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INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic has shattered lives, shaken the economy, and disrupted all aspects of society. Its effects have also extended to humanitarian disarmament. The pandemic has increased the challenges faced by conflict survivors and other persons with disabilities and interfered with diplomatic processes to address the effects of arms and armed conflict. The community of practice around humanitarian disarmament has also faced disruptions and is missing friends and colleagues, but it has proven optimistic and resilient since the pandemic began.

In March 2021, an informal survey of 112 members of the broader humanitarian disarmament community was conducted. The survey asked key questions about the way the community has adopted and adapted to new ways of work. It generated some baseline information about past travel habits, and gave space for people to share, in their own words, what 2020 was like.

For a group of individuals dedicated to social change and hopeful advocacy, it is perhaps not surprising how frequently the themes of opportunity and resourcefulness emerged from the respondents. Nor was it a surprise to see that nearly everyone missed friends and colleagues and in-person meetings (and chasing after people in hallways). The survey confirmed that this is more than a network of professionals dedicated to pursuing policies to prevent harm. It is also a broad community of friends who can’t wait to (safely) hug each another again.

The results of this survey and its accompanying recommendations complement other publications on the issue of pandemic-induced digital diplomacy, including the report Locked out during Lockdown: An Analysis of the UN System during Covid-19, by Reaching Critical Will.

We’d like to thank everyone who participated in the survey and wish everyone good health and good luck.
A combined 112 people responded to the survey circulated in mid-March 2021 to many humanitarian disarmament campaign and working group lists. A majority of respondents said they were from Europe (41%) or North America (31%). The rest reported being from Latin America (10%), Asia (9%), Africa (4%), the Pacific (3%) or the Middle East (2%). Most responded in English, though some chose to answer in French or Spanish.
The first set of questions was designed to assess the impact that lockdown restrictions and a halt to travel had on the broader community. A significant majority of respondents travelled frequently before the pandemic—88% taking at least one trip to an international multilateral meeting (such as a treaty body, UN, or other primarily intergovernmental meeting) per year, while 60% of respondents averaged at least three meeting trips per year. Most respondents didn’t travel for meetings in 2020 at all (55%), though about a third did get to one or two meetings.

The responses showed that most of the conversations moved online, with 94% of respondents participating virtually in at least one international multilateral meeting last year, at a similar rate to what they would have attended in person. Most people also attended online side events, with a majority (68%) attending three or more.

People attended online international meetings in a number of ways. About 80% watched live, and about half of all respondents made statements during international meetings. About 40% of those answering the survey hosted virtual side events as well. Only seven people responded that they had hosted hybrid style events.

The survey showed that many seized the opportunity to attend events they would not normally have joined. Most attended additional webinars, side events, or other civil society meetings, but some also participated in treaty body and other intergovernmental meetings they would not normally join.

A recurring theme across respondents was the need for inclusivity and meaningful participation in events and activities. When asked if the switch to primarily online meetings has increased inclusion or enabled full and meaningful participation, most (51%) agreed or strongly agreed, while 21% did not. There was a clear emphasis on the need to retain a form of inclusive online participation going forward.
Fewer respondents (39%) believed that hybrid meetings (meetings in which some participants are physically present while others are attending through remote connections) increased inclusion or enabled full and meaningful participation by diverse range of civil society organizations. However, the figures did not present the full story. In the open-ended questions, many respondents said that while the digital and hybrid meetings provided increased opportunities to present information, they reduced the collective ability to engage in meaningful advocacy.

Granting opportunities to present information via virtual connections was seen as a useful practice, yet deeper engagement and discussion was lacking without in-person interaction, and previous disparities on who ‘gets to’ attend is likely to continue without focused interventions. As one person said, “The state of the technology now [makes us] more like digital spectators.”

In some countries, pandemic-related restrictions are loosening, and resuming some of the practices from before the pandemic is on the horizon. About half of respondents expected that once it is possible again, they will travel as much as they did before the pandemic, while a third anticipate less travel overall. Still, 57% of those responding indicated they do not expect to travel this year.

Respondents identified many factors in making the decision to travel again—from visa requirements to cost to vaccines—all of which were given about the same weight. Yet there are other considerations as well. Participants identified health issues (including their own aging), COVID-19, and the climate as things to keep in mind when deciding about future trips. Some anticipated that the impact on the community of the Black Lives Matter movement and the concentrated efforts to ensure equitable access and representation across many campaign coalitions would lead to their own decisions to step away from travel.

Stories of 2020

“In an online webinar/meeting, I met a young female activist in Nigeria who is from the same village as a personal friend of mine here in NY.... We all share a similar mission...and a new alliance.”

“In an online webinar/meeting, I met a young female activist in Nigeria who is from the same village as a personal friend of mine here in NY.... We all share a similar mission...and a new alliance.”
Others noted that the art of the possible has been demonstrated through some relatively successful hybrid meeting efforts, and that with shrinking budgets and climate considerations, among other issues, more meetings will move to this format. However, the lack of equitable access (by both states and civil society) to the same internet infrastructure, and the ease with which dissenting voices can be excluded, might result in increased marginalization in a transition to more hybrid settings.

Overwhelmingly, people missed the connection that comes from face-to-face interactions. Whether those involve casual in-person coffees or chats, or local protests, or bilateral meetings usually in the margins of international meetings, members of the humanitarian disarmament community missed each other and the energy that comes from seeing colleagues and friends.

Nevertheless, they persisted. When asked about the surprises of 2020, many identified new opportunities that they seized. Some produced reports, conferences, podcasts, webinars and even a book. Others were able to reach broader audiences and participate in events not usually on their calendar or within their budget.

There were even some surprises reflected—from ease of access to online forums, to the eagerness of the community to try new things. Many welcomed the chance to get more done and do more things, although for some (including those with children in countries in which schools shut down, or those with insufficient infrastructure to enable consistent virtual engagement), there were concrete challenges as well.

Respondents identified lessons from 2020 and offered several recommendations towards leading the best digital (or hybrid) advocacy lives in the future. While many recognized that a return to exclusively in-person meetings is unlikely in the coming year, the lack of meaningful participation for those engaged only digitally was an often-raised concern. As one civil society representative noted there should be “nothing about us without us.”

Stories of 2020

“I had numerous joyous interactions with Fijian diplomats (past and present) and civil society activists when Fiji ratified the TPNW [Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons] in July. It is hard to explain the impact of these moments which reflect decades of resistance at all levels, alongside decades of nuclear colonialism. To share a moment of celebration such as being one of the historic first 50 was a very beautiful 2020 moment.”
MOVING AHEAD, VIRTUALLY

Many respondents said they support retaining some form of digital meetings in the future suggesting that opportunities to engage remotely should be mainstreamed, with efforts dedicated to maximizing meaningful participation. Respondents noted, however, that technological fixes to increase interactivity may improve online settings but will not replace in-person discussion.

States have a responsibility to make sure civil society is involved, and civil society has a responsibility to hold states accountable to the vision and objectives of the instruments and processes that are the basis for these meetings in the first place.
PRINCIPLES

The lessons taken from 2020 give rise to some general principles to bear in mind in future meeting preparation and organisation.

INCLUSIVITY:

- All parties, including civil society, can help ensure wider participation by: investing in diversity; being sensitive to the differences across communities and reaching out to those who are historically excluded; learning from experiences; reviewing connectivity issues; auditing their own events; providing financial, material, or other support when warranted; and taking into account the conditions where participants are located.
- Time constraints, time zones and meeting duration require more thoughtful consideration by those organizing events, especially for those who work at home.
- Internet access (both bandwidth and cost) needs to be considered for virtual meetings.

MEETING QUALITY VS. QUANTITY:

- Digital meetings can increase the number of participants but not necessarily the quality of engagement. To be meaningful digital participation must be more than passive viewing.
- Virtual meetings can be echo chambers that are unambitious and out of touch.
- Engagement can be improved with more bilateral and advance sessions before plenary meetings.
- Space and time for informal discussions also needs to be built into the planning.
- The quality of meetings is more important than the quantity.

KEEPING CONNECTED, EVEN INFORMALLY:

- Keeping cameras on can increase feeling of being together.
- Holding informal coffee meetings, receptions and other semi-social events online can help keep the field alive.
RECOMMENDATIONS

In anticipation of keeping some form of digital meetings, including hybrid meetings, at least for the coming year, respondents offered several recommendations for improvement.

STATES SHOULD:

- Develop digital strategies that are inclusive, including through funding better digital participation.
- Ensure that nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) are not just limited to perfunctory side events, and that all stakeholders are integrated in sessions and engaged.
- Return to in-person meetings supplemented with digital opportunities (e.g., accept video statements, live streaming, online side events).
- Offer post-event viewing, especially for Small Island Developing States and under-resourced regions, and consider posting events afterwards on UN web TV, YouTube, Facebook, etc.
- Allow statements to be delivered digitally.
- Ensure transparency about decision-making processes.

Respondents also offered specific practical suggestions for making meetings more interesting, inclusive, transparent and accessible.

EVENT ORGANIZERS SHOULD:

- Improve distribution of documents.
- Offer more interpretation, including options for consecutive translation if simultaneous is not possible.
- Provide training for how to use online platforms.
- Include options that allow people with disabilities (particularly sight and hearing) to participate.
- Provide practical support (laptops, data minutes) to colleagues in remote locations.
- Ensure that all participants have access to microphones, so voices can be heard.
- Do not overcrowd the agenda and do build in breaks.
- Accommodate different time zones.
- Ensure livestream events are recorded and made available afterwards.
QUESTIONS THIS SURVEY RAISED

Quite a few questions emerged from the survey responses about how and where humanitarian disarmament practitioners might move forward. Many of the questions related to the future of travel or ways to increase inclusion. While most respondents recognized the need for building more accessible digital infrastructure, the conversation does not stop with technological fixes.

We hope that states, civil society campaigns, implementation support units, and others will continue to address these questions as a new normal is created.

TRAVEL:

- Should we increase or decrease our presence in face-to-face meetings? Virtual diplomacy proved to be a useful tool during the pandemic, but should we continue to rely on it in a new post-pandemic reality? Should we be planning for a hybrid future?
- How many international meetings do we really want to attend? What kind of pressure are we putting on ourselves? Is our enthusiasm and high level of programming sustainable?
- How do the expectations of our organizations compare to the new reality in terms of travel and interaction with other people?
- How does the use of hybrid meetings foreshadow ways in which the global diplomatic community may deal with a rapidly changing climate?

INCLUSION:

- How do we address the need for more inclusive, substantive, meaningful, and accessible hybrid meetings in the future?
- What can states do to promote meaningful civil society participation? Have those who have historically championed civil society inclusion continued that practice in the shift to virtual diplomacy? What are states doing to ensure the space for civil society is kept open?
- What technical adjustments should be made to existing commonly used platforms? Is there new technology on the horizon that could facilitate hybrid meetings and promote inclusivity?
- Are donors ready to support new types of participation in budget requests?
CONCLUSION

There is no denying the COVID-19 pandemic has shattered lives, shaken the economy, and disrupted all aspects of society. Challenges faced by conflict survivors and persons with disabilities remain disproportionate. And there is no denying the pandemic interfered with diplomatic processes to address the effects of arms and armed conflict. Yet, the community of practice around humanitarian disarmament remains optimistic and resilient. It has found ways to keep pushing doors open and to take a seat at the table in order to build, strengthen and implement the norms that save lives.
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The following results combine the French, Spanish, and English responses to questions about what the pandemic has meant for humanitarian disarmament advocates. The open-ended questions are summarized. Full anonymized results available on request. Note that not all questions were answered by all respondents.
1. How many in-person international multilateral meetings do you usually participate in during an average year (pre-pandemic)?

For the purposes of this short survey, international multilateral meetings include treaty body, UN, and other primarily intergovernmental meetings.

- 1-2 meetings: 28%
- 3-5 meetings: 27%
- 5 or more meetings: 33%
- N/A (I don’t usually travel for international multilateral meetings): 13%
- 0 (zero) meetings: 6%

2. How many international multilateral meetings did you participate in in 2020 (in-person)?

- 0 (zero) meetings: 55%
- 1-2 meetings: 33%
- 3-5 meetings: 3%
- 5 or more meetings: 3%
- N/A (I don’t usually travel for international multilateral meetings): 6%
3. How many international multilateral meetings did you participate in in 2020 (online)?

- 1-2 meetings: 30%
- 3-5 meetings: 26%
- 5 or more meetings: 38%
- N/A (I don’t usually attend international multilateral meetings): 6%

4. How many international multilateral meeting side events did you participate in or attend in 2020 (online)?

- 1-2 meetings: 22%
- 3-5 meetings: 40%
- 5 or more meetings: 28%
- N/A (I don’t usually attend side events): 10%
5. In what way did you participate online in international multilateral meetings in 2020 (check all that apply)?

- Watched/listened on UN web TV (or other live-stream): 88
- Made statements: 61
- Watched/listened to saved recordings: 55
- Hosted virtual side events: 44
- Read transcripts: 37
- Hosted hybrid side events: 7

6. Did you participate in international multilateral meetings or civil society events that you would ordinarily not have attended in 2020 (check all that apply)?

- No: 24
- Yes, other civil society meetings: 72
- Yes, disarmament-related webinars or side events: 67
- Yes, other international intergovernmental meetings: 34
- Yes, treaty body meetings: 19
Virtual multilateral meetings have increased inclusion or enabled full and meaningful participation by a diverse range of civil society and NGOs.

[Survey results chart]

Hybrid multilateral meetings have increased inclusion or enabled full and meaningful participation by a diverse range of civil society and NGOs.

[Survey results chart]

When travel is possible again, how much do you expect to travel to international multilateral meetings compared to before the pandemic?

[Survey results chart]

Do you expect to travel to international multilateral meetings in 2021?

[Survey results pie chart]
11. How would you rank the following factors in making decisions about attending future international multilateral meetings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Not important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visa requirements</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality of access to vaccine distribution</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of travel</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to diplomats and decision-makers</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to raise awareness of humanitarian disarmament issues</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there other factors in making decisions about attending future international multilateral meetings that you will consider?

About half of those responding to Question 11 noted additional factors. Grouping similar responses showed the majority of these concerns related to priorities, ability to network, costs, COVID-19/health concerns and equitable representation.

### RESPONSES INCLUDED:

| Ability to have fair representation. | COVID-19 was not the only life-changing event of 2020. Black Lives Matter started to impact the humanitarian disarmament movement, in a good way, increasing awareness and raising expectations. Therefore, representation at international meetings must change post-pandemic. It takes time, but we must fully embrace intersectionality, which means making space for others. | Personal health, balance with other work obligations and interests |
| Ability to reinforce and widen my professional network with the meeting participants. | Health and accessibility, funding. | There really is no substitute at this time for the important discussions and side meetings which take place at larger fora. I expect there will be a major shift to hybrid meetings in the future, and while this may allow wider inclusion of spectators, meaningful participation by civil society will be sacrificed and for many governments that will be just fine. Wider use of hybrid meetings or virtual meetings will result in less participation by states who don't have the internet infrastructure or whose foreign ministry cannot obtain the human and technical resources to participate. They will be increasingly marginalized. |
| Ability to take side meetings and side trips to further our goals by meeting directly with people. | If people from the South can join, for example, for joint human rights and disarmament work at an international multilateral meeting on specific themes or countries. | Whether there are other ways to conduct the advocacy. |
| Algo importante, Vacunación. | If possible I will try to travel by train even if it would take longer time. | Who organizes/hosts the meeting is crucial and how it is organized. |
| Alternative travel options (train); increased quality of hybrid meetings so that disadvantages of online participation decrease. | Immigration restrictions (both home and destination). | Ya tengo la vacuna y tengo mucho interes en participar en forma presencial ya que no tengo ningun impedimento. |
| Any new restrictions or regulations imposed on travel. | It depends on the nature of our role within the process and the role we will play there (i.e., if we do NGO coordination, monitoring, or are simply participating). | Yes, old age! :-( |
| Civil society access and what kind of participation is possible. | | |
| Cost of attending, housing, possible sponsorship, help with costs. | | |
Looking at your humanitarian disarmament-related work in 2020, what was the most pleasant surprise?

Opportunity was the most often cited surprise, with about 44% of respondents reflecting on some kind of opportunities in 2020. Persistence was the next most frequently cited item. Inclusion, the entry into force of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW), extra time, and family connections were also cited as pleasant surprises.

RESPONSES INCLUDED:

| Attending a meeting online for the first time. | La motivación de la sociedad civil en continuar el trabajo con entusiasmo a pesar de las dificultades. | The ability to meet easily, though less satisfactorily, with people around the world. |
| Being able to attend events and webinars that might not have been possible previously as many happen in Geneva. | More cross-the-sector humanitarian disarmament outputs. | The ability to participate in international meetings. |
| Having space to try new things. | More people could participate online than could have gone to an international event. | The APMBC [Antipersonnel Mine Ban Convention] Intersessional was a nice surprise because it included a more diverse range of participants than if the meeting had been held in person. Both the Intersessional and the 18MSP [18th Meeting of States Parties] were very well organised and inclusive. |
| High level of interest in the 2020-2021 Humanitarian Disarmament Forum exploring racism and intersectionality. | More time to write and think. | The AU led silencing the gun 2020. |
| How much we could get done and keep connected in the circumstances! | Participation of CSOs [civil society organizations] and their representatives who usually cannot participate in international meetings due to various reasons (visa, costs, availability, language spoken) | The election of Joe Biden as US president. |
| Inclusivity/Diversity/Great quality of educational content/Ease of access. | Pleasant, new networks. | The extent it was possible to participate in sector events. |
| Increased interest/engagement from UN Security Council (UNSC) delegates because they are stuck at home bored! | Stay at home with family. | The feminist perspective is being highly recognized. |
| It has brought us closer to the communities we work with as it is not only about humanitarian disarmament but also about sharing resources to survive the pandemic. | Support to war victims. | The ingenuity of civil society in making things work in alternative ways. It opened up many more spaces for CSOs to exchange and collaborate. |
| Keeping our campaigns active and impactful even in the dire situations of the year. | That despite the ongoing pandemic, some governments remained committed and proactive to areas of work and made progress. | TPNW 50th ratification, where governments and the UN were flexible about accommodating virtual proceedings and procedures. |
| L’adaptabilité des acteurs et la volonté de se parler malgré les contraintes. | That so many could participate. | Zoom. |

Opportunity was the most often cited surprise, with about 44% of respondents reflecting on some kind of opportunities in 2020. Persistence was the next most frequently cited item. Inclusion, the entry into force of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW), extra time, and family connections were also cited as pleasant surprises.
Looking at your humanitarian disarmament-related work in 2020, is there an example of something you were able to do that you did not anticipate?

The largest number of respondents (32%) identified some kind of unanticipated opportunity they seized in 2020. These opportunities ranged from attending a broader range of events, to hosting more events, to setting up new work collaborations. The themes of relationships, outreach and advocacy encompassed about 27% of responses, with many citing the ability to connect virtually to new people. Only 16% answered no to this question.

RESPONSES INCLUDED:

| Access new non-expert audiences.                  | Lots more international conversations with peers—though there needs to be a lot more inclusion for non-Euro or USA campaigners. | To be able to fully engage with all campaigners, although sometimes only during the meeting. |
| Advocacy with parliamentarians and key diplomats. | Maintaining close contact with in-country partners by having the opportunity to meet online. | Translate a movie. |
| Attending and speaking at more events emanating from more places than I’d otherwise be able to access had it been in person. | More time was spent on digital verification-based research, collaboration with a large group of stakeholders was possible. | Unprecedented UNSC access. |
| Be out in the streets safely to protest injustice, create community, enjoy the company of friends and like-minded people. | Online diplomacy does work. During the pandemic we successfully contributed to the ratification of one humanitarian disarmament treaty. Another one is we surprised ourselves that we were capable of producing a podcast. | Use virtual meetings to draw in non-sector expertise. |
| Because there were no bilateral meetings to distract from the main meeting, I found that I paid more attention to plenary discussions and side sessions. It was refreshing to focus on the main meeting and not be pulled in many different directions. | Produce a long-planned report. | We grew from 4 people to 8, launched a new website, wrote for academic journals, and launched a podcast series and hosted webinars. |
| Bring more attention to issues regarding surveillance, data protection and privacy. | Reach a broader audience. | We put on 6 conferences, attending many more meetings. |
| Far more contact with international colleagues online, especially with colleagues from parts of the world with whom I would not otherwise have been in touch. | Several webinars in South Asia over the course of a month—could not have travelled to South Asia repeatedly to attend these events in person. | Work double as any free minute can be booked for an online chat (negative) + Work from anywhere as presence in the office is not necessary anymore (positive). |
| | | Wrote a book. |
| | | Yes, an Instagram webinar, never thought about it before. |
Looking at your humanitarian disarmament-related work in 2020, what did you miss most?

People missed one another. Over 50% of the responses encompassed in-person activities, such as face-to-face meetings, hugs, casual contact, or chasing diplomats. Access was cited nearly as much, with at least 25% of responses reflecting a loss of access to advocacy potential.

**RESPONSES INCLUDED:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability to meet with diplomats and decision-makers.</th>
<th>Creativity that comes through brainstorming in person, sense of actual connection to partners.</th>
<th>People, discussion around a corner of meeting room, running in a corridor to catch a diplomat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active participation since the online meetings were overlapping at times.</td>
<td>El contacto con diplomáticos y colegas era más accesible durante las reuniones multilaterales; ahora depende de las agendas y es más complicado coordinar entre varios actores.</td>
<td>People, hugs, beer, foreign cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of the space we work within (sociologically speaking) and the people we work with. Also, inability to travel to countries where disarmament operations are ongoing limits the understanding which is necessary for any advocacy work.</td>
<td>Face-to-face communication and the energy.</td>
<td>The bilateral meetings that we usually do in the margins. They are exhausting, and as above, sometimes a bit of a distraction, but I think they are also necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a parent of small children, when schools were closed for the best part of a year there were several things I could not participate in as much as I would have liked to. Choices had to be made so I missed the work and colleagues I was not able to engage with.</td>
<td>In-person contact and side conversations—and the ability to work directly in countries that were overwhelmed by considerations brought on by pandemic response.</td>
<td>The hugs of friends and colleagues and the time spent chatting in coffee breaks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La cercanía y proximidad que da lo presencial, la posibilidad de encontrarse con delegados en pasillos y cafés que permitía conversaciones que hoy no existen.</td>
<td>The opportunities for informal or spontaneous networking created by in-person meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on your experiences in 2020, what advice would you give on how humanitarian disarmament diplomacy should be done moving forward, particularly in terms of digital participation?

While respondents recognized the challenges of digital participation, most saw value in continuing some form of virtual diplomacy, and many called for more hybrid meetings. Respondents stressed that disarmament fora, whatever form they take, need to be inclusive. They offered numerous suggestions for making online diplomacy more manageable and accessible, such as being sensitive to the quantity and timing of meetings and ensuring translation is available. Survey participants also recommended ways to build connections even in the digital world.

**RESPONSES INCLUDED:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Be creative and solution-oriented, adapt to changing environments, and ensure inclusiveness and transparency in the way the work is conducted so as to ensure continuity of work.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be sensitive to other meetings and events on the disarmament calendar and capacity constraints, especially for those working from home. Engage stakeholders to make verbal contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry on with zoom meetings; better for the environment, less costly, less time consuming although miss personal interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital participation opens up new possibilities for the inclusion of new voices, perspectives, and energy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society organizations, in a position to do so, should provide assistance (financial and technical) to members and partners around the world to ensure that they are able to access multilateral processes and meetings, and to reach out to delegates and decision-makers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital options should always be available going forward. But we should be mindful of their limitations: though they can enable the participation of individuals/organizations with limited resources or access to travel, they may not always enable &quot;meaningful&quot; participation. Getting the right people in the room will still be important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends highly on the politics and nature of the fora or process. I would avoid broad generalizations. However, some thoughts: ensure that conference documents as well as any written submissions are publicly available and distributed in a timely way, including to stakeholders. Enable interpretation for online forums. Be sensitive to time differences, and duration of meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure longer meetings to ensure consecutive translation is guaranteed for all and doesn’t disrupt the agenda. Limit the number of meetings. Focus more on quality than quantity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considero importante disminuir la brecha digital sobre todo de aquellos activistas que tienen problemas para acceder a internet tanto por falta de conocimientos como de acceso.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De manera virtual se pudieron lograr de mejor manera y más efectiva acercamientos desde la sociedad civil con los sectores e instituciones gubernamentales para resaltar y posicionar la importancia de los temas de desarme humanitario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital participation opens up new possibilities for the inclusion of new voices, perspectives, and energy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HUMANITARIAN DISARMAMENT SURVEY**
Hay ganancias en cuanto a que pudimos darnos cuenta que podemos trabajar en conjunto y a distancias, pero lo digital nunca reemplazará a lo presencial, en especial cuando se deben tomar decisiones.

Hybrid model…must continue digital and freer access to public on UN web TV and YouTube and Facebook please

I think a return to in-person meetings is important, but they should be supplemented with digital participation. For example, video statements should become more accepted and more meetings should be live-streamed. Online side events/webinars should also continue.

It’s important to have the camera on, otherwise there is no feeling of being together.

Make sure to include options that allow people with disabilities (particularly sight, hearing, and intellectual) to participate.

Support internet connection for smaller states to increase inclusivity.

Use web meetings, but also resume some in person meetings when it is safe.

We need to plan for increased costs and lower participation from campaigners at multilateral events but we need to increase our impact at the same time.

Wherever possible offering at least hybrid participation and post-event viewing through recordings is really useful. Especially for those from small island states or from under-resourced regions who can’t travel easily or often. Our work always benefits from inclusive insights from as many perspectives as possible. I believe we can be better by working to ensure that we audit our own efforts/events/materials/boards/staff/panels/etc. regularly to examine the make-up of representation, to include marginalised voices, to challenge colonial bias. We must ensure cultural, linguistic and gender considerations are kept accountable in this work.

Mieux former les organisations locales aux codes du numériques, prise de parole sur forum digitaux—pour éviter une participation trop europe / amériques.

More creative use of online meetings for informal interactions between NGOs and governments—this seems to be biggest gap in forgoing travel.

More semi-social meetings to keep the field alive.

Not packing the agenda so much! Sometime it’s really stressful.

Nothing about us (issues raised by civil society) without us. Governments that think they can solve issues without civil society input, engagement and buy-in must think again. Virtual meetings without civil society can easily become an echo chamber, unambitious, and out of touch.

Prioritise inclusion, equity, flexibility in ways of working

Realización de reuniones pequeñas para tener mayor incidencia

Support internet connection for smaller states to increase inclusivity.

Use web meetings, but also resume some in person meetings when it is safe.

We need to plan for increased costs and lower participation from campaigners at multilateral events but we need to increase our impact at the same time.

Wherever possible offering at least hybrid participation and post-event viewing through recordings is really useful. Especially for those from small island states or from under-resourced regions who can’t travel easily or often. Our work always benefits from inclusive insights from as many perspectives as possible. I believe we can be better by working to ensure that we audit our own efforts/events/materials/boards/staff/panels/etc. regularly to examine the make-up of representation, to include marginalised voices, to challenge colonial bias. We must ensure cultural, linguistic and gender considerations are kept accountable in this work.
**Do you have any anecdotes that illustrate your international multilateral advocacy efforts in 2020?**

There were many great anecdotes submitted. This is a small selection:

**RESPONSES INCLUDED:**

| Cock crowing in the background when recording a statement. | I “met” a senator by zoom and I promoted the inclusion of killer robots in IPU [Inter-Parliamentary Union]. | I had numerous joyous interactions with Fijian diplomats (past and present) and civil society activists when Fiji ratified the TPNW in July. It is hard to explain the impact of these moments which reflect decades of resistance at all levels, alongside decades of nuclear colonialism. To share a moment of celebration such as being one of the historic first 50 was a very beautiful 2020 moment. | I’ve been able to attend or convene several online strategy sessions involving diplomats and civil society members from different countries (e.g., on TPNW, incendiary weapons, etc.) | Increasing funding for partners. | La organización, convocatoria y participación en la Reunión de celebración de entrada en vigor del Tratado de Prohibición de Armas Nucleares a nivel del continente latinoamericano, con la participación de autoridades y Sociedad civil de más de 15 países. | Yes.... In an online webinar/meeting, I met a young female activist in Nigeria who is from the same village as a personal friend of mine here in NY.... We all share a similar mission...and a new alliance.
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17. What region are you from?

- Middle East: 41%
- Pacific: 10%
- Africa: 5%
- Asia: 31%
- Latin America: 2%
- North America: 3%
- Europe: 2%

18. In what sector of the humanitarian disarmament community do you work?

- Civil Society: 95%
- Academia: 5%
Humanitarian disarmament seeks to prevent and remediate arms-inflicted human suffering and environmental harm through the establishment and implementation of norms. This approach to disarmament is people-centered in substance and process.

This report presents the results of a survey of the effects of COVID-19 on the humanitarian disarmament community and its work.