

2012 Young Professionals Day



Summary Report

Strategic Plans and Policy, Strategic Analysis Branch

Headquarters Allied Command Transformation

North Atlantic Treaty Organisation

Table of Contents

Working Group 1 Summary	3
Working Group 2 Summary	5
Working Group 3 Summary	8
Working Group 4 Summary	10

Special appreciation is expressed to the following Mentors and Moderators for their contribution to the Young Professionals Day, for it was their leadership, expertise, and guidance that made this event a success:

Young Professional Mentors:

Ambassador Peter Taksøe-Jensen, Ambassador of Denmark to the United States
Ambassador Ravic Huso, Political Advisor, Supreme Allied Comander Transformation
Ambassador András Simonyi, Former Ambassador of Hungary to the U.S. and NATO;
Managing Director, Center for Transatlantic Relations, SAIS, Johns Hopkins University
Ambassador Kolinda Grabar-Kitarović, NATO Assistant Secretary General for Public
Diplomacy

Working Group Moderators:

Dr. Stephen Flanagan, Henry A. Kissinger Chair, Center for Strategic and International
Studies
Ms. Clara O'Donnell, Visiting Fellow, The Brookings Institution
Mr. Damon Wilson, Executive Vice President, Atlantic Council of the United States
Ms. Heather Conley, Director and Senior Fellow, Europe Program, Center for Strategic and
International Studies

Smart Defence: Who, How, and For What?

Key Issues

- Financial realities pose a threat to NATO's ability to achieve the stated level of ambition.
- Smart Defence provides an approach through prioritization, specialisation, and cooperation to support the development of capabilities needed by NATO.
- Smart Defence is not about NATO directing nations what to develop, but instead is about supporting the alignment of national and NATO priorities among interested participants.
- Can Smart Defence succeed, and will it remain a concept if economic conditions improve?

Discussion

Many viewpoints were shared about what and who Smart Defence should be for and within the current fiscal environment, and there was little consensus on what the priorities should be. Topics included emphasizing core tasks such as collective defence and crisis management; new challenges like missile defence, cyber, and energy routes; partner engagement and its function for the Alliance; NATO's role in the global commons; and the potential for geographic areas of responsibility. The broad and diverse discussion led the group to quickly recognise the difficulty in achieving consensus on priorities among the Allies.

The discussion then focused on how to implement Smart Defence. The lack of an enforcement mechanism was noted, with concern expressed by many in the group about nations not sufficiently participating or "free loading". Politically, nations have signed up to support Smart Defence, but clearly there are more incentives for some nations over others to fully implement various initiatives and there will be a need to develop new metrics in order to better assess the measure of success. There was discussion about the possibility of creating incentives to implement, and how to confront allies that were not contributing enough.

Smart Defence includes the three tenets of prioritisation, specialisation, and cooperation. Prioritisation is about the convergence of national and collective interests to best use limited resources in developing capabilities. The group noted concerns with specialisation if critical capabilities are left to just one nation to maintain. NATO does not control the political will or resources of any government, and this could pose a risk that a capability would not be available in a time of need. Many in the group believe that specialisation should only be considered in the context of cooperation to avoid completely losing a capability.

Pooling and sharing can be effective, such as Baltic air policing and Nordic cooperation initiatives, but protection of industrial bases and national pride become factors as nations consider additional measures. NATO should facilitate more discussions to seek additional cooperative opportunities. It was noted that cooperation for "off the shelf" acquisitions have a higher chance of success than large development projects which face different partner

requirements and industrial participation challenges. Finally, the group acknowledged that smaller, bilateral arrangements are easier than larger, multilateral projects, and NATO should take advantage of those opportunities.

On the question of “who,” the discussion focused on the need for NATO to engage governments and legislatures more than the general public. The key target of influence should be the actual governments who must agree on priorities and provide resources for defence capability development. There was also some discussion about key partners with the will and capability being asked to participate in Smart Defence. Partners will be critical in confronting future security challenges, and they are facing the same economic issues as NATO members. Finally, it was noted that Smart Defence is not about developing capabilities at 28, but instead finding areas of common national interests among smaller groups to develop new collaborative programs that will provide NATO with the necessary capabilities to deal with current and emerging threats.

Take-Aways

- As with the Nations, there was little consensus within the group on what NATO’s role should be or what priorities to focus on.
- Pooling and specialisation can be effective, but there remain concerns over the potential for a single member being responsible to maintain a critical capability. Challenges with sovereignty and industrial base policies were recognized as well.
- Cooperation seems to be most effective for “off the shelf” capabilities, while more complex research and development programs risk being unable to harmonize requirements.
- There is political commitment to implement Smart Defence, but the details of how and the lack of an enforcement mechanism left some wondering how effective it will be. The need for new metrics to assess success will be needed.
- Partners that have the will and capability to support NATO should be considered in implementing Smart Defence.
- Engagement should be focused on governments and legislatures and less on the public in order to have the best chance of success.

Moderator: Ms. Clara O’Donnell, *Visiting Fellow, The Brookings Institution*

Mentor: Amb. Ravic Huso, *Political Advisor, Supreme Allied Commander Transformation*

YP Presentation: Mr. Carles Castello-Catchot, *Associate Director, Strategic Foresight Initiative, Atlantic Council of the United States*

Emerging Security Challenges: What's NATO's Role?

Key Issues

- NATO is an Alliance of like-minded nations. While NATO does not always need to be the specific response vehicle to an event or issue, it has an innate ability to serve as a legitimate convening forum for robust discussion.
- NATO must ensure that it does not become complacent in the constantly changing new world structure and emerging security challenges. NATO needs to maintain/promote its relevancy to a new generation that did not experience the value NATO provided during and immediately after the Cold War.
- The Emerging Security Challenges Division needs significantly more exposure across the broader NATO organization. Current consulting role with SECGEN is beneficial, but the information and expertise provided would be very useful if further disseminated.
- How do we properly differentiate between Article 4 and Article 5 events, particularly when considering issues such as cyber-attacks and global health?

Discussion

This forum was an opportunity for the group to discuss how NATO is doing in defining and publicizing their role in addressing emerging security challenges. Millennials are rising to leadership during a time when the world is experiencing historic, fundamental, transformative change. This event was also an opportunity to inform and educate future decision makers on the purpose and usefulness of NATO. Specifically that this is not NATO looking for another mission, rather a discussion of how to address emerging threats. What are the emerging challenges we face? What opportunities do they bring? How will we shape NATO's future?

NATO is currently facing an extremely challenging time in our history. While it is not necessarily a more dangerous time, it is inherently more complex and unpredictable. The issues that confront us are diverse and varied, and include new challenges such as: cyber-attacks, global health, energy security, nuclear proliferation, regional instability, and access to the global commons. Conquering this complexity is the fundamental challenge that the Alliance must overcome. While the world is in a continuous state of emerging issues and conflicts, it must be acknowledged that this is not a transition to a new equilibrium, but rather the new normal. To remain viable and relevant, NATO must ensure that it does not become complacent and adjusts as necessary. This will require not only a new roadmap, but a new mindset.

One approach within NATO that can have an immediate impact would be to enhance the voice of the Emerging Security Challenges Division. This newly formed team could benefit from more resources, greater exposure, and interaction with member states. More resources are important as the frequency and scope of the different emerging security challenges is not diminishing. Developing the capability to quickly identify these issues and make recommendations is critical to keeping NATO properly focused. Increasing the ability of the team to have an expanded role besides the current function of serving as consultants to the Secretary General would enable this important work to have greater visibility across the broader organization. Finally, interaction with the member nations would ensure line of sight into the wide range of challenges across the Alliance and facilitate discussion on appropriate actions.

NATO is a conventional alliance that is now facing unconventional challenges. During the Cold War, NATO's military dimension was most prominent, but what is the role of force in today's environment, and how do we develop these tools to deal with hybrid threats? We are at a point in time where NATO has to think differently – you cannot fight a current or future war with the tools and approach of the last war. We are also operating with the added challenge of the current financial and budgetary environment which provides increased pressure on the proposed solutions. The analogy is that NATO is a tool, but we ultimately need to decide how to most efficiently and effectively use it. It must be noted, however, that the tool needs to be reconfigured from time to time and we must ask whether we are re-tooling it properly or quickly enough. In that context, approaches such as Smart Defence and burden sharing are critical vehicles for NATO to update the tool kit by developing and deploying new capabilities in today's fiscal environment.

NATO is an Alliance of like-minded nations. While NATO does not always need to be the specific response vehicle to an event or issue, it has an innate ability to serve as a legitimate convening forum for robust discussion. Due to its structure and organizational alignment, NATO is uniquely suited for convening and coordinating stakeholders. It serves as a valuable forum for framing questions and making decisions, while also providing legitimacy for actions taken by member states when required. Part of the challenge in today's environment is determining the meaning of Article V in the 21st Century. Given the emerging security challenges faced by the Alliance today, what falls under Article IV versus Article V when evaluating events such as cyber-attacks, nuclear proliferation, energy issues, and others risks yet to be identified? And finally, what are the thresholds necessary for NATO to take action? There is an argument to be made that there is real value in strategic ambiguity in defining those thresholds for action as that allows for a certain amount of flexibility on when and how to respond.

One interesting discussion the group held was regarding democratic legitimacy in that not all partner nations equally uphold the values of NATO, either domestically or internationally. As the Alliance has grown over the years, has there been any consideration to exploring a process to evaluate the membership of Allied nations if sufficient democratic and human rights progress is not achieved? This is a unique concept that the group felt was appropriate for consideration and further discussion, particularly in light of the social media culture that exists today.

Finally, the future of NATO depends on creative and steady leadership. It is not only about structural shifts within NATO, but a change in the hearts and minds of Allied leaders and how they choose to address this rapidly evolving world. It is about a paradigm shift for individuals as much as for the various organizations. Continued participation and sponsorship of forums such as this will be critical for NATO to maintain its relevancy as new generations ascend to positions of authority across the breadth of the Alliance.

Take-Aways

- As emerging security challenges will require the Alliance to adapt to operate effectively in a perpetually more complex and challenging security environment, NATO should continue to enable the Emerging Security Challenges Division (ESCD) to garner further exposure across the broader NATO organization and create opportunities for greater interaction with member nations to increase capabilities.
- NATO must ensure that it does not become complacent in this constantly changing new world structure if the Alliance is to tackle these emerging security challenges. NATO needs to maintain/promote its relevancy to a new generation that did not experience the value NATO provided during and immediately after the Cold War.
- Continue to define and refine the necessary capabilities for NATO to effectively operate in today's more complex and fiscally challenging environment, leveraging Smart Defence and partners to develop and resource them.

Moderator: Mr. Damon Wilson, *Executive Vice President, Atlantic Council of the United States*

Mentor: Amb. András Simonyi, *Former Ambassador of Hungary to the U.S. and NATO; Managing Director, Center for Transatlantic Relations, SAIS, Johns Hopkins University*

YP Presentation: Mr. Joshua Marcuse, *Founder and President, Young Professionals in Foreign Policy*

A Future Vision for NATO and the Transatlantic Community

Key Issues

- What is the future vision for NATO and the Trans-Atlantic Community? Will NATO transform considerably or will it maintain the status quo over the next ten years?
- Is it time for NATO to consider “re-branding”?
- What can NATO do to strengthen political will?
- With the public perception that US leadership is looking elsewhere (pivot to Asia), how does NATO re-focus attention on European issues?
- Is enlargement of the Alliance required of NATO to keep pace with globalization?

Discussion

This group compared what they “think” NATO would be versus what they “want” NATO to be in 10 years; and if the Alliance would be more or less the same as it is today despite the hope that it would become more democratic, more flexible, more relevant and more Euro-centric among other things. Interestingly, there was general consensus that NATO would be more or less the same despite the hope of what they wanted it to become; clearly there was an initial level of scepticism regarding the future. The moderator then challenged the group to provide thoughts on how NATO could turn their “wanted” NATO into reality. Discussions on the future vision of NATO were then guided by debating three “P’s”— **P**rotect through Article 5, **P**romote values, and support **P**olitical will. By the end of the discussion three additional “P’s” were seen to be as equally relevant to NATO’s future: **P**roject stability, develop effective **P**olicy, and garner the support of **P**ublic opinion.

A significant portion of the discussion was dedicated to whether or not NATO should expand the scope of its partnerships and membership. There was a general feeling that there is a lack of understanding on both sides of the Atlantic about the purpose of NATO, especially since it is believed that there was not much effort toward redefining their purpose after the end of the Cold War. This lack of understanding makes it difficult to define capabilities and establish the need to expand. Expansion models could include increased membership and interactions with such organizations as Partnership for Peace (PfP), Istanbul Cooperation Initiative (ICI), and the Mediterranean Dialogue (MD). Additionally, there will be a need to deepen global partnerships to tackle issues involving developing trans-national threats such as: narcotics, human trafficking, and cyber. Lastly, to tackle globalization over the next ten years, NATO will have to consider how to best engage with partners in regions from MENA through Indonesia (which will see the largest population increases over the next ten to twenty years); this is particularly important since the regional powers (Russia/China) will also continue to expand their influence.

There was consensus amongst the discussion group that NATO must also do a better job of selling itself to European and American leaders, as well as the general populations in these nations. NATO's success in Libya was discussed as a means to convince the public and politicians about the credibility, viability, and efficacy of NATO. While there is a considerable amount of guarded scepticism and fatigue on both sides of the Atlantic, when it comes to military operations, Libya was seen as a good first step in adjusting that mind-set towards more limited interventions and cooperative efforts. Additionally and despite the reality, both Afghanistan, as well as Iraq, have been seen by many on both sides of the Atlantic as unilateral U.S. undertakings, and their scope and structure may not provide the best models for future NATO operations.

Take-Aways

- NATO no longer deals with just north Atlantic issues and missions will only continue to expand. To meet the demands of globalization in the future, NATO will have to have more partners (and potentially member states), and Europeans will need to provide more leadership; however, this growth will take time and requires patience from Nations and leadership. NATO should consider enlargement as part of its strategic vision, but also recognize it takes time (5-10 years) to build political support. The Alliance should use this strategic vision as a tool to not necessarily enlarge now, but to put the framework in place for future expansion discussions.
- NATO needs to better inform the public. NATO has a public relations/branding problem, primarily since both Iraq and Afghanistan have been unpopular among Allied publics. Re-branding may not be the right word, but NATO needs to present itself differently in a changing global environment.
- NATO should continue to build Partnerships to allow NATO to have a more global vision.
- Afghanistan has dominated discussion over the past decade, and will be used to judge if NATO is/has been successful or not. NATO needs to do a better job of explaining why this mission is important in terms of maintaining collective security.
- It is clear NATO needs to maintain political will, continue to protect member nations, promote collective values, and project to our publics the importance of its policies and how NATO can continue to provide real solutions for the 21st century.
- NATO needs to get policy and ambition right before it sets its sights on the future, and then explain to the public why we are doing what we are doing. We can't allow media to shape the narrative.

Moderator: Ms. Heather Conley, *Director and Senior Fellow, Europe Program, CSIS*

Mentor: Amb. Peter Taksøe-Jensen, *Ambassador of Denmark to the United States*

YP Presentation: Mr. Scott Aughenbaugh, *Fellow and Multimedia Manager, CSIS*

NATO Partnerships: How to Work Better Together

Key Issues

- NATO/Russia: Is missile defence a game breaker? Is there currently a political need in Russia to see missile defence as a threat? How will missile defence affect NATO's ability to work with Russia on counter terrorism, cyber security and anti-piracy?
- Global Partners: Although NATO does not have formal partnership arrangements to engage new global partners NATO says it is prepared to "develop political dialogue and practical cooperation with any nation across the globe that shares its interest in peaceful international relations." How should NATO best engage potential new partners?
- Middle East/North Africa (MENA): What is the future? Relationships are only partly formed right now, but need to continue. Transition from vertical authority to horizontal consensus is occurring. Countries are still stabilizing. What is the new policy on security arrangements?
- NATO/EU: Given Turkey-Cyprus impasse, what are some practical steps that NATO and the EU might take to further enhance cooperation?
- NATO/UN: Is UN Security Council backing essential for the political legitimacy for NATO interventions? In interventions such as Libya, was it in NATO's strategic interest to use force only under a Security Council mandate? Mandates which set a clear time limit for interventions would also reduce UN concerns about extended NATO engagements and lower the threshold for non-NATO members to authorize Allied operations. How can NATO better work with the UN?

Discussion

This working group looked at three main questions concerning NATO and Partnerships - **Why do we need partnerships? What kind of partnerships do we need? How can we get such partnerships: What are the challenges and opportunities?**

Shrinking defence budgets due to the implementation of austerity measures on both sides of the Atlantic is increasing need for NATO to develop partnerships. In addition, there is a growing realization that many of the new security challenges are global in origin and will require engagement outside the North Atlantic area in unstable regions of the world where the Alliance has never previously operated. NATO needs greater flexibility and reach in responding to threats and in making the most effective use of its resources. This means that NATO must seek increased engagement with relevant countries and other international/regional organizations. The issue of partnerships is expected to be one of the top priorities of the Chicago Summit.

During the Lisbon Summit, Allied leaders affirmed the central role of partnerships, singling out "cooperative security" as one of the Alliance's three essential core tasks to be achieved in part

“through a wide network of partner relationships with countries and organizations around the globe”. Events since Lisbon have proven the importance of enhancing partnerships: the turmoil in the Arab world showed that NATO’s Mediterranean Dialogue and Istanbul Cooperation Initiative need additional reform and partnerships with MENA countries should be a priority. During the Libya operation, the issue of how NATO can best work with non-NATO contributing nations such as Sweden was also a central concern. Most future NATO missions will likely occur with partners. There is a need for partners to be better integrated into NATO planning and command structures to make it more attractive for them to partner. We also need partners to tackle new threats such as cyber and energy security. Other global actors such as rising powers like China, India, and Brazil also deserve consideration in areas where they share mutual interests with Allies, such as maritime security.

The countries of North Africa and the Gulf region are not Central and Eastern Europe. They are not bound by a common objective to join the Alliance. The absence of a link between partnership and enlargement in this region means that NATO’s influence is likely to be much more limited than it was in Central and Eastern Europe. Moreover, the Middle East is a region in which, historically, there has been a significant suspicion and mistrust of NATO and there is a need to build their trust. In an effort to better engage partners and to make NATO more attractive, the new Berlin Partnership package was approved in April 2011. This package allows NATO “to open its “partnership toolbox” to provide more “efficient and flexible” partnership arrangements, across and beyond existing regional frameworks. There is a full menu of options that NATO can provide: scientific exchanges, counter-terrorism, border security, civil, humanitarian and natural disaster response are some of the tools the Alliance can offer. Individual countries now have access to 1600 plus activities in NATO’s toolkit.

Take-Aways

- New global security challenges require more partnerships with a wide range of nations and international actors. In an age of austerity, partnerships must be a two-way street to enhance the security of the Euro-Atlantic area. NATO needs to highlight the benefits of cooperation to partners, and if partners are providing value added to Alliance activities and operations, they need to have a larger role in shaping and managing them.
- Partnership cannot be an end in and of itself, and NATO has yet to articulate clearly the larger strategic objectives it is intended to serve.
- NATO Partnerships should be defined by the mission and not by geography. In this regard, NATO should make use of its entire toolkit to engage partners in a more meaningful way. This includes tailoring partnerships to the specific needs of the country, organization or mission in question rather than applying a one-size-fits-all strategy.

Moderator: Dr. Stephen Flanagan, *Henry A. Kissinger Chair, CSIS*

Mentor: Amb. Kolinda Grabar-Kitarović, *Assistant Secretary General for Public Diplomacy*

YP Presentation: Mr. Erik Bratteberg, *Visiting Fellow, Center for Transatlantic Relations, SAIS, Johns Hopkins University*