Strategic Foresight for Better Policies

Building Effective Governance in the Face of Uncertain Futures

Introduction

In times of rapid change, growing complexity, and critical uncertainty, responsible governance requires preparing for the unexpected. The purpose of this document is to provide senior officials from centres of government with a brief guide to strengthening the foresight capacity of their governments through a better use of strategic foresight in policymaking. The piece begins with an introduction to foresight and examples of its use by governments and other organisations. This is followed by a description of key components for building a more comprehensive strategic foresight system in government and designing successful foresight interventions, drawing on best practices from around the world.[1] The piece concludes with ways that governments may wish to collaborate with the OECD to advance strategic foresight and preparedness for the future both within their own countries and through global collaboration.

Is your government future-fit?

Governments today face multiple pressures already in the present, including economic disruption; growing international tensions; polarisation and declining trust; large-scale migration; and ageing populations. At the same time, the future will be no less challenging: climate-related crises, further rapid digitalisation of economies and societies, and new forms of political turbulence both at home and abroad could make for a future that is very different from what is commonly expected.

Main takeaways

- In times of rapid change and uncertainty, responsible policy must take multiple future possibilities into account. Strategic foresight offers the means to do that.
- All governments need to do more in order to build greater anticipatory capacity. Institutionalising the use of strategic foresight requires considering demand, capacity, institutions, embeddedness, and feedback.
- The OECD offers support to governments building their foresight capacity through advice, interventions, studies, and networking.

What does it mean to be future-fit in such a challenging context? Attempting to predict or forecast the future is of limited benefit in a world of high uncertainty. What is highly valuable, however, is to identify a number of different plausible future scenarios, explore what impacts they could have and identify potential implications for policies. It is also important to look beyond the scope of traditional policy silos and consider how multiple developments can intersect and interact in unexpected ways. Furthermore, change may be happening further and faster than our deliberative (and sometimes lengthy) policy processes are designed to cope with, and when change grows exponentially, so too must a government's ability to respond to it.

[1] The OECD is grateful for the feedback and contributions to this piece provided by members of the OECD's Government Foresight Community and other expert practitioners of strategic foresight and public sector governance. Further comments and suggestions are most welcome.

Are you addressing the urgent issues, or only the immediate issues?

The immediacy of today's challenges often means that governments fail to take the time to step out of the here-and-now and engage with the future at all (Fuerth and Faber, 2012). Making policy inherently means taking the future into consideration, but governments generally underperform in their duty to prepare for and effectively respond to developments that are unexpected, unprecedented, and unconventional. Even many known future developments such as climate change remain inadequately addressed. As a result, the strategies pursued by a government often fall short in delivering desired outcomes. In particular, policies that assume a continuation of past trends and fail to account for recent or emerging changes can prove ineffective, inadequate or even counterproductive.

Governments around the world are using strategic foresight to address this problem. Strategic foresight is a systematic approach to looking beyond current expectations and taking into account a variety of plausible future developments in order to identify implications for policies today. It does this by revealing implicit assumptions, challenging dominant perspectives, and engaging with surprising and significant disruptions that might otherwise be dismissed or ignored. Foresight uses a range of methodologies, such as scanning the horizon for emerging changes, analysing weak signals and megatrends, and developing multiple scenarios, to reveal and discuss useful ideas about the future.[2]

Strategic Foresight Methods

Horizon scanning: seeking and researching signals of change in the present and their potential future impacts. Horizon scanning is the foundation of any strategic foresight process. It can involve desk research, expert surveys, and review of existing futures literature.

Megatrends analysis: exploring and reviewing of large-scale changes building in the present at the intersection of multiple policy domains, with complex and multidimensional impacts in the future.

Scenario planning: developing multiple stories or images of how the future could look in order to explore and learn from them in terms of implications for the present.

Visioning and back-casting: developing an image of an ideal (or undesirable) future state, and working backwards to identify what steps to take (or avoid).

[2] Strategic foresight is not the same thing as forecasting. Whereas forecasting attempts to predict a single 'correct' version of the future based on evidence and probability, foresight uses multiple alternative plausible futures based on their usefulness in developing robust, future-ready policy.

How can foresight add value in policy making?

Foresight can support[3] government policy-making in the following main ways:

- **Better anticipation**: to identify and prepare sooner for new opportunities and challenges that could emerge in the future
- **Policy innovation**: to spur new thinking about the best policies to address these opportunities and challenges
- **Future-proofing**: to stress-test existing or proposed strategies against a range of future scenarios

Ultimately, strategic foresight aspires to equip governments and societies with the capacity to constantly explore and prepare for the future in order to navigate, adapt, and shape the future through better policies.

Strategic Foresight is required whenever there is a high degree of uncertainty surrounding changes to the relevant future context. This applies as much to broad national decisions as to more specific decisions in particular sectors or policy domains.

Definitions

Strategic Foresight: structured and explicit exploration of multiple futures in order to inform decision-making.

Anticipatory governance: systematic embedding and application of strategic foresight throughout the entire governance architecture, including policy analysis, engagement, and decision-making.

Examples of broad national decisions which can benefit from foresight include a country's overall strategy for achieving Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), or how to manage alliances with other actors. A number of existing foresight processes support this type of objective. Canada produces regular "Metascans" on key emerging changes with transformative potential for the country as a whole.[4] The USA's National Intelligence Council publishes a regular strategic assessment of how key trends and uncertainties might shape the world over the coming 20 years to help senior US leaders think and plan for the long term.

More specific uses of foresight include national skills strategies, industrial policy strategies, or the design of new social, agricultural, or energy policies among others. For example, the national tax administrations of several countries collaborate to assess future developments in terms of their relevance for tax and revenue; this includes the tax offices of the Australia, Canada, Finland, New Zealand, and the UK among others. The Committee of the Future in the Finnish Parliament has published 100 anticipated radical technologies, and in addition identified 100 legislative objectives with which the adoption of technologies can be streamlined. They also identified 200 new professions of the future in order to be able to prepare for upcoming challenges with the right knowledge and skills (Committee for the Future, 2019).

Strategic foresight efforts at both the broad contextual and sector-specific levels can interlink and reinforce each other as part of an ongoing system of integrating futures thinking into policy-making.

[3] Strategic foresight is not the same thing as strategic planning, but is a foundation for it. The task of developing strategies and plans is enhanced and supported, but not replaced, by futures thinking.
[4] For example: https://horizons.gc.ca/en/our-work/metascan-3-emerging-technologies/

How can governments build anticipatory governance?

The capacity of a government to do strategic foresight depends on the quality of the futures thinking and the ability of decision makers to use it. In building this capacity, governments need to consider two interlinked things:

- **Systems**: the governance architecture and incentives that sustain a culture and practice of regular, useful, impactful foresight and its subsequent use in decision-making.
- **Interventions**: the particular activities, studies and processes during which the future is considered, and a strategic dialogue is undertaken with the purpose of better identifying emerging developments, producing better strategies, or future-proofing an existing strategy.

The two are interlinked in several ways: a system is built on the recurrence and usefulness of interventions, while the ability to deliver impactful foresight relies on the system's ability to foster and use effective interventions.

This document continues by outlining some key steps toward building a foresight system, then provides some guidelines on designing successful foresight interventions, and concludes by offering some starting points for governments seeking to implement these changes, including avenues for further collaboration with the OECD.

Elements of a foresight system

Building a system of strategic foresight in government requires putting in place the elements that will enable a sustained and ongoing practice of strategic foresight and its widespread application to policy-making. This contrasts with a common mistake of perceiving foresight to be a niche responsibility for only a small group of experts, or about one-off projects whose impact is only temporary and limited.

OECD experience and consultation with foresight practitioners in governments worldwide has revealed five broad areas where action has been taken to build effective foresight systems.

1. Demand

Any new approach or organisational change relies on sources of legitimacy and support to authorise action and to provide the necessary resources and changes to established practices needed to sustain the effort (Moore, 1995; Moore and Khagram, 2004). Sustained demand for foresight from senior levels in government and the public service can help to ensure that the necessary institutional changes, resource allocations, and practices are put in place to enable the quality and frequency of foresight required for sound policies. Sustained high level demand for foresight can also help to counterbalance the common tendency whereby important work of considering and preparing for the future is squeezed out by more immediate daily pressures or regular reporting requirements. High level support can also provide the permission needed for strategic foresight to explore provocative issues that may challenge existing assumptions and policies. Adequate demand also ensures that foresight is not carried out as an academic exercise, but rather informs the key priorities and decision-making processes of government.

Source of high-level demand for strategic foresight in government include:

- **Legislative commitments**, such as the legal requirement for regular foresight studies in Finland, or the Icelandic Public Finance Act, which calls for regular megatrends analysis to be submitted to the parliament. The Russian Science and Technology Foresight is mandated by Federal Law 172 ‘on strategic planning in the Russian Federation’.
- **Parliamentary oversight**, such as by the Parliamentary Committees on the Future in Estonia, Finland, and Iceland. The Finnish Prime Minister’s office issues an overall Government Future Report to the parliament’s Committee for the Future at least once per term on long-term future prospects and the government's targets. This process is intended to allow government and parliament to recognise important future developments in sufficient time to take action. The government’s implementation of the SDGs is also submitted to the Committee for the Future during each electoral term.
- **Political commitments**, such as the Icelandic Prime Minister’s creation of a Futures Committee. In South Korea, the National Assembly Futures Institute was established directly under the Chairman of the National Assembly. The European Commission also recently saw the nomination of a Vice-President-Designate for Inter-institutional Relations and Foresight[5] who will be tasked with leading the Commission’s work on strategic foresight, including the production of a yearly foresight report and application of foresight to the annual Commission work programme.

[5] Still subject to European Parliament approval at time of writing.

- **Championing** by senior public servants, such as the former heads of the public service in Singapore, Lim Siong Guan and Peter Ho.
- **Institutionalised demand** through a range of high-level committees, declarations and commitments. Canada's national government foresight organisation, Policy Horizons, is co-chaired by the Deputy Minister of Employment and Social Development Canada and the Deputy Secretary, Plans and Consultations at Privy Council Office, and receives oversight from a Deputy Minister Steering Committee representing multiple government departments (Policy Horizons Canada, n.d.).
- **A combination** of many of these factors: Finland's national foresight cooperation exemplifies this through its central positioning in the Prime Minister's Office, a parliamentary Committee for the Future its use of a National Foresight Network and Government Foresight Group representing many fields and disciplines, Ministerial Foresight Group for cross-governmental foresight, and foresight activities and processes which engage the multiple stakeholders (Prime Minister's Office Finland, n.d.). Further examples include Singapore's newly formed Strategy Group in the Prime Minister's Office, better positioning foresight in the context of whole-of-government planning (Centre for Strategic Futures, n.d.).

2. Capacity

To meet the demand, governments must be able to draw on intellectual capacity and skills needed to implement strategic foresight thinking and apply it to policy-making. This requires individuals trained in the theory of multiple futures and their development, as well as the use of foresight methods such as horizon scanning and scenario planning. Foresight capacity further requires the skills to design and facilitate strategic dialogue with the purpose of using foresight to look ahead, challenge assumptions, and draw out implications for policy and strategy. Examples of specialist or semi-specialist roles may include:

- Foresight specialists to develop multiple plausible futures, and foresight process specialists to design and facilitate foresight interventions, processes and strategic dialogue;
- Policy researchers and programme managers to gather signals of change;
- Policy analysts to design and test policy proposals against multiple futures.

Effective foresight capacity also requires those not directly involved in foresight to understand its overall purpose and use, and how to implement it in their respective work. Therefore governments may aspire to provide basic foresight and futures literacy[6] training for all public servants, as well as tailored foresight training for managers and senior decision makers. Similarly, applied foresight skills may be required for other functional communities with specific foresight responsibilities in the policy process, for example:

- Corporate planners and risk assessors to scan for disruptive change and identify and explore risks beyond the expected future; and explore what risks emerge if context changes;
- Auditors and evaluators to ensure that policies make adequate consideration of future uncertainties; and
- Public engagement specialists to reflect with citizens and stakeholders on changing future contexts as part of input to the policy-making process.

[6] 'Futures literacy has been defined as the "capacity to explore the potential of the present to give rise to the future" (Miller, 2007), which means recognising that developments in the present are signals of what the future might hold.

A number of strategies have been used to build these capacities in government, including: hiring public servants with expertise in strategic foresight or in other fields emphasising systems thinking, complexity and the tools to recognise uncertainty; providing introductory and specialised training courses to public servants; and providing learning by doing opportunities for public servants at all levels to engage in foresight processes within and beyond their own workplaces. For example in Singapore, a common practice is to place officials in central foresight institutions to gain experience, and then deploy them across government in order to propagate their expertise. The Strategy Group also serves a training and consultancy role to support foresight mainstreaming across government.

Foresight capacity is also not only about skills, knowledge and tools, but an attitudinal willingness to engage with rapid change and high uncertainty.

3. Institutions

The institutional arrangements needed to deliver foresight can take many forms, but a key ingredient is having at least one central dedicated foresight unit to champion, conduct and coordinate foresight work across government. The aim is not to centralise foresight, but rather to provide some of the heavy lifting that will enable an effective mainstreaming and integration of foresight practices across all government departments and within central decision-making processes. Similarly, most departments and agencies that take seriously the challenge of developing future-ready policies will typically develop their own dedicated foresight teams to support the application of foresight across their respective mandate areas. While the ultimate aim is mainstreaming, a degree of autonomy and even insulation for some parts of these foresight units can provide a space to experiment with and incubate ideas that challenge more widely held assumptions about the future.

A central foresight unit serves a crucial role to conduct high level foresight, coordinate cross-cutting foresight processes, and help support foresight mainstreaming across government. For example, departments throughout the Canadian government are able to draw on the foresight capacity of the centrally housed Policy Horizons Canada as part of their foresight system (Policy Horizons Canada, n.d.). Horizons also supports futures discussions and workshops at high level meetings across the government. Similarly, Singapore's Centre for Strategic Futures, based in the Prime Minister's office, plays a key role in conducting and coordinating regular cross-government foresight studies which then serve to inform the overall strategy of government as well as the more specific foresight work of other ministries. In the EU, the functions of a central foresight unit are provided by several institutions, including the European Political Strategy Centre (the European Commission in-house think tank), the European Parliament's Foresight Unit, and the Strategic Foresight Competence Centre at the Joint Research Centre among others, with activities coordinated through a common steering committee. The United States lacks a defined central foresight unit, but the Government Accountability Office and National Intelligence Council house two of the largest foresight teams and help to coordinate a federal foresight community of practice involving multiple departments.

Building on the role of a central unit, individual government agencies have recognised the value of foresight and set up their own strategic foresight teams, which conduct more domain-specific futures work (Centre for Strategic Futures, n.d.); this is the case with the Singapore Ministry of Trade and Industry Futures Group among others, who coordinate their foresight activities with the Prime Minister's Office. The Queensland Government and Australia's national science agency CSIRO jointly fund a programme of applied research

called Q-Foresight (Hajkowicz et al., 2018). This programme conducts strategic foresight into long-term trends, risks and scenarios relevant to the State's future. To date the research has examined plausible futures for innovation, transport, health, science and environmental policy.

In Finland, in addition to the central role of the Prime Minister's Office in coordinating government foresight, a strategic foresight expert who was a member of the Government Foresight Group was hired in-house by all 12 ministries simultaneously to facilitate the integration of foresight in decision making processes. A comprehensive scenario based strategy process was conducted in nearly all the ministries, with the government officials of the ministries being the content creators and owners. The strategies of multiple ministries were built based on this work. The process further institutionalised strategic foresight by helping to create foresight teams in ministries, establishing a common language of strategic foresight within government, and enabling a multi-level strategic futures dialogue including executive management, permanent state secretaries, a ministerial group and government co-ordinated research.

Other government institutions may also serve an important role in a national foresight system. For example, auditors and evaluators may assess ministries on their effective practice of foresight. Finance ministries may require submissions from all government departments to include a consideration of how alternative future scenarios could impact their assumptions regarding the future costs and revenues of proposals. Research agencies may fund academic research on emerging changes and future scenarios and help disseminate findings to policy-makers.

Informal and formal networks have also been identified as a valuable means through which foresight insights can be channelled into existing lines of work. Communities, focal points, intermediaries, and meetings among futurists have been cited by experts in Finland and Singapore among others as useful resources.

A final, contrasting consideration is that foresight needs to be able to deal with developments and implications which run counter to established practices and orthodoxies. Therefore while it is important to institutionalise strategic foresight to ensure that it is not isolated from decision making, it is also important to provide strategic foresight the space and autonomy to discuss disruptive and challenging ideas and ensure that it is insulated from bias by present-day concerns, agendas, and interests.

4. Embeddedness

Strategic foresight should not be seen as an isolated or optional 'extra' to the conventional decision-making process, but an integral part of it. Foresight can be used at any point in the policy cycle, from initial scoping to design and implementation, through to review and testing of existing strategies. All lines of work can be implicated in a foresight system, from horizon scanning to aid initial scoping and research, through to testing a strategy's robustness against alternative scenarios while it is already being implemented.

The relevant decision makers who need to be involved in the foresight conversation can vary depending on the context. Typically this would include the public servants (analysts, task teams, management) most involved in conducting the analysis and developing policy proposals. However, for significant policy proposals (such as broad national strategies or major initiatives) the foresight conversation should actively involve senior public servants and politicians as well. For it is only by personally experiencing a change in perception about previously unexplored futures and their implications that these decision-makers will acquire a more a more sound and future-ready framework from which to base their choices. In Singapore, politicians

are chiefly engaged through the regular National Scenarios exercises, while senior public officials are engaged through multiple other channels such as quarterly Strategic Futures Network meetings.

It is also important to identify the key decisions and milestones within a policy process where foresight interventions would be most relevant and impactful. Embeddedness is enhanced when outputs coincide with moments of important decisions, such as the expiry of a previous strategy or the preparation of an election campaign. In practice, this means designing ongoing and ad hoc strategic foresight processes that involve active discussions and engagement with alternative future scenarios and their implications at appropriate times in the decision-making process. For example, the publication release dates of the Finnish government foresight are coordinated with electoral cycles in order to enable futures knowledge to carry forward. The flagship report targets the mid-term policy review to act as a reference for government progress and ministerial reviews. Furthermore, political parties in elections are provided with information to help them design campaign platforms that better address emerging and futures challenges.

Finally, the principle of embeddedness applies also in extending the foresight conversation to citizens and other key stakeholders who will be affected by the decisions made. Engaging the constituencies concerned further helps to build legitimacy by ensuring the input of constituents' perspectives (Scharpf, 1970). It may also enhance the quality of a foresight process to ensure a diversity of inputs from a broad range of participants. Several governments therefore aim to regularly engage business, labour, academia, civil society, media, and citizens in their foresight systems. One example is the Slovenia national visioning process, which engaged a range of actors from all levels of society in the production and refinement of the vision statement (Dedić et al., 2016).

5. Feedback

Building foresight systems requires feedback and review to improve and respond to new circumstances. Another important reason to ensure adequate evaluation is to demonstrate the positive impacts of good foresight on better policies, in terms of previously unseen opportunities that were identified and realised, or unseen costs and crises that were avoided or prevented. Such evaluation is inherently difficult as it involves assessing the value of counter-factual outcomes and attributing a source of new ideas within a complex decision-making process.

One example of feedback occurring is in Finland, where the Parliamentary Committee of the Future recently motioned that the first part of the Government Future Report should be founded better on the continuous and joint ministerial foresight work. It was further motioned that second part of the Report should open up some or all of the phenomena highlighted in the first Government Future Report. This would enable the Parliament to prepare a response on the foresight work of ministries and on the top theme chosen by the government.

Peer learning is another means for such learning, and participation in communities of practice such as the OECD Government Foresight Community allows for the exchange of effective practices and use of collective intelligence to overcome barriers to developing impactful foresight systems.

Foresight interventions

Effective anticipatory governance also relies on regular successful foresight interventions. These efforts are essential to demonstrate the value of strategic foresight in decision-making. When successful, foresight interventions contribute to longer term future-readiness, both through their published findings, the legacy of dialogue and new ideas fostered among the active participants, and their influence in strengthening both the demand for and supply of quality foresight thinking within the organisations involved. A concerted foresight intervention can also be a valuable way of initiating a broader upgrade of a government's foresight system by building support, engaging multiple partners, and creating new practices that can later be made ongoing.

Foresight interventions can be broad or specific and conducted rapidly or in depth. Broad foresight interventions typically focus on either a high level government strategy (e.g. a country's national plan for achieving its 2030 Sustainable Development Goals), a key government priority (e.g. the future of work), or better understanding a potential transformative change and its implications for the country as a whole (e.g. the future of Artificial Intelligence). Foresight interventions are also appropriate for narrower topics, including the priorities and institutional strategy of a particular organisation, or an emerging policy issue within one or two departments. Foresight interventions can range from a few weeks (e.g. a quick study to bring a future perspective to a pressing issue) to a few years. Examples of the latter are the USA's Global Trends Report published every 4 years following extensive international research and engagement, or the European Strategy and Policy Analysis System Global Trends Report published every 5 years ahead of a new EU institutional cycle.

A wide range of strategic foresight methodologies and tools can contribute to an effective strategic foresight intervention and the particulars of their use will vary depending on the circumstances. However, the following high-level principles and considerations can been identified to assist senior decision-makers when commissioning foresight interventions:

- Good horizon scanning is the foundation of good foresight. The purpose of a foresight study is to generate new insight and therefore cannot be produced rapidly by simply synthesising existing analysis.
- Disruptive change most often comes from outside the system. No matter how narrow the focus of the foresight study, it is important to look at changes that may emanate from outside the immediate system in question. For example, a study on the future of transportation should include not only technological advancements in vehicles, but also societal needs for mobility due to potentially changing patterns of work, leisure and consumption.
- The lasting impact of a foresight intervention is not only in the publication itself, but particularly in the changed ideas of those who participated. Therefore it may be of great value to involve key decision-makers at all levels in various parts of the participatory process.
- Foresight interventions aimed at supporting broad national strategies typically require extensive engagement of external stakeholders and citizens in the foresight process. This goes beyond simply providing input, but actually participating in the foresight process itself. A strong communications and media strategy may be required to translate the experience of participants to the broader public.

Further steps

Strategic foresight is an evolving discipline and anticipatory governance is an evolving concept. No government claims to have a formula for systematically implementing them in an optimal way. Every government must start somewhere, and there are numerous ways to demonstrate the value that foresight can add, while generating the buy-in needed to take further step. Some examples could be:

- Creating or rejuvenating a foresight team tasked with implementing some of the actions listed above
- Running an effective, impactful foresight intervention on a topic of considerable uncertainty, for which a policy or strategy development process is about to begin.
- Producing a report or series of briefings on cross-cutting issues of considerable uncertainty, under the joint authorship of multiple actors and with perspectives for action for policy makers.

How the OECD can help

Through its Strategic Foresight team, the OECD provides practical advice and support to governments on strengthening their foresight systems and conducting key foresight processes to prepare for uncertain, complex, and potentially turbulent futures. Examples include Iceland's Futures Committee and strategic foresight upgrade, the Slovenia National Development Strategy, the Slovakia national priorities for Agenda 2030, Estonia's 2035 strategy and an upcoming foresight process to support the "Going Digital" Review of Latvia. All these projects set out to facilitate successful collaborations across government ministries and wider stakeholder communities, and often drew an on the broad expertise of multiple OECD Directorates.

The OECD is pleased to offer support to governments in the following main ways:

1. **Advice**: short written guides, briefings, and presentations drawing on OECD and others' experience implementing practical upgrades in strategic foresight within numerous organisations.
2. **Interventions**: a range of interventions, ranging in scale according to the government's needs. See box 'OECD strategic foresight interventions' for more detailed options.

OECD strategic foresight interventions

- **Introduction sessions**: short seminars presenting the approaches of strategic foresight on a small scale for participants to see its potential.
- **Foresight workshop**: one or more workshops (up to two days) building on the introduction to foresight sessions, followed by a structured dialogue tailored to the policy needs of the organisation. Participants leave with a stronger impression of multiple complex challenges and opportunities, and identify concrete actions to better prepare.
- **Foresight for policy and strategy**: a full-scale intervention, expanding on the first two options. A specific policy domain, strategy, or organisation is identified in advance as the target for the intervention. A project plan is developed, spanning the time needed to generate initial ideas (horizon scanning), develop relevant and impactful futures (scenarios, for example), and bring them to bear on the policy process. A typical set-up involves one workshop at the beginning of the project and one near the end, with some weeks of desk research and expert consultations in between. The end deliverable is a strategic dialogue and report, with tangible impact on the policy process.

3. **Studies**: high-quality foresight for use in policy processes. The strategic foresight team works with experts within the OECD to produce studies on specific policy topics which take into account uncertain, disruptive, and significant future developments. The output is a more future-facing report with relevant considerations for the intended policy audience to take into account.
4. **Networking**: the OECD convenes the Government Foresight Community, an international network of expertise where experienced foresight practitioners exchange futures knowledge and effective practices on building capacity and use of foresight within their respective organisations. Participation is free and by invitation only; recommendations can be sent to the Strategic Foresight Unit.
5. **High-level dialogue**: the OECD provides a variety of platforms for ministers, parliamentarians and senior government officials to engage in futures dialogue.

The OECD Strategic Foresight unit welcomes continued ideas and suggestions for collaboration in order to support. Please contact us at foresight@oecd.org.

References

Centre for Strategic Futures, n.d. Who We Are [WWW Document]. URL https://www.csf.gov.sg/who-we-are/ (accessed 8.23.19).

Committee for the Future, 2019. Societal Transformation 2018-2037: 100 Anticipated Radical Technologies, 20 Regimes, Case Finland. Parliament of Finland, Helsinki.

Dedić, J., Šooš, T., Dermelj, M., Kampuš, A., Kobe Logonder, N., Menart, Ž., Tolar, M., Urbančič, H., Zupančič, I.Ž., 2016. Vizija Slovenije. Služba Vlade RS za razvoj in evropsko kohezijsko politiko, Ljubljana.

Fuerth, L.S., Faber, E.M., 2012. Anticipatory Governance Practical Upgrades: Equipping the Executive Branch to cope with increasing speed and complexity of major challenges. NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIV FORT MCNAIR DC INST FOR NATIONAL STRATEGIC STUDIES.

Hajkowicz, S., Bratanova, A., Neale, N., Cameron, L., 2018. The Innovation Imperative: Risks and Opportunities for Queensland over the Coming Decades of Economic and Technological Transformation. CSIRO.

Miller, R., 2007. Futures literacy: A hybrid strategic scenario method. Futures 39, 341–362. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2006.12.001

Moore, M.H., 1995. Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government. Harvard University Press.

Moore, M.H., Khagram, S., 2004. On Creating Public Value: What Business Might Learn from Government about Strategic Management. Corp. Soc. Responsib. Initiat. Work. Pap.

Policy Horizons Canada, n.d. About Us [WWW Document]. URL https://horizons.gc.ca/en/about-us/ (accessed 8.23.19).

Prime Minister's Office Finland, n.d. National foresight cooperation [WWW Document]. Valtioneuvoston Kanslia. URL http://vnk.fi/en/foresight (accessed 7.22.16).

Scharpf, F.W., 1970. Demokratietheorie zwischen Utopie und Anpassung, Konstanzer Universitätsreden, 25. Druckerei u. Verlagsanst. Universitätsverl, Konstanz.

Acknowledgements

We thank members of the Government Foresight Community from Australia, Canada, Finland, Iceland, Singapore, and the European Commission for reviewing this document and for enriching it with examples.