

Singapore 25. August 2014

Report

NATO - Asia/Pacific Dialogue 2014

Seoul, Republic of Korea, 24-25 June, 2014

Since 2011, Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung's regional office in Singapore organises in collaboration with the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation an annual "NATO – Asia/Pacific Dialogue". The Dialogue is aimed to offer an opportunity for networking, confidence building and the sharing of experiences with regard to the construction of efficient and durable security alliances. The NATO-Asia/Pacific Dialogue also provides a platform for the exchange and better understanding of extra-regional security issues and their consequences for the Asia-Pacific region.

The NATO-ASIA Dialogue 2014 with the title "Cooperative Security in a New Strategic Security Environment" was held on 24 and 25 June 2014 in Seoul, Republic of Korea. The Participants were from Afghanistan, Australia, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Mongolia, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Pakistan, People's Republic of China, Singapore, Taiwan, Vietnam, and from France, Germany, Great Britain, US/Austria.

In his welcome remarks, **Dr. Wilhelm Hofmeister, Director, Regional Programme Political Dialogue with Asia, Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung, Singapore** underlined that as of today, neither the EU nor the NATO countries are part of a security structure in Asia. Nevertheless transregional cooperation on common security concerns is gaining in importance for each continent. In terms of trade and the economy, Europe has become increasingly dependent on the stability of the Asian regions. On the other side, NATO as well as the EU can provide valuable experiences when it comes to preparing the ground for a stable security environment. In this regard, strategic cooperation built on mutual trust and understanding of each other's regions was identified as a prerequisite for the development of cooperative measures and sustainable security frameworks.

General Lieutenant (re) Hwang Jin-ha Member of the National Assembly, Seoul, Republic of Korea noted that rapid changes surrounding the security environment are creating greater instability in international politics. Against the backdrop of the financial crisis and worrying developments in Iraq, the international community is confronted with more plural and complex security challenges. With the rise of China, and North Korea's nuclear weapons programme international attention is gradually moving towards North-

East Asia. In light of this, NATO and the Republic of Korea should retain their strategic partnership and continue discussing a future orientated mutual relationship.

Ms. Barbora Maronkova, Programme Officer, Engagement Section, NATO Public Diplomacy Division, Belgium remarked that the on-going Ukraine crisis has caused NATO to reinforce its collective defence and risk mitigation strategies in the so-called "Eastern neighbourhood". Nonetheless, NATO's global partnerships have not lost in relevance and remain a key priority. During Anders Fogh Rasmussen visit to London in June 2014, the General Secretary outlined NATO's main pillars for the Wales Summit in September. These include, along with the successful completion of the ISAF engagement in Afghanistan and support for collective capabilities, the maintenance of NATO's global partnerships.

Ultimately, **Dr. Norbert Eschborn, Resident Representative Republic of Korea Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung** emphasised that if a well-rounded relationship was to develop between Asia and Europe, both sides would have to step up their efforts for security collaboration. Tangible cooperation and an accurate understanding of each other's regions are only possible if cooperative measures expand beyond the confined economic sphere. What is needed, therefore, is a more full-bodied sense of interest and relations.

First Panel: Russia's annexation of Crimea – the impact of our common neighbour's behaviour on the international security environment

With the annexation of Crimea on March 21 2014 Russia has violated fundamental principles of international law and challenged the foundations of the prevailing collective security system. In face of the gradually intensifying conflict, the international community is urged to address questions of how to assess Ukraine's instability and how to determine its impact on global security challenges.

According to **Dr. Christoph Schwegmann, Office of the Chief of Staff, German Federal Ministry of Defence** one has to distinguish here between immediate reactions and long-term implications, and may at this stage only draw preliminary conclusions. Regarding the former, a strong and united international response could be observed. Russia's behaviour has been condemned, signalling that there is no going back to normal. At the same time, it was consented to abstain from military confrontation and to provide financial support for Ukraine. Although NATO will not be actively engaged in the Crimea crisis, the Alliance yet promised reassurance measures in favour of its Eastern allies. In terms of long-term implications, one should avoid identifying path-dependencies but remain flexible and look for new windows of opportunities.

Dr. Xu Longdi, Associate Research Fellow, China Institute of International Studies, asserted that the crisis in Crimea has not produced any winners; every party involved bore losses. Ukraine, being on the verge of a civil war, constitutes the primary victim; nevertheless Russia, the EU and USA will each suffer from tense diplomatic relations and a correlated trade decline. He reasoned that the momentum for

development would need to come from within the country. Therefore, Ukraine needs to be put back on track on the process of nation-building.

Finally, **Amb. Ranjit Gupta, Distinguished Fellow, Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies (IPCS), India** explained that India's stance in relation to Ukraine has been balanced, yet admittedly in favour of Russia. On the one hand India has voiced its support for territorial integrity and political dialogue, however, the government did not condemn Russia's reaction but called for a solution that takes due account of all interests at stake. India seeks to maintain a strong partnership with Russia, especially in light of a growing strategic alliance between Russia and China. Russia has been a consistent strategic supporter of India and thus it cannot become a partner in any Western scheme of isolating Russia.

Malgorzata Bonikowska, President, Centre for International Relations, Poland mentioned that the Crimea Crisis urged the EU and NATO to redefine their stance towards Russia. The West should step up efforts to stay in touch with the Russian civil society and assist the Ukraine in handling independence through integration and consolidation. Speaking from a Polish perspective, NATO and US cooperation were seen to be crucial. The EU should intensify discussions on the creation of an energy union and speed up the TTIP negotiations with the US.

Dr. Takako Ueta, Professor, International Christian University, Japan recalled that the non-compliance with international law by a permanent member of the UN Security Council is a cause of concern and sheds light on Russia's expansionist approach. Japan has introduced sanctions against Russia and suspended talks on investment cooperation and space exploration treaties. The crisis has revealed a lack of mutual crisis reduction mechanisms in the Asian-Pacific region. In the case of Crimea, the OESC has played a significant role in deescalating tensions; by contrast similar security frameworks in Asia are still highly fragile.

Dr. Nguyen Thi Lan, Vice Dean, Diplomatic Academy of Vietna, remarked that despite the elaborate security structures provided by NATO and the EU, no one could effectively prevent Russia. A similar event in the Asia, where security structures are yet to develop, could have fatal consequences. Such prospects, therefore, raise the need for a more intense cooperation in security matters between the EU and Asia in order to preserve international law and address future conflicts elsewhere in the world.

Melissa H Conley Tyler, National Executive Director, Australian Institute of International Affairs, commented on Ukraine's impact on the international order in the Pacific region. The international environment has become more insecure and in such a context, being a member of a strategic alliance is vital. Correspondingly, a strengthening of US alliances is to be expected. Simultaneously, there will be more doubting about US alliance commitments in the region and alliance members will need to prepare itself for more burden-sharing. Australia's main interest lies in enhancing cooperation so as to prevent the emergence of a nervous security environment in Asia.

During the subsequent discussion it was again highlighted that the conflict had not produced any winners. Especially the Kremlin has faced severe strategic as well as economic consequences. Rather than marking the return of geopolitics, the crisis demonstrated that the major powers have become vulnerable and interdependent.

Second Panel: Afghanistan – lessons learned from NATO led ISAF operations

By the end of 2014, despite Afghanistan's continuously precarious security situation, NATO has announced to terminate its International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) Mission, and with that, to set an end to its thus far most complex and extensive operation. The withdrawal of Western troops puts Afghanistan at a critical crossroads, leaving its impact on the regional security environment yet to be determined.

Mr Hamayan Hamed, Associate Professor, Kabul University, Afghanistan, commented on the prevailing security situation in Afghanistan. Accordingly, corruption and growing Taliban influence still constitute threats to the future development of the country. During the 2014 presidential elections security concerns and allegations of fraud were again raised. NATO must bear in mind that Afghanistan's security remains fragile and cannot overcome the challenges lying ahead of it without international support.

Barbora Maronkova, NATO Programme Officer, stressed that as NATO withdraws its hard security, the presence of soft security measures will become more important. NATO and its Partners' must continue to provide assistance, especially in terms of building domestic security forces. Recent developments in Iraq have demonstrated that a too early exit may lead to a collapse in sovereignty. Therefore, NATO hopes to be able to sign a bilateral security agreement in the near future. Furthermore, NATO has reinforced its degree of military and political interoperability. Finally, NATO now focuses on enhancing its partnership framework and aspires to adopt a more comprehensive approach, encouraging closer collaboration with other international organizations.

Subsequently, **Prof. Bernard F.W. Loo, Associate Professor, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore** remarked that the operation in Afghanistan illustrated that a new strain of thought in war theory has emerged. Military operations have become more extensive and may require staying behind to assist a nation to reconstruct itself. He supported the idea of a comprehensive approach and welcomed NATO's aspiration to incorporate regional perspectives into the planning processes. Nevertheless, one should be cautious to use lessons learnt as template solutions for evolving future conflicts.

Finally **Dr. Benjamin Schreer, Senior Analyst, Australian Strategic Policy Institute, Australia** added that ISAF exemplified that political dynamics in the key NATO member states are more important than operational realities on the ground. Furthermore, it surfaced that the Alliance has only finite resources in terms of political will and capabilities to employ. Correspondingly, it would be advisable to focus on niche capabilities when planning the contribution of Allied countries.

During the discussion it was pointed out that Afghanistan had shown that failed states can constitute a direct threat to established states and that unilateral actions were no longer the appropriate response to complex security challenges.

In the context of collecting niche capabilities, it was proposed to establish a system where framework nations and NATO partners are joined together to form clusters of integrated forces based on specific capabilities.

A further issue of debate was the transferability of experiences in Iraq to Afghanistan. In order to avoid past mistakes, inclusive governance and legal structures would need to be strengthened. Moreover, a regional security framework and a mutual understanding of how Afghanistan is to develop in the future were considered crucial.

Third Panel: Capabilities – smart defence and interoperability on cyber security

The “Smart Defence Initiative” was implemented by the NATO member states during the Chicago Summit in 2012 and embraced a new culture of cooperation focused on the pooling and sharing of Allied modern defence resources. Moreover, the smart defence seeks to develop greater competences in capability areas that are critical for NATO, without necessarily increasing levels of expenditures.

Alexander Klimburg, Research Fellow, Harvard Kennedy School, opened the panel with his presentation on Understanding Military Cyber. According to the Joint Pub 3-13, military computer network operations can be divided into three categories: Computer Network Defence (CND), Computer Network Attack (CAN) and Computer Network Exploitation (CNE). Activities in CAN and CNE are mutually dependent. To conduct an attack, one has to engage in espionage. CND is aimed at information protection and constitutes the key objective for US military as well as NATO. Cyber-attack and defence involve complex governance processes and huge amounts of investment. Thus, a majority of countries can acquire cyber weapons only through cybercrime. As of today, the prospect of a cyber-arms control convention remains contested. However, International Humanitarian Law now applies to military cyber. Furthermore, a common definition of cyber-crime has not yet been found. In this context, the Council of Europe Cyber Crime Convention still constitutes the most useful tool. For NATO it has become evident that Article 5 and 4 of its North Atlantic Treaty do apply to cyber. Although NATO can provide valuable support through the sharing of intelligence and infrastructure, effective cyber security structures will require a whole of nation approach.

Dr Rex Hughes, Co-Director, Cyber Innovation Network, University of Cambridge highlighted the key issues in regards to cyber security. Primarily, NATO’s role in securing cyberspace and how cyber generally fits into NATO partnerships still needs to be clearly defined. It was seen crucial to identify the unique challenges to Asia-Pacific cyberspace and where there may be a common cause with NATO. Power over the Internet is becoming more diffuse. While the US share in the cyber market is diminishing, India and China are gaining more and more in influence.

Rocky Itan, Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), Indonesia provided an insight into how the issue of cyber security is dealt with in Indonesia. He stressed that developments in this domain suffer from three structural deficits; the lack of regulatory frameworks, the lack of capacity building and the lack of a formal strategy. Securement of property rights remains a major problem in Indonesia. Moreover, Indonesia does not demonstrate the appropriate awareness of the threat posed by cybercrimes, neither on the state nor on the consumer level. Thus, it needs international assistance in formulating an individual cyber defence strategy.

During the discussion, NATO's lack of own intelligence capabilities was pointed out. If NATO was to prepare for future defence, it would have to put greater emphasis on its own smart defence measures and cyber crisis reduction mechanisms. Interoperability and intelligence sharing were identified as key areas of cyber security where NATO could contribute.

In developing cyber security capacity, a multilateral approach was considered crucial. NATO will need to engage with international partners, the private sector and civil society to promote a secure and open cyberspace. China's support for the application of International Humanitarian Law to the cyberspace was welcomed; however, Russia now seems to be moving in the opposite direction.

One further question closely bound up with this problem concerned the relevance of dialogues between US-China and EU-China in responding to cyber security issues. Overall diplomacy was considered vital in order to promote confidence building mechanisms. Regional organisations such as the EU or ASEAN were encouraged to explore this area of soft politics.

Fourth Panel: Cooperative security in a new strategic security environment – the case of maritime cooperation

Maritime security has evolved into one of the key challenges to international security in Asia. Piracy and the current disputes over islands in the South and East China Sea are among the most prevalent examples of threats to security on the high sea and underline the necessity of establishing trans-regional mechanism of conflict escalation prevention and naval cooperation.

Dr. Mathieu Duchatel, Senior Researcher and Head China Project, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute opened the fourth panel with his presentation on maritime security cooperation between China and the West. NATO has stated commitment to advance maritime security cooperation with China. Simultaneously, China seeks to evolve the importance of naval diplomacy in its overall defence diplomacy. Moreover, China's involvement in the Gulf of Aden and its participation in RIMPAC in 2014, illustrated its leadership commitment to peace-keeping operations. Although China shows greater interest in public diplomacy and seems to be overcoming distrust of the West, there is still a long way to go for sustainable maritime

security cooperation to develop. The EU may come to play a vital role in acting as an intermediary between the US and China.

Prof. Myn Gyo Koo, Chairperson of Research Committee, SLOC Study Group-Korea, stressed that East-Asia maritime issues have formed a multi-layer structure, involving sovereignty disputes, maritime delimitation, and environmental protection and safety issues. Behind this lies the shifting balance of power in the region, represented by the rise of China and US strategic rebalance toward the Asia-Pacific, and their efforts to foster a “new great power relationship” between them. On-going regional rivalries and the deepening tensions between Japan, China and Korea reflect the limitations of the international maritime regime. The lack of effective regional security institutions for the East Asian seas suggests that there is a growing need for a sequential scheme capable of dealing multilaterally with regional maritime issues.

Ms Melissa H. Conley Taylor, National Executive Director, Australian Institute of International Affairs, Australia asserted that one of Australia’s key objectives is the maintenance of the stable wider region, which they are now conceptualising as the merging Indo-Pacific. Potential conflicts of interest may arise between Australia’s and India’s perceptions on this strategic environment. In assessing the mainstream Indian discourse on this issue, two common threads were pointed out. Firstly, a vision of retaining primacy in the Indian Ocean Region (IOR) and secondly, a general concern about China’s growing presence in the IOR. Australia, however acknowledges that China has an interest in the region and knows that any regional security architecture would depend on Chinese participation.

Dr. Hui-Yi Katherine Tseng, Research Associate, National University of Singapore, highlighted that, China’s economic strength creates insecurity and encourages alliance formation among its neighbours. An atmosphere of deep mistrust and a lack of political wheels could undermine cooperation efforts. Thus, it is important to consider whether international rules and the degree of public consciousness are sufficient to protect and restrain individual activities.

Mr. Iis Gindarsah, Researcher, Centre for Strategic and International Studies, Indonesia identified two ways of ensuring future maritime stability; either by raising the costs of conflicts or by enhancing incentives for cooperation. With regards to the dialogues held over a code of conduct in the South China Sea, the claimant states do not have sufficient incentives to commit to an agreement. It is therefore for the international community to consider how to convince the respective parties of the usefulness of the COC.

Finally, **Mr. Ippeita Nishidad, Research Fellow and Project Manager, Tokyo Foundation, Japan** remarked that Japan has formulated its first national security strategy and announced its aspiration to play a leading role in maintaining secure and open seas. In face of the 2011 earthquake, Japan is committed to maintain its own energy resources and reduce its energy dependency. Additionally, it is keen to strengthen its alliance with the US and to counter-balance China’s maritime expansion.

The first issue of discussion focused on counter proliferation and potential NATO-China or EU-China cooperation in this area. A sea-based dimension to sanctions and an enlargement to the existing sanction regime were identified as a crucial issue that would need to be discussed further in the future.

Although China remains reluctant to adopt a multilateral approach, existing multilateral forums such as the ASEAN Regional Forum, the six-party talks or the East Asia Summit, nevertheless, constitute useful opportunities for discussion and information exchange on maritime security issues.

As regards the Indo-Pacific concept, with the expansion of the East Asian Summit, there is now an institution that covers responsibility for both areas. In response to Australia's aspirations of how to realize this concept, Australia seeks simple rules, clear communication and rules of conduct at sea.

Fifth Panel: The Partnership Framework – experiences with its actual structure and perspectives

Ms Barbora Maronkova, NATO Programme Officer, explained that NATO identifies cooperative security as one of its core tasks to be achieved through the creation of an extensive partnership network. The current "Individual Partnership Cooperation Framework" is a programme jointly developed between NATO and each partner country and seeks to strengthen political ties and military cooperation. Remaining open questions on this issue are how to engage in Afghanistan after ISAF and how to cooperate with countries outside the IPC such as China. In order to make partnership agreements more effective, they should be perceived as a two-way street, where NATO and the respective countries can take the initiative to contribute ideas and define policy priorities.

Mr Tsuneo Watanabe, Director of Foreign and Security Policy Research at the Tokyo Foundation, emphasized that in an increasingly precarious security environment, close cooperation with neighbouring countries is crucial for Japan. Therefore, the Japanese government has announced its first-ever National Security Strategy calling on the country to make a "proactive contribution to peace" based on international cooperation. However, Prime Minister Abe's doctrine has been met with suspicion and scepticism by China, illustrating that little real progress has been made in resolving their tense relations, which constitute a direct threat to stability in Asia. China's military rise encouraged Japan to sign Japan an Individual Partnership Agreement with NATO, which deepens their cooperation in areas such as counter-piracy, disaster relief and humanitarian assistance.

Dr. Hae-Won Jun, Assistant Professor at the Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security (IFANS) stated that the Republic of Korea has been one of NATO's closest non-ally partners for the past nine years. In 2012 they signed an Individual Partnership Agreement. For South Korea non-traditional security issues have only recently attracted official attention and re-defining the concept of security yet remains a slow process; Korea's security policy is still focused on territorial disputes and North

Korea's nuclear weapon programme. NATO could help Korea to acutely assess the importance of NTS issues.

Dr Zafar Nawaz Jaspal, School of Politics and International Relations, Quaid-I-Azam University Pakistan remarked that Pakistan has been a major non-NATO ally as part of the War on Terrorism and that there is still potential for a closer partnership between them. However, while NATO's focus is moving towards non-traditional security issues, for Pakistan traditional security issues still dictate security policies. The Salala incident on 26 Nov 2011 temporarily worsened Pakistan's relations with NATO and caused Pakistan to question its US Alliance. Therefore, in order to cooperate further with Pakistan, NATO will need to demonstrate that it acts independently from the US.

Dr. Liu Fu-Kuo, Research Fellow from the Institute of International Relations, Taiwan mentioned that the threat of natural disasters in South-East Asia calls for greater cooperation with international organizations in areas such as humanitarian assistance and disaster relief. As regards regional stability and security, the China-Japan relationship again was deemed crucial. Both sides would need to actively seek closer partnership and include cooperation efforts in their national security strategies.

Conclusion

The conference was concluded with a general discussion on the future organisation of the NATO-Asia Dialogue. NATO's past experiences have been confined to the North Atlantic Area; thus in its efforts to go more global, NATO has to gradually adapt to a new working environment. During the conference it surfaced that NATO would need to show the Asia/Pacific region what added value it could bring to regional security. In the same way, NATO should engage more to disseminate its role to global security. NATO and the EU need to ensure that their participation in Asia goes beyond the economic sphere and both have to analyse how to become more integrated into political discussions at the regional level in Asia/Pacific. In his respect, there is not always obvious for the Asia/Pacific that NATO and the European Union are two different actors at the international level. A dialogue between representatives of the NATO and the EU was put forward as a suggestion for enhancing their mutual cooperation in the Asia/Pacific region.

Dr. Wilhelm Hofmeister