**UK-Brazil Conversa 3, 13 May 2017, King's College London - Report**

**Session 1 – Healthcare: How to Give Our Societies What They Need**

Chair: Ambassador Sergio Eduardo Moreira Lima, President of Fundação Alexandre de Gusmão

Speaker (Brazil): Fernanda Farina, President of Brazil Oxford Society

Speaker (UK): Rogerio Ribeiro, Senior Vice-President, Glaxo-Smith-Kline

Rapporteur: Maria Cecilia Barcelos Cavalcante Vieira, Technology and Innovation Attachée, Brazilian Embassy London

The session focused on the importance of trust, communication and transparency.

Although public policy was intended to be in the citizens’ best interests, it was not always so perceived as there were deficits in all three areas. There were differences in how the state healthcare systems are regarded in the two countries: while the NHS is one of the UK’s most trusted institutions, there is markedly less trust in the Brazilian SUS (Universal Healthcare System). As the SUS was in many ways modelled on the NHS, there might be a path towards emulating the level of trust enjoyed by the NHS. The group looked at the problem of rising healthcare litigation, noting how this complicated delivery in São Paulo.

Secondly, the session discussed the distinction between "accurate knowledge" - holistic and full presentation of facts backed by technical and other findings - and "information", which might or might not be based on "accurate knowledge" but was characterised by boiling down messaging and was more subject to manipulation. This was a delicate issue in healthcare. The session argued for greater transparency and a greater role for the public in discourse about healthcare policy.

Thirdly, the group discussed the relative importance of applied and pure research, and the impact of the private sector. Companies, and other private institutions, had a big role to play in research and its use in healthcare. But, linking up with the discussion on state healthcare, there was concern: in the US, state delegation of healthcare to the private sector increased costs with the additional burden falling on the individual citizen. It was easy to agree on the importance of all kinds of scientific research to address healthcare issues, but the question remained who would pay for this as states appeared increasingly to be turning towards more private solutions.

The discussion also covered specific medical issues relevant to both countries, such as mental health and neglected and rare diseases. The themes of communication and transparency re-emerged, especially in relation to mental health and the stigma associated with it. This discussion underlined the centrality of civil society involvement in addressing healthcare issues and healthcare policy; those specifically affected by these diseases are especially important as advocates and spokespeople.

Lastly, the session turned to the role of technology when looking to the future of healthcare in the UK and Brazil. The group emphasised the need for collaboration involving both civil society and the state - connecting public policy understanding and analysis with scientific and technological research and co-operation to address our healthcare needs. The group agreed there should be greater collaboration between the hard and social sciences: separation was detrimental to society. Open communication was central to support collaboration. Adjusting methods of communication to include fully the public voice was seen as a field in which both countries could move ahead, as civil society in both countries played a specific role as stakeholder in the healthcare system. It was essential to frame these discussions in a more equitable and understandable manner in order to provide civil society a stronger platform from which to speak about these issues.

**Session 2 – Economy: Creating Prosperity and Fairness in the Era of Globalisation**

Chair: Alexander Brennan, Brennan and Partners

Speaker (Brazil): Sergio Agapito Lires Rial, Santander Brazil

Speaker (UK): Peter Collecott, Chairman, Canning House

Rapporteur: Cristina Cortes, Chief Operating Officer, Canning House

The session agreed that globalisation had increased prosperity. But rather than simply continuing on the path of globalisation hitherto, the group saw a need - not least in order to defend the prosperity already achieved - to include more fully those who believed they had been left behind. Prosperity was easy to lose: greater economic inclusion was important in its defence.

The group discussed how to defend against protectionism, not only in trade and investment but also in the exchange of ideas. The group considered the benefits of reducing protectionism in Brazil. At the same time, there was a countervailing perception of an international trend towards turning inwards and closing minds as a reaction to globalisation.

Brexit was creating uncertainty. It was unclear how the UK would address this challenge - whether it would embrace a proactive global role or become more insular. The changing role of the UK in the coming years could be influential in the world, as other countries are experiencing a rise in nationalistic and isolationist sentiment. This linked with the issue of Brazil and its economic future, and specifically how Brazil could move forward to a higher level of productivity - a crucial next step following its urbanisation and industrialisation. Brazil would have to prioritise this issue, while at the same time promoting a more equitable distribution of wealth..

The group considered the national and international management of globalisation. Competition policy should deal with the impact of globalisation on the economy and society. The role of the state was central: on interest rates, inflation policy, currency management, research and development, and education. The state was active in these areas, but struggled with the productivity of its own significant level of investment. In this context, the group discussed the balance between free enterprise and government control.

The group looked at how best to include those feeling excluded and disenfranchised. This was not likely to be achieved only through handouts: tangible and lasting advances for the citizen were needed such as stable employment, and not just the right quantity of jobs but also the right quality.

The group examined the impact of the politics of our two countries. New governments coming into power would have new possibilities. The group had concerns that new governments would be tempted to adopt only short-term remedies. It was essential also to grapple with the need for long-term policies to provide both sustainable growth and fairness.

The group concluded that discussion on this topic was in its infancy and should be developed further. In both our countries these questions should come to the forefront of debate and government action.

**Session 3 – Are Security and Privacy Compatible?**

Chair: Vijay Rangarajan, British Ambassador to Brazil Designate

Speaker (Brazil): José Mariano Benincá Beltrame, Former Rio State Secretary for Security; Roberto Troncon, Police Attaché, Brazilian Embassy

Speaker (UK): Guilherme Brafman, Lewis Silkin

Rapporteur: Frederico Singarajah, Hardwicke and Lex Anglo-Brasil

The session started with a discussion of public policy and law. From the UK perspective, this meant giving people rights in respect to privacy and what may intrude on that privacy in the name of security. In the UK, terrorism and the prevention of terrorism were at the forefront of the conversation about security. In Brazil, the policy debate and practice derive from a different historical context, leading to a focus chiefly on public safety and crime prevention. In Brazil, the primary reaction to these issues was apathy: public security was never really faced up to.

The discussion moved from broad national considerations to more specific topics, beginning with the UPPs (Unidades de Policia Pacificadora) in the favelas of Rio de Janeiro. This was a key case to study in looking at how security policy should be implemented and how politics and political transition complicate that, to the detriment of civil society.

The group looked at the problems of some young people in both the UK and Brazil described as “direction-less”. These youngsters were effectively disenfranchised, which had the effect of pushing them more towards anti-social behaviour and crime. More needed to be done by government and civil society.

The group saw two vital areas in national policy - education and legislation. Action on these should be allied with greater international co-operation. Crime, terrorism and its causes were to some degree international and supranational in nature, going beyond the reach of national laws and thereby beyond the present understanding of the ways in which these issues can be addressed and regulated. Current models of analysis needed to be re-evaluated in order to reflect the issues of today and address them more effectively in both the short and long term.

**Session 4 – Education, Research, Innovation: How to Make Ourselves Successful by 2030**

Chair: Sir Mark Walport, UK Government Science Adviser

Speaker (Brazil): Joaquim Clotet, Former Rector, PUCRS

Speaker (UK): Sir Richard Trainor, President, Exeter College, Oxford University

Rapporteur: Fernando Vasconcellos, Head of IP Valuation at Coller IP

Success in the future depended on education throughout the levels, from primary school to post-graduate research. The UK and Brazil faced challenges to adapt to the emerging needs of our societies and economies and to develop delivery throughout the education sector. This had implications for leaders in the field, including academics and governmental actors, when considering how education was to be provided to all citizens.

Inclusion was central. The UK and Brazil needed to ensure equitable access to education for all. There were significant hurdles for both countries to overcome. But there were also potential solutions in view on access, delivery, and inclusion paying particular attention to equality and privacy.

The group saw that in the pursuit of knowledge we had to retain our focus on ethics, inclusion and social responsibility. If we did so, there were great opportunities for our citizens.

The group thought that the UK and Brazil faced many similar challenges in shaping the future of education and research - such as its impact (social, scientific and economic) , the importance of innovation, and the generation of quality jobs for suitably prepared citizens (including fair pay). This underlined the value of greater bilateral dialogue.

**Session 5 – National Reputation: The Importance of Soft Power for Brazil and the UK**

Chair: Baroness Hooper, Deputy Speaker of the House of Lords

Speaker (Brazil): Francisco Gaetani, President ENAP (National School of Public Administration)

Speaker (UK): Jonathan Hannay, ACER (Associação de Apoio à Criança em Risco)

Rapporteur: Helen Jones, Science Museum

 The session could not avoid some discussion of the nature of soft power: it was defined chiefly by what was it *not*: soft power was *not* hard power (the militaristic and financial exercise of power). In possible contradiction to the title of the session, the discussion recognised that soft power was also not national reputation nor was it branding. “Soft power is exercised, while national reputation is capital.”

The group saw the role of governments as supporting and encouraging soft power especially through creating a framework and an environment in which it could thrive. The government should have an oversight role rather than sustained, direct and tangible involvement. Civil society and institutions were the real leaders - through culture, sport, and professional associations to name a few. The direct contact and exchange sought and encouraged by these actors is what drove this agenda, promoting greater inclusion and opening on the global stage.

The role of media was a focus of the session, as the media both reflect society and shape it. In the current era of social media, instant communication and access, the media are central to the dissemination of information and the telling of stories, making them part of the creation of national reputations.

Building national reputation, soft power and require long-term effort. In many ways, both the United Kingdom and Brazil have much on which to build and reasons to be optimistic.

**Session 6 – How to Shape Foreign and International Co-Operation Policy in the Interest of Citizens**

Chair: Eduardo dos Santos, Brazilian Ambassador to the UK

Speaker (Brazil): Ambassador Hermano Telles Ribeiro, Brazilian Permanent Representative to International Organisations in London

Speaker (UK): Joanna Newman, Secretary General, Association of Commonwealth Universities

Rapporteur: Nigel Baker, Deputy Director Americas, Foreign and Commonwealth Office

From an investigation of what co-operation meant for the citizen, the group considered inter-institutional and international co-operation as a means of promoting global citizenship, although there were also questions about the meaning and value of global citizenship and why there was so much emphasis on it. It was necessary to take into account the alternative perspectives and international experiences of global citizens as vectors for development in their countries, as well as for the encouragement of open societies, international exchange and change. This was for the benefit of individual citizens and also civil society and states as a whole. International co-operation was a soft-power asset for both Brazil and the United Kingdom.

 In the past, international co-operation had been mostly driven and dictated from above, with the citizen generally passive. But today citizens played a central role as participants and stakeholders in international exchange; and they themselves were much more ready to become, and were better equipped, to act as the drivers of these dialogues. Still, the role of government remained key, for example in setting objectives and implementation of policies.

Language was important in the creation of global citizenship, both to facilitate exchange and to drive international understanding. In relation to this, the session addressed the growing global trends of isolationism and insularism. In the UK, the growth of English as a global language had discouraged investment in learning other languages and this in turn could limit a rounded understanding of other cultures. In both countries, the current long-term frameworks and perspectives around what was being sought from international partnerships and co-operation could end up limiting flexibility and impact. But, looking ahead, there was reason to be hopeful as the trend towards encouraging exchange and co-operation served to combat insularity, providing citizens and countries with greater international understanding, and imbuing greater curiosity and generosity.

**Session 7 – Politics and Business: Promoting Engagement and Trust in Our Societies**

Chair: Michael Reid, The Economist

Speaker (Brazil): Bruno Covas, Vice-Mayor of São Paulo

Speaker (UK): Vera Helena de Moraes Dantes Innes, Member of International Bar Association

Rapporteur: Marcus de Freitas, FAAP (Fundação Armando Alvares Penteado) and Oxford University

The session considered the connection between politics and the economy, analysing the interplay between Brazil’s recent economic history of negative growth and political malaise. In times of economic hardship and uncertainty, trust was inevitably elusive, as civil society became dissatisfied with both the economy and politics. This lack of trust pervaded throughout society. The gap between political promises and political delivery undermined trust and would continue to do so in Brazil and in other countries. The session addressed the question of holding leaders to account and how accountability could be restored throughout society in order to rebuild trust. Political financing was a key area.

The session discussed the role of social media as a tool for civil engagement so that citizens might play a more active and involved role. However, social media and its use as an avenue of engagement were also a risk as they could also create isolated groups. Education could help to encourage engagement and promote closer interaction between civil society and government. Civil society had to be an important stakeholder in political governance, and had to be treated as an active participant. Governments still had a lot to do to improve their own accountability and thereby encourage engagement and promote the trust of civil society.

**Session 8 – Capital Markets, Banks, Investment: The Roles of Government and the Private Sector**

Chair: Luciano Coutinho, Former President of BNDES

Speaker (Brazil): Renato Lulia Jacob, Itaú BBA

Speaker (UK): Ed Hudson, EY

Rapporteur: Joanna Crellin, Director of Trade and Investment Brazil and UK, Consul General São Paulo

The global context was characterised by high levels of uncertainty, not only in Brazil and the UK. There was an unprecedented level of global liquidity and uncertainty about the best locations for stable and suitable investment. The tightening of the international regulatory landscape following the 2008-2009 economic crash remained a further factor. In Brazil there had been considerable activity over the past couple of years in the financial sector, creating both stability and instability. There was a need to reduce interest rates in Brazil, as at the present level they discouraged equity investment. Short- and long-term solutions were required, including the reduction of interest rates, which would allow a wider range of investors to enter the market.

Looking to the future, the group hoped to see a sensible return to growth in Brazil as interest rates decreased, consumer confidence returned, and proposed financial policy was implemented.

**Session 9 – Defence and Security: The Importance of Technological Innovation**

Chair: Jackson Schneider, VP EMBRAER

Speaker (Brazil): Vinicius Mariano de Carvalho, Director, Brazil Institute, King’s College London

Speaker (UK): Marco Caffe, BAE Systems

Rapporteur: Antonio Sampaio, International Institute for Strategic Studies, London

The group addressed the longstanding challenge of defence and security policy in Brazil - how to justify to civil society the need for investment. Defence was perceived by many citizens solely in connection with the risk of inter-state conflict, which in the Brazilian context was extremely low at present. Yet defence and security should be seen in a broader international context. It was important to invest because of emerging issues and threats, including cyber security and non-state actors. Defence should be explained as an insurance policy for civil society against future threats. It was noted that “few votes are gained by getting defence right, but many votes are lost when getting it wrong”.

Moving on to industrial and technological aspects, research in defence and security had helped create high-value jobs and new ideas applicable to the wider economy. The investment in jobs created internationally-oriented careers linked with global policy-making and investment, of value not only for individual citizens but also their countries in general. These sectors created long-term and sustainable business, providing significant support for citizens and states alike. Both in the UK and Brazil, the defence and security sectors had positive impacts on the lives of our people.

 In Brazil, there was reluctance about becoming a big defence power not least because of the priority of addressing overwhelming inequalities in society including lack of access to basic goods and services. In light of this, the discussion considered how to connect defence spending with tangible results benefiting civil society. It was crucial to set goals based on an understanding of the real defence needs of the population and how to demonstrate the value of investments. In both countries, it would be ever more important to be transparent about the priorities for defence and security spending.