



# Broker Day: the outcomes

**Bye bye Calimero!**

*Why the Netherlands can act big on inclusive and sustainable development*

## The Broker Day 2019 – we waved goodbye to Calimero!

Remember Calimero, the tiny chicken with his famous catch-phrase, “*They’re big and I’m little*”? This hapless cartoon character has lent its name to the so-called ‘Calimero Complex’, a complex that has seeped into Dutch politics and civil society’s beliefs about our impact on global development. At this year’s Broker Day, with the help of a wide variety of experts and participants, we waved goodbye to Calimero. The Netherlands may be a small country in terms of its size, but certainly not in terms of its impact. Joined by policymakers, academics, and representatives from the private sector and civil society, The Broker shed new light on the Dutch role in, and impact on, international development. Together we engaged in thought-provoking discussion sessions around seven topics carefully selected for the day:

1. Pension funds and development (p. 3)
2. Water-conflict management (p. 4)
3. Circular migration (p. 5)
4. Equality and sustainability (p. 6)
5. Knowledge brokering with the private sector (p. 7)
6. Illicit economies (p. 8)
7. Inclusive circular economies (p. 9)

This report highlights the most important outcomes and reflections from each sessions. It shows how, during the Broker Day, we **challenged** long-standing narratives, **changed** our focus to embrace new ideas and opportunities, emphasized the importance of **collaboration** and co-creation, and put into practice what we preach – **connecting worlds of knowledge**.



## Session 1. How to start using our pensions to combat climate change

With experts: **Wiert Wiertsema**, Both ENDS; **Yvonne Bakkum**, FMO; **Arthur Rempel**, The Broker (moderator).

### Key outcomes:

- Incorporating pension funds in development agendas has **immense potential** due to their gargantuan size and global influence.
- The key to tapping into this potential, particularly for Dutch pension funds, revolves around clarifying the legislation and organizational structure governing them.

In addition to managing assets amounting to [USD 27.6 trillion](#) (equivalent to roughly 30% of [global GDP](#)), pension funds have financial ties to a plethora of industries that bear a direct influence on inclusive and sustainable development agendas. ABP and PFZW – the two largest Dutch pension funds – are no exception. Given their size and global influence they have the potential to have a significant and positive impact on development initiatives.

To begin tapping into the vast potential that pension funds have for development, this session started by looking more closely at the organizational structure of pension funds themselves. It quickly turned out that there is a general lack of understanding about the intricacies of pension funds – particularly Dutch pension funds. There seemed to be much ambiguity and complexity, which was reflected in the conversations between participants. For instance, it was noted that pension funds are legally companies and, therefore, should abide by [OECD guidelines](#). Yet, at times, these guidelines contradict national legislation governing pension funds. An expert pointed out that in the Netherlands there are no rigid laws or frameworks for pension funds to adopt while investing. It was argued that the very absence of such rigid legislation should be reason enough for development actors to put pressure on governments to introduce appropriate legal mechanisms and call on pension funds and hold them liable for the social and environmental implications of their investment decisions.

Another participant noted that the ownership structure of ABP – the largest pension fund in the Netherlands and [fifth largest globally](#) in terms of assets under management – is quite straightforward: 50% belongs to the Dutch government and 50% is allocated to pensioners and ABP personnel. Due to this split in ownership, they posited that pensioners and ABP employees should theoretically be able to transparently and effectively engage with the pension fund to address pertinent development issues. However, this is not the case in practice, which suggests that there are structural issues within the pension fund that deter direct stakeholders from having a say in the decisions made at higher levels.

Ending with a powerful message, one participant offered an anecdote about a Swiss pension fund CEO who, at a conference, announced his determination to take any means necessary to ensure that his pensioners had access to reliable and sizable pensions. He was simultaneously stunned and silenced soon after when another participant asked, “**but what if they do not have a world to enjoy that pension in?**”. This is the question we must keep asking ourselves in the years to come.

## Session 2. Going Dutch in global water challenges: how Dutch should we go?

With experts: **Henk Ovink**, Dutch Special Envoy for International Water Affairs; **Shabana Abbas**, Aqua4All/Water Youth Network; **Ellen Minkman**, Erasmus University; **Anika Altaf**, The Broker (moderator).

### Key outcomes:

- The Netherlands should establish strategic global partnerships to collaboratively exchange knowledge on addressing water challenges.
- Potential economic gains can drive the Netherlands to seek global partnerships to exchange water knowledge and expertise, which can detract from aid agendas.
- The Netherlands should be proud of its assets and expertise in water management, but at the same time open to learning from local partners and to putting them in the lead of water management interventions in their contexts.

The Netherlands has established its water prowess based on centuries of executing state-of-the-art water projects worldwide. But the Netherlands is not the only water expert; countries like Bangladesh, China, Egypt, Chile and Australia are employing their own expertise to handle local water shortages and abundances. The question that persists is how Dutch water knowledge and expertise should be used on a global scale, given that there are other knowledgeable parties. A potential answer is with **global collaboration**.

During this session, the panel and audience members explored how the Netherlands can use its expertise and knowledge related to water challenges, not merely as an income-generating export product, but also as a supporting mechanism to contribute to sustainable global water solutions – a mechanism that supports a level playing field and genuine knowledge exchange, acknowledges local knowledge, and is demand driven. It was speculated that there are three drivers that prompt the Netherlands to transfer water knowledge: aiding other countries; learning from external experiences; and creating (economic) opportunities for the Dutch water sector. This marketing argument for Dutch knowledge exchange brings with it a tension: we want to help and learn, but simultaneously benefit economically, which might undermine the advantages of Dutch involvement in the first place. Putting Southern partners in the lead, or co-lead, is key to effective collaboration and can alleviate this tension.

This urge to form (particularly global) partnerships is essential to improve efforts to meet SDG 6 (clean water and sanitation). The focus should not be on Dutch responsibility, but rather on building a global community that feels responsible and involved in clean water and sanitation practices – Dutch or non-Dutch. Governments signed off on the SDGs, but it is not enough for NGOs to hold governments accountable, the different actors and sectors must hold each other accountable. Accordingly, the Netherlands should not shy away from its own assets; instead, it should actively pursue partnerships that take into account local complexities.

How Dutch should we go? Not all the way, but we can certainly bring in Dutch knowledge and skills while going global and forming equal partnerships. To this effect, the Netherlands should consider shifting its focus from economic growth to economic stability, while endorsing global partnerships to address the water agenda. So what is the next step for the Netherlands? Be curious, open to discussion, humble and ambitious!

### Session 3. Circular migration: a win-win or too good to be true?

With experts: **Abubakarr Bangura**, Migration and Development Consultancy; **Adri Zagers**, International Organization for Migration; **Anita Strockmeijer**, UWV/Amsterdam Institute for Advanced Labour Studies; **Anne Van Der Meer**, Foundation Max Van Der Stoel; **Georgina Kwakye**, Pimp my Village/International Organization for Migration; **Max Koffi**, Africa in Motion; **Sonja Avontuur**, Advisory Committee on Migration Affairs.

#### Key outcomes:

- As a wealthy recipient nation, the Netherlands should re-establish policies and efforts domestically to accommodate migrants and fill labour shortages strategically.
- Collaborating with and making efforts to improve conditions in sending nations is pivotal to incentivize migrants to eventually return to complete the migration cycle and benefit all stakeholders. Diaspora communities may be invaluable in such collaborations, given their expertise on host nations and their originating nation.

Circular migration can, in theory, produce a threefold win for migrants, recipient countries and sending countries. Migrants could help satisfy labour shortages in host nations and, upon their return to their country of origin, bring back acquired knowledge and expertise for the direct benefit of the sending country. The Netherlands could play a pivotal role in promoting circular migration, by a combination of revamping domestic policies that strategically support migrants, while at the same time allocating resources to bolster migrant-sending nations to incentivize migrants to circulate back home.

Reflecting on the feasibility of the triple-win outcome, participants in this session pointed out various challenges. For one thing, migrants are generally more costly than domestic labour and not all sectors require labour migrants in the long term. As a result, participants speculated that circular migration may not produce threefold wins in the long run, and under certain conditions may predominantly benefit employers. To overcome these challenges, targeted policies can be crafted to ensure that political agendas support migrants and sender nations in addition to recipient employers. Circular migration is a natural process and supportive policies would enable migration to unfold in a smoother and more continuous way.

Designing policies to facilitate circular migration pathways is another challenge. Host nations are usually richer, offer higher wages and have higher standards of living; this can entice migrants. However, in order for the migration to become circular, incentives must be in place to entice migrants to return to their country of origin. In devising policies to bolster circular migration, we must tackle the complex task of aligning the needs and skills of migrants with the demands of host labour markets, as well as the resources of recipient and sending nations. Policymakers could also benefit from the expertise of diaspora communities, as their knowledge of both host and sender nations may enable this complex alignment of demands.

The incentives that drive migrants to and from host nations are not always monetary. In fact, most migrants migrate with the intention of returning or, at the very least, remaining linked to their birth nation, financially or otherwise. This simple, yet pivotal, notion must be kept in mind when establishing the legal pathways for smooth migration and connections between host and recipient nations. Some governments (e.g. [Germany](#)) are already experimenting with policies to supply local labour shortages with foreign workers; the Netherlands could use these initiatives as inspiration when devising its own strategic, multidimensional policy framework to promote circular migration in a way that benefits all stakeholders, not just employers.

## Session 4. Equal risk, equal gain: equality as requirement for sustainability

With experts: **Dr Leo Meyer**, Climate-Contact Consultancy; **Darko Lagunas**, Fawaka Nederland; **Frank Van Kesteren**, The Broker (moderator).

### Key outcomes:

- Explicitly drawing attention to the linkages between inequality and sustainability would help broaden the debate and overcome deadlocks in discussions on combating climate change.
- We must recognize that the intersection of multiple inequalities is a major driver of unsustainable behaviour.

In times where politically urgent issues are framed as emergencies, debates tend to be narrowed rather than expanded. The way sustainability is addressed in the Netherlands is no exception to this rule: recent debates on the 'nitrogen crisis' and climate agreements often end in cramped position being taken, with polarized standpoints such as 'employment vs nature preservation' or 'farmers vs climate activists'. What stood out most in this session is that broadening the debate can provide new perspectives that overcome such deadlocks.

One such perspective was provided by panellist Darko Lagunas (Fawaka Nederland), who argued that the intersection of inequalities is a major driver of differences in sustainable behaviour and support for sustainability policies. In investigating the influence of migration backgrounds, Fawaka Nederland found that it is not the migration background in itself that drives unsustainable behaviour, but rather a combination of factors such as education and income levels, gender and the geographical area of people with migration backgrounds. This resonates with an important discussion that formed a red line throughout this session: that inequalities are best visible in the sustainability debate in the form of organized movements. Looking at the various protests taking place, we see that they are organized by social groups such as students, youth, farmers and builders. Defending their stakes, their arguments are often raised in silos. Participants argued, for instance, that climate change movements are often not very diverse in terms of ethnic backgrounds. This is a cause for concern, as ultimately the interests of these groups are not as polarized as they may seem.

At the international level, inequalities may be even more severe. Dr Leo Meyer (Climate-Contact Consultancy) shed light on decades of negotiations within the United Nations, which ultimately led to the Paris Agreement on Climate Change in 2015. Since the start of these negotiations, differences in bargaining power have dominated the positions of developing versus developed countries. While on paper these have been taken into account through the Climate Fund (a fund providing \$100 billion annually to developing countries to build resilience against climate change and transit to sustainable economies), these agreements are mostly on paper instead of actual reality. This is not only limited to funds, but also applies to the question of liability: there is a clash between high and low-polluting countries in terms of responsibility.

While this session did not provide us with direct solutions or concrete angles to integrated inequality concerns into policy debates, it did provide us with various fresh angles from which to review the debate. For instance, the issue of empowerment was raised as a key ingredient for a renewed debate. This varies from the empowerment of youth to the empowerment of indigenous communities. The bottom line is that their empowerment not only enhances more equitable solutions or more support for sustainability policies, but can also shift the paradigm – a shift from 'ecomodernist' or utilitarian approaches to nature, towards those that build on political ecology or conviviality.

## Session 5. Teaming up with the private sector in knowledge brokering on development

With experts: **Sarah Cummings**, VU; **Arthur Rempel**, The Broker (moderator).

### Key outcomes:

- The private sector holds invaluable resources and power that could aid development agendas worldwide.
- To tap into these potentials, public and private actors should enter into partnerships on a level playing field and eradicate negative preconceptions of each other.

Private sector actors hold immense power and resources, which can generate invaluable knowledge for development actors, as well as directly serve the SDG agenda. However, engagement between public and private actors can be challenging due to differences in agendas and objectives. The question that persists is: how can we bridge this divide, overcome differences and better incorporate the private sector in knowledge brokering on development? A possible starting point is establishing a level playing field and accountability for all actors, public and private alike.

One issue with successfully forming public-private partnerships to facilitate knowledge brokering on development that came up during this session is the public sector's loaded preconceptions of the private actors. Often times they are assumed to be self-centred, have hidden agendas, and expect tangible results from their investments in initiatives. We deduced that the very existence of these preconceived notions not only deters public-private engagement, but when partnerships do occur, they tend to be inefficient and fail to reap the full benefits of engaging both sets of actors. Thus, eradicating this stigmatization may set the stage for more synergistically beneficial partnerships, particularly in terms of achieving the SDGs.

Participants also pointed out that a hesitation to collaborate is not limited to the public sector. Private actors are also sometimes reluctant to engage in public-private partnerships, suspecting public actors of being corrupt, inefficient, conservative, traditional, non-adaptive, and unreliable due to high and frequent turnover. These preconceptions can deter public-private partnerships from materializing altogether. To overcome such barriers, it is imperative that the public sector works to become more transparent and accountable. Improving transparency and accountability, however, are equally important for the private sector if we are to make headway in establishing fruitful partnerships for development. This becomes particularly clear when looking at the complex involvement of the private sector in achieving the SDG agenda. For instance, a private-led initiative to support the tobacco industry in Ghana can stimulate economic growth and, thereby, address SDG 8, despite obvious repercussions for other elements of the SDG framework. Without sufficient transparency, it is difficult to evaluate to what extent private sector involvement is actually beneficial – or harmful – to the SDG agenda. It was concluded that if the private sector is serious about committing their resources to inclusive development, it should not only be held accountable, but should hold itself accountable for its actions and impact.

In order to maximize the unprecedented benefits of incorporating private sector actors in knowledge brokering for development, public and private actors should have an equal playing field. That is, we should focus on the unique contributions that each can make to addressing the SDGs, and move beyond our focus to differences and preconceptions.

## Session 6. Beyond the taboo: what can drug economies do for the poor?

With experts: **Eric Gutierrez**, Christian Aid; **Tom Blickman**, Transnational Institute; **Dr Ir. Gemma Van Der Haar**, Wageningen University and Research; **Prof. Dirk-Jan Koch**, Ministry of Foreign Affairs/Radboud University Nijmegen; **Prof. Em. Frank Bovenkerk**, Utrecht University; **Rojan Bolling**, The Broker (moderator).

### Key outcomes:

- The Netherlands can help address the full scope of the SDGs and include fragile and conflict-affected areas in development agendas by: 1) reframing problems surrounding illicit economies from focusing on law enforcement to focusing on development and 2) prompting legislative reform.
- Dutch institutions should catalyse new research to discern if and how these policies can be revamped to be more inclusive, particularly for fragile and conflict-affected communities that rely on illicit economies to meet basic needs and provide services.

The SDGs were established in 2015 with the promise to 'leave no one behind'. However, almost five years later, fragile and conflict-affected areas are still left behind. Lack of basic services in these regions has rendered development initiatives ineffective, prompting communities to turn to illicit economic activities to sustain livelihoods. Although identifying the role of Dutch development actors in illicit economies is challenging, perhaps it can begin with a reframing of legislation by local law enforcement.

Illicit economies span multiple dimensions, perspectives and experiences. Think for instance of the transition of cannabis into legality in some parts of the world. Due to this development, marginalized traditional producers of such crops risk being pushed out of the newly legalized market by parties moving in. So, when and how should livelihood activities be considered illicit or (re)framed as legitimate? Relatively 'normal' activities like [logging](#) can become illegal and, although mining is not necessarily harmful per se, conflict minerals are at times deemed illicit as their purchase indirectly supports armed groups,

'Illicitness' also varies in relation to coca production. Colombian coca production is engulfed by violence, while in Bolivia this is much less the case, as strong *cocalero* (coca growers) unions mediate between producers, the state, consumers and other stakeholders. These unions are self-regulating, prevent large-scale producers from entering the market and ensure that coca leaves are traded in controlled amounts on local markets for chewing rather than for cocaine. *Cocalero* unions have assumed the role of a local governance institution – including repairing local schools, in addition to regulating the coca market. Other examples exist of 'unusual actors' taking up governance roles. Smugglers in Mali provide funding to repair irrigation systems in remote regions. Similarly, smugglers in Niger act as traders, and when their businesses were disrupted by the state, local economies collapsed. Despite their illicit status, these smugglers play a crucial role in supporting local communities untouched by governments and development actors.

Moving forward, it is important to reframe these issues as development problems rather than law enforcement problems: **the problem is not coca, it is marginalization**. More research on illicit economies is needed to see if, and how, policies and practices could be redesigned to be more inclusive. This could include bringing local farmers together with policymakers to discern whether it is really too complicated to attempt to legalize markets for illicit crops in traditional source countries, and why monitoring systems for drug production exist for countries producing illicit crops, but not for countries buying the drugs.



## Session 7. It's consumption stupid! A mindset change for a truly inclusive value chain

With experts: **Aldert Hanemaaijer**, Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL); **Janneke De Vries**, World Resource Institute (WRI) & Platform for Accelerating the Circular Economy; **Joost De Kluijver**, Closing the Loop; **Reinier De Adelhart Toorop**, Impact Institute/True Price.

### Key outcomes:

- Information, innovation and cross-sectoral collaboration are key components for realizing a circular economy.
- To scale up circular initiatives, we should support the new ideas and energy of social enterprises, employ the resources and know-how of large companies, and develop policy frameworks conducive to experimentation.

In recent years the Netherlands has established itself as a frontrunner in circularity, with extensive knowledge and experience in waste and nutrition management, and circular activities making up for over 5% of the economy. The fact that the Dutch government, as well as many private actors, are actively pursuing full circularity is quite a feat in itself. As one of our panel members pointed out, in the US the concept of a circular economy is not part of economic jargon at all, let alone a goal to strive for. Yet, while developments in the Netherlands give cause for optimism, there is still a long way to go to realize the goal of a fully circular economy by 2050. The solution? Information, innovation and cross-sectoral collaboration.

Research organizations like [PBL](#) and WRI are most obviously contributing to the information element that is vital for the circular economy, but so are other organizations, including [True Price](#). For True Price, information itself is an instrument, a precondition, for circularity. In the eyes of consumers, non-circular products *seem* cheaper, but this is only because they lack information. If they were aware of the costs involved – if they were given more information – they would realize that circular products are cheaper.

In addition to revealing the hidden costs of a linear economy, panellist agreed that we need exploration and innovation to scale up initiatives and develop new ways of circular production and consumption. For companies, however, there is a big drawback. Innovation and experimentation involve venturing into the unknown, with the associated risks and insecurity. How then can we encourage companies to innovate and go circular? Some panellist argued that incentivizing private companies to innovate is a task for the government; policy frameworks should be amended to ensure they serve as drivers of, rather than obstacles to, innovation. It was also argued that, because firms adjust to consumer demand, the government and CSOs have a role to play in swaying demand. That is, if the demand for circular products exists, companies will provide. However, there was scepticism about the role consumers play. One of the panellist even said he had “given up on consumers”. Whether or not consumers can indeed be a *driving* force in realizing a circular economy, it is clear that their participation and collaboration is necessary.

This brings us to the final element: collaboration. Generating and disseminating information, raising awareness and spurring innovation are all necessary, but insufficient. What is imperative is to rewire society to think circular, not linear. Realizing this mindset change is not something that one actor can accomplish; neither the government nor private actors can impose circularity and produce this transformation. Both cross-sectoral collaboration and collaboration within and across sectors are needed if we want to make lasting change. As one panel member remarked “the Dutch culture encourages collaboration and small firms are good at innovation”. If the new ideas and energy of social enterprises is harnessed and efficiently supported by the resources and know-how of large companies, scaling-up becomes a real possibility.

## Challenging | changing | collaborating | connecting

Over the course of seven engaging discussion sessions, two interesting keynote speeches, and plenty of networking breaks, our knowledge brokers, policymakers, academics, and representatives from the private sector and civil society said ‘goodbye to Calimero’. To do so, we approached the Dutch role in inclusive and sustainable development from a variety of fresh and at times controversial angles. We **challenged** long-standing narratives, **changed** our focus to new ideas and opportunities, and emphasized the importance of **collaboration** and co-creation. Most importantly, the Broker Day 2019, was a day for exchanging ideas and open debate between people from different sectors. Together, we put into practice what we preach – **connecting worlds of knowledge**.

### Challenging narratives

One narrative that the Broker Day aimed to challenge is the idea that international cooperation is primarily about what donor countries can do elsewhere in the world. Yet, a global development perspective implies recognition that the world is interconnected and that what we do here in the Netherlands matters for development elsewhere. These choices do have an impact – more than we tend to acknowledge.

Take Dutch pension funds for instance. While it is common knowledge that there are massive amounts of money involved in these funds, too often we fail to look beyond their role as ‘pension providers’ – and if we do pay attention to the global economic impact of their investments, the narrative tends to be very gloomy. We have all heard the stories of questionable investments in companies linked to human rights and environmental violations. But what about opportunity and positive transformation? If we can rewrite the narrative and tackle the perverse incentives that prevent pension funds from investing more sustainably, their impact – the Dutch impact – has the potential to make a real difference.

Another narrative that warrants challenging is the often polarized debate surrounding sustainability and economic development. As showcased in the session on the link between equality and sustainability, the two themes are usually not linked in policy discourse. Yet, by explicitly drawing attention to their interconnectedness we can broaden the debate and overcome deadlocks in discussions on combating climate change. If we recognize that the intersection of multiple inequalities is a major driver of unsustainable behaviour, a plethora of new options for action and impact opens up. Thus, by challenging the narratives that underpin current policies, we can begin shifting the development paradigm and effectively question the accuracy of Calimero’s convictions.

### Changing focus

In addition to challenging negative narratives, coming up with fresh angles and new storylines can also help bring forward the Dutch potential for generating positive impact. Venturing into such new terrain demands that we dare to be controversial and explore the boundaries of our policy options. To that end, during one of the sessions, we explored the potential positive impact of illicit (drug) economies. Whether we like it or not, the Netherlands has a reputation for playing a central role in global drug economies. And while it will remain of the utmost importance to combat its negative and violent dimensions, the Dutch may also be uniquely placed to employ their position to do good. We shifted our focus and, together with experts from a variety of sectors, explored the question: What can we do to ensure these economies generate positive outcomes for the most marginalized? The way forward will undoubtedly demand more bravery and more refocusing: To begin with, we must reframe issues of illegality into development issues and include actors that are usually depicted as ‘criminal’ in the policy-making process.

During our Broker Day we also tried to refocus the discussion on migration. International migration from low and lower middle income countries (LLMICs) is framed as a threat, rather than an opportunity, and migration policies are generally aimed at prevention. Yet, if we dare to let go of this fear-driven perspective and look at the problem from a new angle, migration can be an opportunity for host communities, migrants and employers

alike. In our session on circular migration, a highly diverse panel considered the role of a group that is often left out of migration debates – the diaspora. This group has intimate knowledge of, and connections in, both host communities and sending countries. As such, they can act as bridge builders and contribute to creating opportunities beneficial for all involved.

### **Collaboration for development**

Saying goodbye to Calimero does not mean that the Netherlands should become over confident and tackle global challenges on its own. Believing that we can have a positive impact on global development is important, but it should also be accompanied by the realization that we can achieve more through collaboration. In the session on circular consumption and production, this idea was made particularly clear. Information, awareness and innovation were all flagged as key components of realizing a circular economy, but truly meaningful transformation is not something one single actor nor country can accomplish on its own. Cross-sectoral and cross-border collaboration is needed if we want to make lasting change – a message that was also emphasized during the session on teaming up with the private sector. And the Netherlands, with its culture that encourages collaboration and innovation, and its expertise in many fields relevant to sustainable global development, can position itself as a frontrunner in our joint endeavours.

A similar sentiment was expressed in the discussion on the Dutch role in global water management. ‘Water’ is a conventional policy field of Dutch international cooperation, and it is undeniable that the Netherlands, as a ‘water country’, has much to offer with regards to solving global water challenges. However, our positive impact would be greater if the Dutch water sector would collaborate more, and on a more equal footing, with Southern partners and, as such, be more sensitive to local complexities. More than anything, leaving behind Calimero is a balancing act. It is about appreciating and using our knowledge and expertise, while at the same time recognizing the value of, and establishing meaningful collaboration with, others, especially those who are often overlooked.

### **Connecting worlds of knowledge**

With the Broker Day we sparked fresh debates, draw attention to the untapped potential of Dutch development policy and interventions, and challenge our common ideas and preconceptions about what impact the Netherlands can have. Naturally, our knowledge brokers did not do so alone. Echoing the lesson of the foregoing paragraph – cross-sectoral and cross-border collaboration is key – it is our belief that the most valuable insights and understandings are achieved through meaningful exchange between different worlds of knowledge. The day’s conclusions and thought-provoking discussions were possible because representatives of a wide variety of organizations and sectors came together during the Broker Day and joined us in open and honest debate. Many thanks, therefore, to all participants and speakers. We hope to meet you again for more fruitful knowledge exchanges in the future.

