personal accounts and experiences of scholars and experts who have actively engaged in various stages of the international policy process.[2] When surveying this literature, three unexplored aspects of the topic become apparent.

First, scholars have so far focused their analyses on the ways experts, operating in a broader knowledge community: 1) frame issues for collective debate and influence the negotiations; 2) identify policies for adoption at different governance levels; and 3) produce new evidence that changes the beliefs and understandings of the epistemic community, leading to regime reforms.[3] Existing literature thus focuses on one mode of knowledge mobilization frequently evident in the early phases of the international policy process—the way knowledge—specifically, issue definitions, new evidence, and policy solutions—feeds into decision-makers' preferences as they formulate policies. Exclusively focusing on this type of knowledge mobilization leaves space for the analysis and conceptualization of different modes of knowledge mobilization found at various stages of the international policy process.[4]

Second, scholars examining epistemic communities focus on the mobilization of knowledge through "community"—experts coordinating and collaborating with like-minded experts in networks to collectively influence decision-makers.[5] By doing so, the literature overlooks the countless scholars and experts who engage in the international policy process in an individual and independent capacity. That academics can do this—act individually and independently—is of vital importance to understanding certain modes of knowledge mobilization yet it remains unexamined. The academic setting, which only demands of its members scientific rigor guarantees in principle independence from political, ideological, and financial agendas, enabling scholars to: 1) conduct independent research; and 2) freely speak about and publish their scientific research findings. International bureaucracies, like governments and other actors involved in international policy processes, frequently call on scholars to fulfil policy functions that not only require expertise, but also political independence. As many of the examples of this

chapter illustrate, scholars and experts frequently engage in the international policy process in an independent capacity, both on their own initiative, or as solicited by international bureaucracies, and other actors.

Finally, this literature focuses on the "shared beliefs and common understandings" held by experts in an epistemic community.[6] This overlooks the rigorous debate, questioning, and challenging of research findings that is an essential part of the process that generates new, scientifically sound knowledge. In the academic forum, healthy debate, scrutiny, and disagreement is precisely what pushes the boundaries of what we already know, giving rise to new frames and definitions of global issues, and new policy solutions to address them. In the issue identification phase of the international policy process, it is sometimes the lack of consensus between scholars about the causality of a particular issue that demands its re-examination, and eventually leads to the re-definition of the issue's cause, with ensuing policy ramifications.

Modes of knowledge mobilization by/for bureaucracies across the international policy process

The international policy process, for the most part, follow a standard trajectory: issue identification, agenda setting, policy negotiation, policy implementation, and finally monitoring, review and enforcement, the outcome of which often feeds back into implementation activities.[7] Throughout the various stages of the international policy process, dynamic interactions between diverse actors are at play, with different types of actors often driving different phases of the policy process. The level of involvement of experts in policy processes varies greatly from one issue to the next, depending on the technical nature of the problem. The environment sector, for example, is largely dependent on scientific research, calling for greater knowledge mobilization across the entire international policy process. By contrast in the field of human rights, the policy-making process relies heavily on research in the policy formation phase, but more on non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society organizations in the monitoring, review and enforcement phase. Uncovering different modes of knowledge mobilization therefore requires an assessment of the role of scholars and experts alongside other actors throughout the policy process. Doing so will also ensure that claims of their involvement in international policy are not exaggerated. This chapter focuses on the mobilization of knowledge in the international policy process by/for

international bureaucracies, and not on the mobilization of knowledge by/for other actors involved in these processes.[8]

In the subsections that follow, I provide examples of different ways scholars and experts, and their knowledge, have been mobilized by/for bureaucracies across the five phases of the international policy process. These examples are not an exhaustive list of the different ways knowledge is mobilized, and each example is not necessarily found in all international policy processes. Rather, these examples illustrate what can occur. Based on this, I later develop a typology of different modes of knowledge mobilization by/for international bureaucracies.

Phase one: issue identification—raising the red flag, debating and defining issues

When referring to the various phases of the international policy process, many IR scholars begin their analysis at the agenda-setting phase, whereby they claim that actors create issue frames and seek to push them on to the policy agenda of some level of governance.[9] By doing so, they overlook a key phase of activity—the issue identification phase. In this phase, experts and academic researchers often encounter an issue first hand, raise the red flag, speak out about the issue, document and assess the problem at stake and its possible causes, debate it within the scholarly community, and finally define and publish conclusions in academic forums—often providing the basis upon which their issue frames are taken forward in the agenda-setting and policy formation/decision-making phases of the process. It is in this initial, issue identification phase that new knowledge, eventually picked up by bureaucracies, is generated.

A number of international campaigns and policy change processes have at their foundation the work of experts and academic researchers, whose initial contact with an issue, and ensuing academic journal articles and books documenting and defining the problem, become the cornerstones around which policy change processes have been initiated. The Nestlé boycott of the 1970s and 1980s, for example, is well known for galvanizing mass, global public support that led to creation of the World Health Organization's (WHO) 1981 *International Code of Marketing Breastmilk Substitutes* (hereafter "International Code"). What is less well known is that it was a small number of medical workers and researchers who, working independently from one another, began to observe a growing correlation between rising infant malnutrition rates, and the aggressive, unethical marketing practices of infant-formula producing companies, particularly in developing countries during the

1930s–1970s. In the 1930s, Dr. Cicely Williams—a Jamaican medical doctor working in the maternity unit of a Malay hospital—was alarmed at the infant malnutrition constantly brought before her, and she began to associate a decline in breastfeeding practices to the pressures being placed on mothers by a third agent—the baby food manufacturer.[10] During her speech "Milk and Murder," delivered to Singapore Rotary Club members in 1939, Dr. Williams deplored the role doctors and manufacturers played in convincing mothers to feed their babies sweetened condensed milk instead of breastmilk.[11] In the decades that followed, and long before NGOs became active on the issue, researchers began to examine, and debate in academic journals, causes of early weaning as well as the relationship between early weaning and infant malnutrition/ mortality.[12] Research findings increasingly identified baby food company promotional practices at that time as a significant causal factor of: a) a decline in breastfeeding; and b) correspondingly higher rates of infant malnutrition when infant formula is used in environments that do not permit its safe preparation and adequate consumption. This new evidence challenged conventional knowledge and government policies that had, for centuries, implemented social behavioural change programs designed to encourage mothers to adequately breastfeed their infants.[13] It was Dr. Derrick Jelliffe's evidence, and eventual coining of the term "commerciogenic malnutrition" in the 1960s that identified infant-formula producing companies as the issue cause, and promulgated an issue frame that had policy agenda-setting in sight.[14]

Similarly, the groundwork collation of evidence that gave rise to the US and global environmental movements has been traced back to two biodynamic farmers who took legal action against the US government relating to the detrimental environmental effects brought on by the chemical pesticide DDT aerial spraying in the late 1950s. These two farmers, who had themselves directly observed the problem, compiled and documented evidence about it in order to build their legal case.[15] Their groundwork documentation of the issue, based on direct observations of it, was soon after mobilized by other actors in the agenda-setting phase, as discussed below.

The importance of the initial work of experts and scholars in direct contact with issues in this pre-agenda-setting phase, is key. They can raise the red flag, document the evidence, debate the possible causes of an issue, and hold their research findings/evidence up to the scrutiny of their scholarly peers and/or the legal system. It is in this phase that new knowledge is generated, before it is mobilized by/for international bureaucracies in the phases that follow.

Phase two: agenda-setting

The most studied mode of knowledge mobilization is that which takes place in the agenda-setting phase of the international policy process. The literature on experts and epistemic communities and the literature on NGOs and advocacy examine the role scholars and/or NGOs play in framing issues for debate, setting agendas, and identifying policies for adoption at different governance levels.[16] I show here that in this stage, academics can be advocates themselves; or their research can be used as evidence by international bureaucracies, as well as other actors pressuring or working with international bureaucracies, such as NGOs, governments, and the business community.

For example, where Jelliffe's academic research documenting commerciogenic malnutrition played a crucial role in raising the red flag in the issue identification phase, this issue only gained traction in the public and policy worlds when Alan Berg published his best-selling 1973 book, *The Nutrition Factor: Its Role in National Development.*[17] Some of the key NGO activists involved in the process that led to the International Code, including the founders of the Nestlé boycott, became acquainted with the issue through this book, which extensively cited Jelliffe's academic research and presented it in language that was accessible to and resonated with non-academic audiences.[18]

Similarly, marine biologist Rachel Carson's research and writings captured ocean life in a way that was never made available to the public before. Her 1962 best-selling book Silent Spring spurred on US and international environmental movements.[19] Using the evidence compiled by the two farmers mentioned above, who researched chemical pesticide DDT aerial spraying, Carson presented the factual, legal evidence documenting the role synthetic pesticides played in causing environmental degradation. She did so in language that was accessible to, and which resonated with the public, NGOs, and grass-roots networks, who, in turn, pressured national and international bureaucracies for environmental policy change.[20]

Experts and scholars also advocate to international bureaucracies directly in the agenda-setting phase of the international policy process. Jelliffe, for example, directly engaged with the WHO in the late 1960s, co-publishing a monograph with the organization on infant malnutrition in the Subtropics and Tropics.[21]

Similarly, in the process that led to the 2005 Tobacco Convention, the WHO responded to mounting evidence on the adverse effects of smoking in the 1970s by directly engaging scholars and experts in an Expert Committee on Smoking Control. In 1979, this committee

published a report that raised the idea of using the WHO's constitutional authority to establish an international regulatory mechanism for tobacco control, suggesting that the World Health Assembly use its treaty-making powers to control tobacco use if other WHO programmatic strategies did not work. Two professors subsequently advocated for a convention on tobacco control: in 1989, Professor V.S. Mihajlov, of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics published an article on the feasibility of an international law framework for tobacco control; and in 1993, Dr. Ruth Roemer of the US, launched a campaign for an international legal approach to curb the tobacco epidemic. At the 1994 Ninth World Conference on Tobacco and Health, WHO consultant, Dr. Judith Mackay, Director of the Asian Consultancy for Tobacco Control, and Dr. Roemer jointly drafted a resolution requesting national governments, ministers of health and the WHO prepare an International Convention on Tobacco Control for adoption by the UN.[22] The Tobacco Convention thus appeared on the WHO's agenda thanks to the activist advocacy work of a small number of professors and scholars.

Phase three: policy negotiation

In the policy negotiation and formation phase, the duration of which can vary greatly, scholars and experts can advocate to international bureaucracies independently, or as part of a network, by lobbying decision-makers in the corridors, providing support/background material, attending and holding side events, among other activities. Experts and scholars can also be formally invited by and/or incorporated (as staff) to international bureaucracies, to aid state delegations as they formulate policies and regulations, particularly for technical and scientific issues whose complexities extend beyond their capacities.[23] International bureaucracies also frequently call on scholars and experts to draft the text of international agreements. Examples to illustrate each of these roles are presented below.

Researchers and experts actively advocate during the negotiations of international agreements, either at the request of international bureaucracies, or on their own initiative. This was evident in the negotiations of both the 1981 International Code and the 2005 Tobacco Convention, both overseen by the WHO. During the former, the WHO and UNICEF invited scientists and medical practitioners to participate in their joint 1979 October meeting on Infant and Young Child Feeding, which produced recommendations for the development of an international code. Dr. Derrick Jelliffe, for example, was invited to present his

research findings on the issue of infant malnutrition and its cause.[24] Experts were also consulted during the Code drafting process, to comment on drafts, along with governments, NGOs, and representatives of the business community. Similarly, during the negotiations leading up to the 2005 Tobacco Convention, experts and scholars held lunch-time technical and briefing seminars, they lobbied in the corridors, and delivered statements in plenary sessions. According to the WHO, the negotiations became a "tobacco control open university," whereby the tobacco control and public health community worked to build the technical capacity and know-how of decision-makers drafting and voting on the Tobacco Convention.[25]

Scholars and experts can be formally engaged by/incorporated into international bureaucracies on a longer-term basis. One such example is the engagement of scientific experts in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). The World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and UN Environment Programme (UNEP) set up the IPCC panel in 1988, with the aim of providing policymakers with "regular assessments of the scientific basis of climate change, its impacts and future risks, and options for adaptation and mitigation."[26] As explained on the IPCC factsheet, "the IPCC assessments provide a scientific basis for governments at all levels to develop climate-related policies, and they underlie the negotiations at the UN Climate Conference – the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)." With a scientific and intergovernmental make-up, the panel claims to provide rigorous and balanced scientific information to decision-makers. Hundreds of scientists voluntarily serve as Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors of its reports, and other scientific experts are also engaged to produce shadow reports.[27]

The UN Secretary-General frequently calls on scholars to serve as his special representatives on certain issues, to aid states navigate policy options for new or changing global challenges. John Gerard Ruggie, Berthold Beitz Professor in Human Rights and International Affairs, Harvard Kennedy School of Government, for example, served as Special Representative of the Secretary-General on human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises between 2005 and 2011. During that time, Ruggie worked with governments, companies, business associations, civil society, affected individuals and groups, and investors to research the relationship between human rights, transnational corporations, corporate responsibility and accountability, and state regulation, as well as methodologies to assess the impact of business on human rights. In 2011 he presented the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights for implementing

the UN "Protect, Respect and Remedy" Framework to the Human Rights Council. The "Ruggie Principles," as commonly referred to, were endorsed unanimously by the Human Rights Council, establishing a global standard to prevent and address violations of human rights related to business activity.[28]

While international agreements are sometimes drafted by the states who end up adopting them, at other times international bureaucracies call on scholars and experts to draft international agreement texts. The drafting process of the 1998 *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement*, for example, was a collaborative effort. The UN's Special Representative on Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs), Francis Deng, first consulted with the Brookings Institution, and legal scholars at Harvard and Yale, to produce a study showing gaps in the protection of IDPs in the existing international legal framework. The study proposed the creation of a set of nonbinding principles, composed of existing law offering protection to IDPs.[29] Deng then consulted with the American Society of International Law, the Human Rights Law Group within the Brookings Institution, and other international legal experts—Robert Goldman of American University Law School and Manfred Nowak of the Boltsman Institute, Vienna—to compile relevant human rights law, humanitarian law, and comparable refugee law. Walter Kälin from the University of Berlin synthesized their work, and presented the final compilation of law, analysis and draft principles to the special representative in 1998.[30] Using this study, Deng worked with Roberta Cohen at the Brookings Institution to finalize the draft Guiding Principles, which he presented to the General Assembly for adoption in February 1998.[31]

The WHO has involved scholars in the drafting of international texts in a similar manner. Describing WHO's engagement of legal experts to draft the 1981 *International Code*, Dr. Joe D. Wray, School of Public Health, Harvard University, who had attended the joint WHO/UNICEF meeting as a member of the US delegation, explained:

> WHO, through Dr. Moses Behar, who is the Chief of the Nutrition Unit in Geneva, has hired a consultant, an international lawyer experienced in drafting legislation regulating business and commercial activities, to draft the code. The WHO has turned over to this consultant the recommendations of the meeting in Geneva. They have also placed in his hands copies of codes for the control of formula marketing that are already in place in several developing countries, specifically Papua New Guinea, Jamaica, and perhaps others. This man is drafting a code.[32]

While working under the direction of international bureaucracies, experts and scholars are thereby granted a powerful role in the policy-making process, by being directly involved in the sculpting of policy texts.

Phase four: policy implementation

In their research on the opening up of international organizations (IOs), Tallberg *et al.* show that IOs grant transnational actors, including experts and scholars, more formal access to the policy functions of implementation, monitoring and enforcement than in any other policy function, to fill a functional demand, among other reasons.[33] I show here that knowledge is mobilized at this stage of the policy process in various ways, and for various purposes, including: 1) the publication of research findings in policy accessible formats, to feed into the design of implementation programs; 2) the solicitation of research institutes to establish projects that help states implement international agreements; 3) the solicitation of individual experts and scholars to help states implement international agreements; and 4) the setting up of executive education and training programs for policy practitioners, offered by research institutes. Examples of each are provided below.

While many international bureaucracies are allocating resources to evaluate their programs after they have been implemented, some are also beginning to conduct studies that assess the governance arrangements and implementation strategies of existing international agreements when they plan and design new implementation programs. This is made possible by researchers who translate their research findings into policy-accessible language, and who publish their findings on easy-to-access, technologically innovative platforms. Policy practitioners, often starved for time, do not have the capacity to wade through libraries and lengthy academic journal articles and books. When policy-relevant research findings are packaged in easily accessible ways, policy practitioners can benefit from previous lessons learned when designing new implementation strategies. Policy practitioners working on the design and implementation of UN targeted sanctions, for example, use research findings of the Targeted Sanctions Consortium—a group of more than 50 scholars and policy practitioners examining the effectiveness and impacts of UN targeted sanctions regimes—when they design new targeted sanctions regimes.[34] In addition to publishing research findings on traditional academic publication platforms, the Consortium's directors also translated their academic research findings into a language and format that is easily accessible to policy practitioners—a mobile device application.[35]

International bureaucracies frequently solicit scholars and experts to help governments implement international agreements at national levels. For example, Vincent Chetail, Professor of Public International Law, and Director of the Global Migration Centre at the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, frequently advises the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the International Organization for Migration (IOM), and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), as well as governments.[36] Similarly, Jorge Viñuales, Harold Samuel Professor of Law and Environmental Policy at the University of Cambridge, and Director of the Cambridge Centre for Environment, Energy and Natural Resource Governance, acts as international legal consultant on various aspects of international law to international bureaucracies, as well as governments, NGOs, and businesses.[37]

International bureaucracies also work with/solicit research institutions to establish formal projects designed to aid governments with the implementation of international agreements. One such project was the Brookings-Bern/Brookings-LSE Project on Internal Displacement. Created at the Brookings Institution in 1994, the project formally supported the mandate of the Representative of the UN Secretary-General on IDPs, who co-directed the project with Brookings staff. Working with governments, regional bodies, international bureaucracies, and civil society, the project was tasked with the promotion, dissemination and application of the UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, creating policies and institutional arrangements for IDPs, and monitoring displacement worldwide. The project published major studies, articles, and reports on its website.[38]

One final mode of knowledge mobilization increasingly playing a key role in the transfer of knowledge to international bureaucracies is executive education and training offered by universities and research institutes. Students, comprised of international bureaucrats, as well as diplomats and representatives from business and civil society organizations, are instructed by a combination of scholarly professors and experts. For example, the Geneva Centre for Security Policy, whose tagline aptly reads "Where knowledge meets experience," offers an executive education course on Comprehensive Peacebuilding for the Twenty-First Century.

Phase five: monitoring, review and enforcement

Scholars and experts, and the knowledge they produce, are again mobilized in different ways during the monitoring, review and enforcement phase of the international policy process: 1) they are called on to

monitor issues and the implementation of policies and programs designed to address those issues, either while being formally solicited by international bureaucracies or as independent watchdogs; 2) independent watchdogs can then use the information they have gathered through monitoring and provide country submission reports to formal review processes; 3) they are called to sit on independent review committees that review implementation and compliance with international agreements, and serve in official monitoring teams.[39] Examples of each are provided below.

For many international agreements, the task of monitoring issues, and monitoring implementation of policies and programs designed to address issues, falls to scholars and research projects. The Brookings-Bern/Brookings-LSE Project on Internal Displacement discussed in the previous section on policy implementation is an example of a project formally established to support the mandate of the Representative of the UN Secretary-General on IDPs. It monitored worldwide displacement problems and the implementation of policies and programs by governments in line with the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement.[40] Findings from the project were published in studies, articles, and reports, available on a policy accessible website.[41]

The Global Detention Project, by contrast, was set up as an independent nonprofit research center based in Geneva, Switzerland. Through monitoring and capturing data on each country's immigration detention practices, the project maintains a database on national detention regimes that can be used, according to its website, "to assess the evolution of detention practices, provide an evidentiary base for advocating reforms, and serve as a framework for comparative analysis." The project publishes its research findings in concise country profiles on its website, which are frequently cited in migration-related policy documents. Project members have also begun to provide country submission reports to various UN Human Rights review committees, including the Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC), the Committee against Torture, the Committee on Migrant Workers, among others.[42]

Scholars and experts are also often called to sit on independent review committees, to review implementation and compliance of international agreements; as well as to serve in monitoring teams. For example, the CRC was, at the time of writing this chapter, comprised of 18 independent experts tasked with monitoring implementation of the 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child, and its two Optional Protocols, by their state parties. Eight of the 18 experts are professors and/or scholars at academic institutions around the world, including Kirsten Sandberg, Professor, Department of Public and International Law, University of Oslo; and Benyam Dawit Mezmur, Research

Fellow, Community Law Centre, Children's Rights Project, University of Western Cape, and Assistant Professor Addis Ababa University. They serve alongside other experts on the review committee, including lawyers, judges, psychologists, and representatives of government and civil society organizations.[43]

Discussion—four types of knowledge mobilization

The examples of knowledge mobilization illustrated in each phase of the policy process show the different ways scholars and experts, and the knowledge they produce, are mobilized by/for international bureaucracies. Two dimensions emerge in each case of knowledge mobilization: 1) who mobilizes the knowledge—the scholar/ expert who produced it, or the international bureaucracy; and 2) the level of engagement scholars/ experts have with international bureaucracies—scholars/experts become directly engaged with the international bureaucracy, or they are only indirectly involved in the process, with international bureaucracies using/ referencing their research. It is along these two variable dimensions of knowledge mobilization that I have generated a typology—illustrated in Table 8.1.

1 Advocacy

Knowledge mobilized through advocacy is evident when scholars/ experts proactively mobilize their research findings, and directly engage with international bureaucracies in the policy process. This type of knowledge mobilization is most evident in the agenda-setting and policy formation phases, as well as the monitoring, review and enforcement phase. An example examined here is Dr. Cicely Williams speaking out about baby food manufacturers' promotional practices causing rising infant malnutrition rates in the issue identification phase of the process that led to the *International Code*, and the "strategizing at night" that experts and scholars engaged in during the negotiations of the Code. Other examples are the lunchtime briefings and side events set up by scholars and experts to lobby decision-makers during the negotiations of the 2005 Tobacco Convention and the Global Detention Project's country submissions to various human rights review committees.

2 Technical/applied

Technical and applied modes of knowledge mobilization occur when scholars/experts are solicited by international bureaucracies to fill a

Table 8.1 Four modes of knowledge mobilization

Who mobilizes the knowledge?		
Level of scholarly/expert engagement in policy process	*Scholar/expert*	*International bureaucracy*
Direct	**1. Advocacy** Examples: ● Speeches at grassroots events ● Lobbying during negotiations ● Side events/background info. during negotiations ● Independent watchdogs who monitor issues, and provide country submissions to review processes	**2. Technical/applied** Examples: ● Solicited as consultants during negotiations (independently or formally) ● Solicited to draft agreement text ● Invited to speak at events / conferences ● Secretary-General's special reps. ● Monitoring and review committees ● Implementation and monitoring projects set up in research institutions ● International bureaucracies cite policy tool/resource
Indirect	**3. Policy tool/resource** Examples: ● Present research findings in best-selling book format ● Independent watchdogs publish monitored findings ● Research published in policy accessible formats ● Executive education	**4. Old school** Examples: ● International bureaucracies cite traditional academic publications (journal articles, books) ● NGOs, business community reference research in their advocacy

functional, expert role, where technical skills and expert knowledge are required in the international policy process. This type of knowledge mobilization is most evident in the later stages of the international policy process, including policy negotiation, implementation and monitoring, review and enforcement. Examples include the WHO/UNICEF inviting Dr. Derrick Jelliffe to present his research findings at the 1979 meeting on Infant Feeding; the formal incorporation of scientific experts into the IPCC by the WMO and UNEP to aid governments as they negotiated the 2015 Paris Agreement; the UN Secretary-General's solicitation of Professor John Gerard Ruggie to serve as his Special Representative on human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises; the mobilization of various scholars and experts by Francis Deng, the UN Secretary-General's special representative on IDPs, to conduct background research on, and draft the *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement*; the Brookings-Bern/Brookings-LSE Project on Internal Displacement, created to support the mandate of the UN Secretary-General on IDPs; and the scholars who sit on review committees made up of independent experts, such as the CRC.

3 Policy tool/resource

Knowledge is mobilized as a policy tool/resource when scholars proactively make their knowledge and research findings easily accessible to policy practitioners, either through translating their findings into policy accessible language, and publishing it on platforms that can be easily reached, or through the setting up of trainings and executive education programs designed for policy practitioners. Knowledge is thus rendered more easily accessible to policy practitioners, who can use it in their work. Best-selling books have traditionally brought academic findings to the public and policy worlds, and scholars and experts are also beginning to present their research findings on websites and mobile information devices. Examples examined in this chapter include the best-selling books published by Alan Berg and Rachel Carson; the Targeted Sanctions Consortium's publication of its research findings in SanctionsApp; the Global Detention Project's website; and the Geneva Centre for Security Policy's education course on Comprehensive Peacebuilding.

4 Old school

Old school knowledge mobilization occurs when international bureaucracies, policy practitioners, and other advocates reference or use

scholarly research findings published in traditional academic avenues—journal articles, books, and academic conferences. Dr. Derrick Jelliffe's work on "commerciogenic malnutrition," published in journal articles and books, was frequently cited by international bureaucracies, such as the WHO. Doug Johnson, one of the organizers of the Nestlé boycott, also sought to determine whether they were dealing with a "real issue" by sourcing academics, journal articles, and books, before launching their onslaught campaign targeting policy-makers, and infant-formula producing companies.

As the examples presented in this chapter show, different types of scholars and experts are involved in the international policy process in different capacities, depending on the reason for their engagement in the policy process, and the nature of the issue at hand. These include lawyers, hard scientists, political and social scientists, health/medical experts, among others.

Conclusion

Building on what we already know about the way knowledge feeds into decision-makers' preferences as they formulate policies, this chapter sought to analyze and conceptualize different modes of knowledge mobilization found at various stages of the international policy process. I have examined various examples of knowledge mobilization by/for international bureaucracies in the issue identification phase, the agenda-setting phase, the policy negotiation phase, the implementation phase, and the monitoring, review and enforcement phase. These examples show that there are four different modes of knowledge mobilization, differentiated based on who mobilizes the knowledge (either the scholar/expert, or the international bureaucracy), and the level of engagement of the scholar/expert with the international bureaucracy (they engage either directly, or indirectly).

First, knowledge mobilized through advocacy, most evident in the agenda-setting and policy formation phase, occurs when scholars and experts proactively mobilize their research findings, and directly engage with international bureaucracies. Second, technical and applied modes of knowledge mobilization, most evident in the later stages of the international policy process, occur when scholars and experts are solicited by international bureaucracies to where technical skills and expert knowledge are required. Third, knowledge is mobilized as a policy tool/ resource when scholars proactively make their knowledge and research findings easily accessible to policy practitioners, either through translating their findings into policy accessible language, and

publishing it on platforms that can be easily reached, or through trainings and executive education programs. Finally, old school knowledge mobilization occurs when international bureaucracies, policy practitioners, and other advocates reference or use scholarly research findings published in traditional academic forums—journal articles, books, and academic conferences.

Dynamic interactions between diverse actors are at play in the various phases of the international policy process. Not only is knowledge mobilized in different ways, but different types of scholars and experts become involved in different phases of the international policy process, and in different capacities, depending on the nature of the issue at hand, and the requirements of international bureaucracies.

Notes

1 See, for example, Peter M. Haas, "Introduction: epistemic communities and international policy coordination," *International Organization*, 46, No. 1, (1992): 1–35.
2 For examples see Monika Ambrus, Karin Arts, Ellen Hey, and Helena Raulus, *The Role of 'Experts' in International and European Decision-Making Processes: Advisors, Decision Makers or Irrelevant Actors* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014); and Abraham Lowenthal and Mariano Bertucci, *Scholars, Policy-makers, & International Affairs: Finding Common Cause*, (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014).
3 For 1) and 2) see Haas' discussion of the literature in "Introduction: epistemic communities and international policy coordination," 5; and for 3) see Raymond Hopkins, "Reform in the International Food Aid Regime: The Role of Consensual Knowledge," in Haas, *International Organization*, 46, No. 1 (1992), 225–264.
4 Personal accounts offer insights into alternative modes of knowledge mobilization. For examples see Thomas Biersteker, "Participating in Transnational Policy Networks: Targeted Sanctions," in *Scholars, Policy-makers, & International Affairs: Finding Common Cause*, ed. Abraham F. Lowenthal and Mariano E. Bertucci, (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014), 137–154; and Lukasz Gruszczynski, "The role of experts in environmental and health-related trade disputes in the WTO: deconstructing decision-making processes," in *The Role of 'Experts' in International and European Decision-Making Processes*, ed. Ambrus, Arts, Hey, Raulus (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 216–238.
5 Haas explains, an epistemic community is "a network of professionals with recognized expertise and competence in a particular domain and an authoritative claim to policy-relevant knowledge within that domain… may consist of professionals from a variety of disciplines and backgrounds," Haas, "Introduction: epistemic communities and international policy coordination," 3.
6 Haas emphasises the "shared set of normative and principled beliefs," "shared causal beliefs," and "shared common policy enterprise," ibid.

7 IR scholars often commence their analysis at the agenda-setting phase, such as Abbott and Snidal's stages of agenda setting, negotiation, implementation, monitoring, and enforcement see Kenneth Abbott and Duncan Snidal, "The Governance Triangle: Regulatory Standards Institutions and the Shadow of the State," in *The Politics of Global Regulation*, ed. Walter Mattli and Ngaire Woods, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2009).

8 I examine the mobilization of knowledge by/for other actors, including governments, elsewhere. For example, Cecilia Cannon, *Campaigning for Universal Norms: Measuring Non-state Actor Influence in Processes of Normative Change* (Geneva: Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, 2013).

9 Hopkins exceptionally describes the way new evidence changes the beliefs and understandings of epistemic communities, leading to regime reforms. "Reform in the International Food Aid Regime: The Role of Consensual Knowledge," in Haas, *International Organization* 46, No. 1 (1992), 225–264.

10 Andrew Chetley, *The Politics of Baby Foods: Successful challenges to an international marketing strategy*. (London: Frances Pinter Publishing, 1986).

11 Cicely Williams, "Address to Rotary Club, Singapore: Milk and Murder," 1939.

12 See, for examples Barbara Hall, "Changing composition of human milk and early development of an appetite control," *The Lancet* 305, No. 7910, (1975), 779–781; Paulo Luis Sousa et al., "Patterns of weaning in South Brazil," *Journal of Tropical Paediatrics and Environmental Child Health*, August 1975, 210; and a combat exchange of letters to the editor in the medical journal *The Lancet* between D.P. Addy and Derrick Jelliffe August–October 1976.

13 For government strategies to encourage mothers to adequately breastfeed their infants in France, Britain, and other countries between the 1500s and 1800s see Alan Berg, *The Nutrition Factor: Its Role in National Development* (Washington, DC: the Brookings Institution, 1973), 101.

14 Derrick Jelliffe, "Commerciogenic malnutrition?" Based on a Paper presented at a Gordon Conference, 1968. Reprinted in *Nutrition Reviews*, 30, No. 9 (1972), 199–205.

15 John Paull, "The Rachel Carson Letters and the Making of *Silent Spring*," (*SAGE Open*, July–September 2013), 1–12.

16 For examples, see Jane Jaquette, "Scholars, policymakers, and agenda creation: Women in development," and Peter Andreas, "Dialogue of the Deaf: Scholars, Policymakers, and the Drug War in UN Foreign Relations," in *Scholars, Policy-makers, & International Affairs: Finding Common Cause*, ed. Lowenthal & Bertucci, (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014), 59–73 and 74–90, respectively; and Haas' discussion of the literature in "Introduction: epistemic communities and international policy coordination," 5.

17 Berg, *The Nutrition Factor: Its Role in National Development*.

18 Ibid.

19 Rachel Carson, *Silent Spring* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1962).

20 Paull, "The Rachel Carson Letters and the Making of *Silent Spring*."

21 Derrick Jelliffe, *Infant Nutrition in the Subtropics and Tropics* (Geneva: WHO Monograph No. 29, 1968).

22 WHO, "History of the World Health Organization Framework Convention on Tobacco Control" (Geneva: WHO Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data, HD 9130, 2009).

23 Experts and scholars also often serve as consultants to states, or are invited to join their delegations as they navigate policy options during the negotiations, as examined by Cannon, *Campaigning for Universal Norms: Measuring Non-state Actor Influence in Processes of Normative Change.*

24 Interview with Doug Johnson, Infant Formula Action Coalition, Minneapolis, Minn., July 2011.

25 WHO, "History of the World Health Organization Framework Convention on Tobacco Control."

26 IPCC Secretariat, *IPCC Factsheet: What is the IPCC?* (2013), www.ipcc.ch/news_and_events/docs/factsheets/FS_what_ipcc.pdf.

27 Ibid.

28 UNOHCHR, *Special Representative of the Secretary-General on human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises*, www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Business/Pages/SRSGTransCorpIndex.aspx.

29 Thomas Weiss and David Korn, *Internal Displacement: Conceptualisation and its consequences* (New York: Routledge, 2006); Simon Bagshaw, *Developing a normative framework for the protection of internally displaced persons* (New York: Transnational Publishers, 2006).

30 Ibid.

31 Interview with Roberta Cohen, the Brookings Institution, Washington, DC, July 2011.

32 Committee on Foreign Affairs US Government House of Representatives, "Marketing and Promotion of Infant Formula in Developing Countries. Hearings before the Subcommittee on International and Economic Policy and Trade of the Committee on Foreign Affairs House of Representatives," (US Government Printing Office, Ninety-Sixth Congress, second session, 30 January and 11 February 1980).

33 Christer Jönsson and Jonas Tallberg (eds), *Transnational Actors in Global Governance: Patterns, Explanations and Implications*, (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010); and Jonas Tallberg, Thomas Sommerer, Theresa Squatrito, and Christer Jönsson, *The Opening Up of International Organizations: Transnational Access in Global Governance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2013).

34 Biersteker, "Participating in Transnational Policy Networks: Targeted Sanctions."

35 Thomas Biersteker, Zuzana Hudakova, and Marcos Tourinho, *Sanctions App*, Computer software, iOS & Android app, (2014).

36 Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, *Global Migration Centre: Who we are: Vincent Chetail*, graduateinstitute.ch/home/research/centresandprogrammes/global-migration/Whoweare/Chetail.html.

37 University of Cambridge Faculty of Law, *Professor Jorge E Viñuales*, www.law.cam.ac.uk/people/academic/je-vinuales/5327.

38 The Brookings Institution, *Brookings-LES Project on Internal Displacement*, www.brookings.edu/about/projects/idp/about; www.brookings.edu/about/projects/idp/about/history.

39 They additionally serve as consultants, legal counsel and advocates for states before international tribunals and dispute settlement mechanisms, and act arbitrators, not examined in this chapter.
40 Brookings-LES Project on Internal Displacement, *About*, www.brookings. edu/about/projects/idp/about; and *History of the Project*, www.brookings. edu/about/projects/idp/about/history.
41 Brookings-LES Project on Internal Displacement, *Research*, www.brook ings.edu/about/projects/idp/research.
42 Global Detention Project, *About the GDP*, www.globaldetentionproject. org/about-the-gdp; and *Submissions*, www.globaldetentionproject.org/p ublications/submissions.
43 United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, *Committee on the Rights of the Child*, www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CRC/Pages/ CRCIndex.aspx; and *Committee on the Rights of the Child: Membership*, www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CRC/Pages/Membership.aspx.