

Canadian NATO  
Parliamentary Association



Association parlementaire  
canadienne de l'OTAN

**Report of the Canadian Parliamentary Delegation  
to the Spring Session of the  
NATO Parliamentary Assembly  
Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association (NATO PA)**

**Madeira, Portugal**

**May 25-28, 2007**

# Report

The Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association has the honour to present its REPORT on the Spring Session of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, held in Madeira, Portugal, May 25-28, 2007. The Canadian delegation was represented by the Association's Chair, Mr. Leon Benoit, M.P., Senator Raynell Andreychuk, Senator Jane Cordy, Senator Joseph A. Day, Senator Percy Downe, Senator Pierre Claude Nolin, Mr. Claude Bachand, M.P., Mr. Blaine Calkins, M.P., Mrs. Cheryl Gallant, M.P. and Mr. Joseph McGuire, M.P. The Delegation was accompanied by Mr. James Cox, Analyst, Parliamentary Information and Research Service, Library of Parliament and by Mr. Denis Robert, Executive Secretary.

## OUTLINE

The 2007 spring session of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly was held in the Technopolo Institute, Funchal, Madeira, Portugal from 25-27 May 2007. Details of the proceedings, including the full summary of all meetings, can be found on the NATO Parliamentary Assembly website at <http://www.nato-pa.int/Default.asp?SHORTCUT=1230>. Detailed Committee Reports are at <http://www.nato-pa.int/Default.asp?SHORTCUT=16>.

The first meeting of the session was that of the Delegation Secretaries, held on 25 May 2007, followed later in the day by the Plenary Meeting. The Economics Committee, the Political Committee and the Science and Technology Committee all met on 26 May 2007. On 27 May 2007, meetings of the Committee on the Civil Dimension of Security and the Defence and Security Committee were held.

## 25 MAY 2007

### Plenary Session

Proceedings began with a plenary session on 25 May 2007 led off by an address by José Lello, President of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, followed by a welcome from Guilherme Silva, Vice-President of the Assembly of the Republic of Portugal.

Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, Secretary General of NATO and Chairman of the North Atlantic Council addressed the Assembly and answered questions, including one from Mr. Leon Benoit. Luís Amado, Minister of State and Foreign Affairs Minister of Portugal, also spoke to the Assembly and responded to questions, two of which came from Senator Raynell Andreychuk and Senator Pierre Claude Nolin.

Addresses from the Prime Minister of Macedonia and the Speaker of the Parliament of Georgia followed.

Later, after some discussion, the Assembly granted Associate Member status to Serbia, Montenegro and Bosnia and Herzegovina.

## 26 MAY 2007

### Economics and Security Committee

The Economics and Security Committee met on 26 May 2007, under the Chairmanship of John Tanner (US). He introduced a presentation on the US defence budget, by

Lawrence Korb, Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress and a Senior Advisor to the Center for Defence Information. Some of the issues he covered are highlighted here.

Mr. Korb presented figures of national security-related spending of the US government for fiscal year (FY) 2007 and suggested that the actual cost of wars in Iraq and Afghanistan in the FY 2008 would exceed administration estimates. Delegates heard Mr. Korb explain that US monthly spending in Iraq was approaching \$10 billion. While the cost of operations in Iraq will amount to \$500 billion, the actual costs of war so far equal nearly \$3 trillion. He felt that the current level of defence spending would be difficult to maintain once the wars (i.e. in Iraq and Afghanistan) are over, but that even then a significant amount would be allocated to social programmes for the retiring military personnel. In addition, military personnel costs will continue to rise and the maintenance of equipment and facilities will remain very costly. Significant funding will have to be allocated for long-term healthcare for war veterans because advances in healthcare provide for a greater survival rate among wounded people, and the cost of treatment will have to be covered by the government.

Mr. Korb went on to suggest that future debate on the defence budget would likely be centered on the challenge of obtaining new technology. Two issues would have major budgetary implications – national missile defence and strategic nuclear weapons. Mr. Korb further noted that US spending on nuclear weapons is equal to \$20 billion, which constitutes a small portion of the \$500 billion budget. He believes that it is necessary to reduce strategic nuclear weapons and to withdraw tactical nuclear weapons from Europe.

A Russian delegate asked what percentage of the budget would be devoted to the missile defence programme in Europe, if the resources for the programme would come from the strategic budget and whether or not the programme would involve all NATO member states. Mr. Korb replied that the current cost of the missile defence programme is \$10 billion per year. Very few of the NATO nations will be directly involved in the programme.

Another questioner asked if, given the major security challenges remaining, there were any proposals Mr. Korb would table to change the structure of the budget in order to meet the present-day conditions in the world. Mr. Korb pointed to the need to reduce tactical nuclear weapons, emphasised the necessity to invest in small combat ships, rather than expensive destroyers, the requirement for strategic airlift and made a call to concentrate more resources on peacekeeping and stabilisation corps.

Following Mr. Korb, another presentation was delivered by Giorgi Baramidze, Vice Prime Minister of Georgia and State Minister for European and Euro-Atlantic Integration on Georgia's Economic and Political Transition and its Prospects for Euro-Atlantic Integration. He stressed that his country has undertaken reforms in nearly all aspects of governance, focussing on strengthening democratic institutions and the rule of law and establishing an open market economy. There are continuing problems however and Mr. Baramidze stated that smuggling from Russia still represented a challenge. Despite a 1994 agreement, Russia was still controlling two border passes, to Abkhazia and to

South Ossetia, but he added that he hoped for a normalization of this situation, so that Georgia could support Russia's candidacy for WTO membership.

In responding to questions, Mr. Baramidze characterised the Russian embargo on Georgian goods as illegitimate. Although it could have potentially devastating effects, the Georgian economy had not collapsed as a result, largely due to liberal reforms previously implemented. The consequence of the ban was an estimated 2% loss in real GDP growth for 2006; yet Georgia expected 12% GDP growth in 2007. Mr. Baramidze also pointed out that trade liberalisation has been a highly disputed policy, since some companies have collapsed. However, those that had not been forced out of the market had become more competitive.

Mr. Baramidze said Georgians look forward to someday being a candidate for NATO membership. Paul Gillmor (US) noted that a number of NATO member countries helped Georgia in its reform process. Mr. Baramidze specifically thanked the United States, Germany, United Kingdom, France, Turkey, the Netherlands, Greece, the Baltic States, Poland and Luxembourg for their contributions.

The next agenda item was the consideration of the *Draft General Report on Trends in Defence Resource Management in Europe and North America and the New Burden Sharing Debate: A Survey* by Hugh Bayley (UK), General Rapporteur.

The Rapporteur's presentation centred on the issue of defence planning and burden sharing among NATO countries. He noted that the complexity of the current strategic environment increased the difficulties Allies confronted in setting defence priorities and that tight budgets and slow economic growth, as well as divergent threat perceptions, represented major obstacles to adjusting to new strategic realities. Daunting out-of-area operations in which NATO found itself engaged act not only as a catalyst for transformation, but were also the source of significant budgetary pressures. He therefore suggested that common funding, shared purchasing and mission specialisation within the Alliance were indispensable to eliminating systemic redundancies and to achieving a sustainable increase in members' capabilities.

The Rapporteur further asserted that more open markets and more coordinated planning procurement were needed to achieve scale economies and reduce costs. Closer cooperation between NATO and the EU, in his opinion, would also reduce the potential for resource misallocation. The Rapporteur maintained that current operations highlighted the capabilities and spending gaps among members. He pointedly suggested that they also might reveal the so-called gap in the will to accept the full burden of risk – the most serious gap of all. The fact that mission funding was still based on the "costs fall where costs lie" rule was hardly satisfactory for an integrated military structure such as NATO. The Alliance, the Rapporteur concluded, needed to envision new funding and burden sharing mechanisms that would spread the costs paid by those member states fighting on the frontlines in fairer terms.

A German delegate made the point that 2% of GDP allocated to military spending is not necessarily the best measure of commitment. Germany, he explained, does not meet that percentage, but is the second largest contributor in foreign deployment in NATO operations after the United States. A French delegate forthrightly stated that since three-quarters of the Alliance members are not even at 2% of GDP in terms of military

spending, it is illusory to imagine it can fight. He also warned about the danger of NATO and (European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) duplication.

The next agenda item was the consideration of the *Draft Special Report on The Economic Situation in Moldova* was presented by Kurt Bodewig (Germany), Acting Rapporteur and Chairman. The presentation focused on the Republic of Moldova, the poorest country in Europe and one that poses a range of security, social and economic challenges to the region and to Europe as a whole. He noted that the Transnistrian "frozen conflict", as well as the country's dubious role as a hub of human trafficking and smuggling, have led analysts to characterize it as one of the last serious security challenges on the continent. The fact that Moldova was also seeking a closer partnership with the EU, and the West in general, was complicating its relations with Russia, which supports it politically, economically and financially.

The delegates then moved to consideration of the *Draft Report of the Sub-Committee on East West Economic Co-operation on Economic and Political Transition in Georgia* offered by Kurt Bodewig (Germany), Acting Rapporteur and Chairman. The report explored the rapid and deep economic, political and social reforms that Georgia has undertaken since the 2003 'Rose Revolution' and focused on the dramatic improvement of the main macroeconomic indicators over the past four years. In addition to an evaluation of the impact of the recent Georgia-Russia energy dispute, Georgia's strategic position along the South Caucasian energy corridor was also discussed. The Rapporteur went on to cover Georgia's principal foreign policy ambitions, particularly its relationships with Russia, the US and the EU. Finally, the Rapporteur spoke about Georgia's defence policy, its aspirations to join NATO and its prospects for doing so.

A Russian delegate objected that the report failed to consider the possibility that Georgia might have provoked the Russian action. He also objected to what he considered to be the common perspective that Russia was responsible for the problems in the South Caucasus. The Rapporteur defended his report's assessment.

Acting as Co-rapporteurs, Petras Austrevicius (Lithuania) and John Boozman (USA) presented a *Draft Report of the Sub-Committee on Transatlantic Economic Relations on The Rise of the East-Asian Economic System: Implications for Europe and North America*.

The Co-rapporteurs discussed China's rise in a regional context by looking at the economic trends in East Asia as a whole, citing the dynamic economic growth of the region. It was suggested that the victory of liberal economic policy-making over centrally planned economies has led to a significant increase in economic activity throughout the region and to an expansion of the flow of goods and capital. High growth rates mean that East Asia is playing an increasing role in the global economy as a whole. The region's countries were growing more economically interdependent too. East Asia is no longer just an offshore resource for Western companies, but a thriving economic zone with its own purchasing needs that were being filled by expanded regional trade.

The Rapporteurs pointed out that no overarching framework or organization like the EU or NATO existed, to structure relations among players in the region and that a confusing array of regional and bilateral trade agreements govern economic relations among the countries of East Asia. While there are some concerns that the trend towards

increasing economic regionalism will lead to a "Fortress Asia," most countries in the region see the creation of such a bloc as a second best option. While North America builds sea and air links to Asia across a vast ocean, the European economy is beginning to focus on land links across its enormous shared landmass. Europe's integrationist model of regional development has a certain appeal in the region, as does its commitment to multilateralism in international diplomacy. These efforts could either complement those of the US or create frictions. Europe and North America cannot afford to be pitted against each other in the region.

### **Political Committee**

In his introductory remarks, Chairman Markus Meckel (Germany) raised the topics of missile defence, a potential new role for the EU in Transatlantic Security, Afghanistan, as well as the recent Estonian-Russian problems.

With regard to missile defence, Mr. Meckel said it is important how the debate is to be conducted and that it is necessary to discuss it within both NATO and the NATO-Russia Council. Russian delegates expressed their reservations about the US missile defence system. A US delegate, supported by a German colleague pointed out that the planned system is defensive in nature and consists of only 10 interceptors which will not target Russia.

As to the current strained relations between Estonia and Russia, a Russian delegate criticized Estonia for having conducted an "uncooperative policy" towards Russia and said that the Russian response is merely a result of Estonia's provocation. Another said that the Estonians should have consulted Russia before moving the [Soviet WWII] memorial site. An Estonian delegate explained the background of the removal of memorial that caused the current Estonian-Russian row and provided examples of Russian pressure on his country. He also called for an international response to the cyber attacks against Estonia.

Russian delegates responded and criticised NATO's "open door" policy, stating that NATO is not a "club of philanthropic dreamers". They rejected the "fairytale" that NATO expansion is about expanding democracy. One Russian delegate stated that NATO is an offensive alliance and criticized Georgia's wish to join.

British and Danish delegates said they found the tone of Russian President Vladimir Putin and other Russian officials "offensive" and "disconcerting". They called upon Russia to "stop the Soviet rhetoric and join NATO member countries in addressing the key security challenges, because we need you there".

Regarding NATO enlargement, one British delegate said he could not see why NATO relations with Georgia would threaten Russia. Noting that NATO member states have never attacked each other, A Lithuanian delegate stressed that enlargement is about expanding security. She also pointed to the increasing political dimension of NATO. A Russian speaker insinuated that Russia should be asked before a country applies for NATO membership, but the Chairman replied that every state has the right to commit alliances of its own choice.

Several members alluded to NATO's changing role. One decried problems in Afghanistan, but also reminded members that NATO member countries have to be

prepared to suffer losses if they engage in a military mission like Afghanistan. A Dutch delegate noted that NATO is no longer a purely defensive organization but that it is engaged 'out-of-area' like in Afghanistan and suggested an open debate about NATO's mission. A British delegate went further and raised the issue of individual countries' willingness to participate in NATO missions, expressing concern over a lack of understanding of NATO within member countries' political class, which could lead to decreasing support for the Alliance.

Senator Raynell Andreychuk introduced committee consideration of the draft *General Report on Afghanistan and NATO's Ongoing Transformation*.

Following her remarks, a delegate informed members that the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) had sent a memorandum to NATO to remind states contributing troops to ISAF that they should respect rules regarding the treatment of prisoners (there was no detailed discussion on the technical difference between 'prisoners' and 'detainees'). Most speakers agreed that military operations alone are not sufficient to stabilize Afghanistan and that civilian casualties should be avoided as much as possible.

Coordination between ISAF and the US Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), increased poppy crops and corruption within the Afghan government and the Afghan National Police were among other topics brought up.

Senator Mohammedmian Soomro (Pakistan) noted that progress in Afghanistan has been made, but that many problems remain. To promote development in the border areas between Pakistan and Afghanistan he suggested that special investment zones be set up and a practical strategy conceived. Commenting that President Hamid Karzai lacks sufficient support, a Russian delegate saw a need for a local "strong man" for Afghanistan. Others wondered if talks with the Taliban would secure and stabilise Afghanistan. One delegate compared NATO's involvement in Kosovo to operations in Afghanistan and called for more co-operation with Pakistan as well as for additional economic and financial support for Afghanistan.

Senator Francesco Martone (Italy) said that there are limits to the Italian presence in Afghanistan and called for a diplomatic solution to the conflict. The international community should be more receptive to the needs of the Afghan people and rethink its approach towards transitional justice, he added. He also cautioned against NATO engaging in reconstruction other than delivering "quick impact" projects. Referring to a proposal by a member of the current Italian government, Senator Selva (Italy) asked the Rapporteur whether or not a peace conference, that might include Taliban representatives, would be useful to solve Afghanistan's problems.

In response to the comments made, Senator Andreychuk agreed that more co-operation is necessary, not only between the military, but also between NATO and the UN, as well between NATO and the EU and the NGOs. That said, she noted that it is difficult to link security and developmental aid. She further underlined the need to improve our knowledge about Afghanistan, including the historic, ethnic, social, religious economic and neighbourly complexities.

The Committee went on to consider a draft Report of the Sub-Committee on NATO Partnerships on *Pakistan: A Crucial Player for Stability in the Region*, led by Bart van Winsen (Netherlands), the Rapporteur.

Following Mr. van Winsen's introduction, a British delegate explained that the defeat of the USSR in Afghanistan created a base for terrorism and Islamist ideology. A re-evaluation of the historical and ideological causes of terrorism could be helpful to counteract terrorist groups, he suggested, adding that Kashmir's potential as a mobilising force of concern and anger for many Muslims is underestimated and that it needs to be addressed.

Senator Soomro said that Pakistan has paid a heavy price in the fight against terrorist groups. He underlined his country's "unwavering commitment" to the fight against terrorist groups and the need for close international co-operation. The Chairman of the Pakistani Senate also welcomed closer Pakistani-India relations. There is no gap between the government and the people of Pakistan, he said, adding that a democratic process is taking place and institutions are getting stronger. However, Pakistan needs more help and co-operation from the international community to prevent "talibanisation" of the country.

Dr. Ivan Safranchuk, Director of the Moscow Office of the World Security Institute gave a presentation on *Russian Domestic Developments and Russia's Approach to Foreign and Security Policy*. He argued that Western hopes that Russia would become a democratic power which would have friendly relations with the West have not materialised. Russians – the business community in particular – came to realise they were not welcome in the West. Consequently, they became more supportive of Russian authorities and increasingly critical towards the West. Hopes that the Russian opposition would become a pro-Western force have also been dashed. They want to prove they are "more patriotic than Putin", partly to dispel accusations of being 'Western puppets', Mr. Safranchuk suggested. He added that the Putin government may well be "the most pro-Western force in Russia".

It would be incorrect to say that Russia is not a democratic state, but according to Mr. Safranchuk, Russia's democracy puts much less emphasis on official accountability than on citizens' freedom to organise their private lives. Russia's political culture does not really embrace the idea of government accountability and very little is done by parliament to hold government accountable. If one wants their personal career to go forward, it is better not to be critically active in politics. A separation between 'private life' and 'state' has thus taken place.

Turning to Russian foreign policy, the speaker argued that, at the end of the Cold War, Russia lacked financial resources and the political will to continue competition with the West, both of which it has now in abundance. But President Vladimir Putin's speech at the Security Conference in Munich earlier this year asked for an equal voice in international affairs and was not a declaration of another Cold War as it was widely interpreted in Western media. Moscow's self-confidence in international affairs was contrasted with a widespread Russian perception that it is not treated with the respect it deserves.



A British delegate warned against becoming "paranoid" over Russia and said that Moscow wants to get as much as possible from the West. The EU supported Russia's bid to join the WTO, but now Russia's policy towards, for example, Poland and Georgia, would not allow it to be a member. He also said that the more that Western countries depend on Russian energy, the more vulnerable they become. Referring to restrictions on political freedom, the work of NGOs and recent assassinations, he also noted that Russia's human rights record is not good. He called upon Russia to develop a working relationship without threats and intimidations.

A delegate from Lithuania noted that Russia is becoming more aggressive towards its neighbours and moving away from democratic values. In contrast and in an attempt to add some balance, another British delegate cautioned against a turning the discussion into one of "the West against Russia" and stressed the need to develop a good partnership. Another delegate reminded Committee members that today Russia and the Allies are facing a common threat posed by radical Islamist groups and should co-operate to meet this challenge.

As for US plans for building missile defence infrastructure in Poland and the Czech Republic, Russia fears that the limited system could later be expanded. In this context, Mr. Safranchuk referred to the US administration's withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. Although Russia does not want a nuclear armed Iran, Mr. Safranchuk thinks Moscow also assumes that there is a hidden agenda in the US position.

The next presentation came from Nicholas Whyte, an independent diplomat, reporting on *Kosovo and South-Eastern European Security*.

Stressing that he was speaking as a private citizen, Mr Whyte briefly revisited the developments in Serbia and Kosovo since 1999. At present, he said, time is running out for the UN Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) and that the lack of clarity on a final status and the political instability in the region hampers foreign direct investments. Referring to the report by UN Special Envoy Martti Ahtisaari, he suggested that further negotiations are not useful, as the parties are too far apart. It is impossible to put Kosovo under Serbian rule and a continued international administration is unsustainable. The Ahtisaari report therefore proposed a limited independence under international supervision, including special provisions for minorities.

A larger question might be the region's membership in Euro-Atlantic institutions. In the view of some, the EU offers the best prospects for the future of Kosovo and the Balkans. Others felt UNMIK's performance was "completely unsatisfactory" and criticised the lack of serious reconciliation programmes in Kosovo and in Bosnia. One delegate added that it was a mistake for NATO to have offered participation in the Partnership for Peace (PfP) programme to Serbia, because the Serbs, he claimed, saw this as encouragement to continue its sluggish co-operation with the international community. A German member warned that a unilateral declaration of independence by Kosovo, without a UN Resolution, could split Europe.

Dusan Prorokovic (Serbia) elaborated the position of Serbia and underlined that Belgrade is proposing an autonomous area with many powers for Kosovo and

international guarantees for minorities to reassure Kosovars. The Serbian proposal would allow Kosovo to have independent access to international financial institutions, he said. Mr. Naim Maloku (Assembly of Kosovo) welcomed the Ahtisaari proposal and informed that the Kosovo Assembly has also accepted it. He called upon the international community to decide on a final status soon. Kosovo's institutions are ready to take on more responsibility, under the supervision of the EU, after the departure of UNMIK he said.

The Committee moved on to consider a draft report of the Sub-Committee on Transatlantic Relations entitled *Five Years into the 'War on Terrorism': Impact and Implications for the Transatlantic Alliance*. The Rapporteur was Assen Agov (Bulgaria).

Following introductory remarks, Senator Mushahid Hussain Sayed (Pakistan) suggested the term "war on terror" should be replaced as many Muslims feel that this "war" actually directed against Islam. Terrorism has no religion and it should not be linked with Islam that has 1.5 billion followers. He said there should be laws against Islamophobia in Europe similar to anti-Semitism laws. Arguing that there is a "need to review the current infatuation with military might" he suggested the creation of a NATO PA Study Group to devise non-military means to combat international terrorism.

A variety of ensuing opinions variously questioned the effectiveness of the current military-oriented strategy against terrorist groups

Mr. Agov responded that the wording "war on terror" would be changed in the final draft and agreed that Islam and terrorism should not be equated. Bulgaria, for example, has Muslims but no terrorism, he said.

Joint Meeting of the Science and Technology Committee and the Defence and Security Committee

The first briefing came from Daniel P. Fata, Deputy Secretary Assistant of Defence for European and NATO Policy, US Department of Defence, on Proposed US Missile Defence Installations in Europe. Mr. Fata outlined US plans to develop and field a missile defence system as stemming from a growing ballistic missile threat to the US and its Allies. This threat originated from worrying trends in the Middle East (particularly Iran) and North Korea. The US system was intended to prevent attempts at blackmail by rogue states with long range missile capabilities.

He suggested that the Bush Administration had transitioned from a National Missile Defence to a Missile Defence (MD) writ large in order to protect the indivisibility of security of its Allies.

Mr Fata described the installations the US has proposed to field in Europe, which would include radar in Czech Republic, an interceptor site located in Poland and forward-deployed radar in Southeast Europe. This capability was designed to counter threats from the Middle East and is not directed against Russia. It is a purely defensive system, which could not be equipped with offensive warheads. Most importantly, the missile defence system would provide defensive coverage of a considerable part of Europe and was therefore an important symbol of US commitment to European security. Mr Fata suggested negotiations with Poland and the Czech Republic might be concluded by the

end of this year, and with funding from Congress, construction could start in 2008, with the goal of completing the installations by 2010.

The US has regularly briefed Russian officials on this system, Mr Fata indicated, including three briefings since November in the NATO-Russia Council. Russia has never accepted nor rejected cooperation offers from the US. Mr Fata also cited the existence of a nuclear-armed Russian missile defence system around Moscow as evidence that Russia does not oppose missile defence per se.

A second presentation was delivered by Dennis Mays, Acting Deputy Director for Systems Engineering and Integration Chief Engineer, Missile Defence Agency, who provided additional technical details on the MD system. After describing the threat from Iran and North Korea, he reviewed recent successes in tests of the MD system (16 of 17 tests were considered successes). He described the logic behind placing the proposed European sites in Poland and the Czech Republic, and stated that the proposed system would, in 2011, cover all European States that were at risk from long-range ballistic missiles and would complement a potential NATO system that could counter shorter range threats.

In the lively debate that followed, Mr. Mays confirmed to Mrs. Cheryl Gallant that the US already used space-based sensors in their testing. Mrs. Gallant also asked whether NATO would be expected to shoulder some of the costs of the proposed installations; Mr. Fata responded that the US anticipated funding the entire system.

Victor Ozerov (Russia) insisted that the Russian Federation was ready to dialogue on this issue. Russia had been assured by NATO and the US at the end of the Cold War that neither troops nor NATO infrastructures would be deployed close to Russian borders, he stated, and those promises were not being kept. Russia had not been sufficiently consulted at the expert level, he asserted, and warned that Russia must take action in response to the US deployments, for instance by withdrawing from the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) treaty. Mr. Fata stated the only disagreement with Russia on the Iranian missile threat was its immediacy. Mr. Fata insisted that the US had repeatedly offered partnerships on missile defences and that the proposed system could actually provide protection for some Russian territory.

In response to questions about the extent of defensive coverage and system effectiveness, Mr. Fata noted that NATO members such as Turkey are threatened not by long-range missiles but by short-range missiles and that therefore a NATO MD system in South-East Europe could serve to protect Turkey. He went on to underline that Czech or Polish refusal of the MD installations would preclude US deployments in those countries. Mr. Mays explained that the kill rate of the system is greater than 80% against a single incoming missile and could reach 90% if two interceptors are launched against one target. Mr Fata added that no defence is perfect, and only 10 interceptors could not stop all adversaries. In this sense, it is clear that the US is not seeking invulnerability.

Ellen Tauscher (US), Chair of the US Congressional Committee with responsibility over these systems, described the current Congressional majority's views on MD. She agreed that there was a very significant threat that also affected Europe. She stated that the Democrats have historically supported a comprehensive missile defence

strategy, but suggested that the current proposals needed to include dramatic engagement through NATO, including ensuring interoperability and wider public support. The US Congress had therefore cut funding for the construction of sites in the Czech Republic and Poland, although funding was provided for the purchase of the necessary interceptors and radars. She advocated wider parliamentary and public discussion of this issue, and called for a stronger commitment from NATO to develop its MD system.

Some European delegates shared the concern over the apparently widespread belief in Russia that the proposed interceptors in Poland could be transformed into offensive weapons. Mr. Fata replied that the MD sites could be easily monitored and could not be secretly converted. Besides, any funding to do so would require Congressional approval. He also stated that the silos are designed for two-stage missiles rather than the three-stages required by offensive missiles. He also suggested Russian officials might inspect the facilities.

### **Science and Technology Committee**

After a short break, a meeting of the Science and Technology Committee was held. Michael Mates (UK) started the meeting by welcoming the delegates and giving a few introductory remarks. The first item to be considered was a Draft Report of the Sub-Committee on the Proliferation of Military Technology on *Proliferation of Missiles and Missile Technology*, by Cristian Valeriu Buzea (Romania), Rapporteur.

The Rapporteur emphasized that the relevance of ballistic and cruise missiles has not diminished since the end of the Cold War, although the nature of the threat has changed. While the US and the former USSR/Russia have significantly reduced their arsenals of long-range ballistic missiles and eliminated all of their intermediate and medium range missiles, the number of countries with short and medium range missiles is still increasing. Even non-state actors, such as Hezbollah, have acquired a missile capability.

Mr. Buzea went on to say that the international mechanisms to control missile proliferation are rather loose. They need to be reinforced by strengthening the coordination of export policies, creating missiles-free zones and expanding the membership of the Missile Technology Control Regime. National export rules must be tightened to curb the proliferation of cruise missiles as well as shoulder-launched missiles that pose a serious terrorist threat. He concluded with the thought that prevention alone might not be enough, as the proliferation of missiles cannot be completely stopped. Therefore, he felt the missile defence debate should be placed high on NATO's agenda.

Dr. Waheguru Pal Singh Sidhu, Course Director, New Issues in Security Course (NISC), Geneva Centre for Security Policy (GCSP), gave a presentation on *Dealing with Proliferation of Missiles*.

Dr. Sidhu commended the Sub-Committee report, which covered a lot of key issues. Today missiles and efforts to manage and control them are seen as a blind spot, a crucial gap in the panoply of existing arms control that needs to be closed. Missiles armed with weapons of mass destruction (WMD) are a cause of concern, but even

conventionally armed missiles or unarmed missiles pose a clear and present danger. Indeed, most missiles could have strategic effects because being "strategic" is no longer related only to the distance that missiles can fly.

Also, unlike the nuclear, biological and chemical weapons, there is no universal treaty or agreement governing the development, testing, production, acquisition, transfer, deployment or use of missiles. Even more significantly, there is no universal effort or agreement to rid the world of missiles. Indeed, the rare cases of voluntary missile disarmament (e.g. Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, Iraq, South-Africa and Libya), were the result of particular circumstances and not in adherence to any global norm or regime.

Dr. Sidhu also underlined two trends which have become evident among the international community. The first focuses on political and diplomatic initiatives ranging from the Hague code of conduct through the Russian proposal for a global control system to the UN Panel of governmental experts on missiles. The second trend is the military and technological approach, which includes the missile defence dimension and the proliferation security initiatives.

Dr Sidhu reviewed the three regions of greatest concern: the Middle East, Northeast Asia, and South Asia. He concluded by saying that while efforts addressing missiles at both the global and the individual country level are commendable, they are unlikely to be effective alone in the short-term. In contrast, regional approaches to addressing missile issues hold more promise. Nonetheless a one-size-fit-all approach is unlikely to work. Each regional arrangement would have to be tailor-made in the context of history, geography, technology and politics of the region before it can move forward.

Ms. Tauscher asked whether there is a disconnect between the existential threat and the real threat? And if there is a significant threat, how do we get the political support necessary to have a convention on disarmament or arms control? Dr Sidhu noted the different approaches inherent in the Russian and US perceptions of the threat. It seems that there is a consensus that the threat is the same, but views differ on the timeline and the response. A second issue is found in the fact that even if there is a consensus on a threat, there is no consensus on the way to deal with the threat. Missile defence is an option, but there is no such thing as a purely defensive missile. The Chinese anti-satellite missile is a perfect example of ambiguity between offensive and defensive missiles. A missile defence may seem attractive in the short run, but in the long run, the MD may complicate security issues dramatically rather than resolving them.

Anatoliy Semenchenko (Russia) highlighted the fact that the installation of a missile defence could create a new arms race, as it is difficult to perceive the difference between an offence and defence in this case. Russia will be encouraged to modernize its arsenal and it could trigger a new arms race. Dr Sidhu agreed that the US plan will trigger an arms race in Europe, however, the nature of this arms race has to be seen, and could do many different directions. Another fear is that we might see proliferation of defensive systems around the world. An interesting question could be: what if Iran wants to deploy a similar defensive system on its own soil? Iran nuclear intentions are still unclear. However, Iran's peculiar approach to missiles is clear – they are seen as

substitute for aircraft. One should observe the reason why Iran looks for missiles; it is something to keep in mind.

The next presentation was delivered by Professor Ricardo Serrão Santos, Director, Department of Oceanography and Fisheries, Pro-Rector, University of the Azores, on *Deeper than Light: Life at the Edge of Expanding Seafloors*. He spoke about the importance of deep sea floors and marine life as well as the current and future threats that are putting them in danger. The presentation focused on four key elements that can significantly affect the deep-sea regions. First, deep-sea fisheries have negative effects on both target species and habitats. Second, major negative impacts and large-scale disturbances can be expected from the extraction of minerals, gas and oil from the deep-sea beds. Third, the use of the deep-sea regions as a waste disposal location can lead to serious contamination of the sea water, with major risks deriving from radioactive materials and heavy metals. Finally, Dr. Serrão Santos underscored the tremendous consequences global warming can produce on the world's sea regions. The rise of surface temperatures, in particular, may lead to the disruption of the so called "Great Conveyor Belt" thus altering the distribution of heat in the global ocean. Furthermore, vast methane reservoir along the continental margins can be destabilised as a result of the warming of bottom waters by 3° C. This in turn could cause a massive injection of greenhouses gases into the atmosphere thus inducing further warming.

In response to a question, Dr. Serrão Santos pointed out that Exclusive Economic Zones are extremely useful in order to regulate fisheries and other economic activities. However, specific rules do not exist for most of the international zones. For this reason, many scientists support the idea of a UN moratorium on fisheries for international waters.

Senator Pierre Claude Nolin, General Rapporteur introduced Committee consideration of the draft General Report *Transforming the Future of Warfare: Network-enabled Capabilities and Unmanned Systems*. The report focused on the two most prominent emerging high-tech capabilities – network-enabled and unmanned systems – which promise to revolutionize the way military operations are carried out in the 21st century. The new technologies raise a number of important questions for policy-makers, one of which is how these technologies will affect the functioning of military alliances.

Network-enabled capability (NEC) is the military expression of the Information Age. Networked forces are more agile, survivable and effective by translating information superiority into combat power. The United States is an undisputed global leader in developing NEC. The UK, Germany and France, as well as NATO agencies are looking into developing such capabilities. Technological (compatibility) challenges involved in NEC do not seem insurmountable. The real problem is the willingness of coalition partners to share information and provide access to their networks. Without this high level of trust, joint operations in the era of NEC will be ineffective.

Emerging unmanned systems technology could be considered a physical extension of NEC. These systems reduce the need for manpower and significantly increase reconnaissance, surveillance and even attack capabilities. However, as systems become increasingly autonomous, moral issues emerge. To remain relevant, NATO and Member States need to take into account these new technological developments when

drafting defence budgets and defining acquisition strategy and information-sharing policies.

Senator Pierre Claude Nolin also served as Special Rapporteur for consideration of the draft *Special Report Climate Change: Thinking Beyond Kyoto*. In recent years, the most authoritative scientific reports have left no doubt that climate change is occurring rapidly, and that it is very likely that it is caused by human activity. Climate change will affect, and is already affecting, nearly all areas of life, including security and the geopolitical situation. Urgent action is needed, since it makes more economic sense to engage in mitigation activities than to deal with the consequences.

The Kyoto agreement will expire in 2012 and there is an emerging consensus that the new framework should take shape by 2009. The post-Kyoto system must exceed the current framework both in scope and ambitions. It has to be universal, bringing the US and Australia to the table. While the industrialised world has to bear the lion's share of the responsibility, developing countries also have obligations. Adaptation efforts need to be strengthened considerably. Further investment in 'green' technologies, particularly renewables, is also critical.

One delegate noted that the report's conclusion lacks a discussion on how far we should go with emission cuts. Senator Nolin disagreed and indicated paragraphs of the report that deal with this issue. He also stressed that it is unacceptable that industrialized countries buy quotas from poor ones, instead of embarking upon serious emission cuts themselves. He went on to say that it is hypocritical to ask poor countries to provide rich countries with the ability to continue polluting instead of reforming emission policies.

Next came consideration of the draft *Special Report on Improvement on International Law for Space Policy* by Rafael Gimalov (Russia), Special Associate Rapporteur. The report claims that current international space legislation does not correspond with reality. New actors of international law, such as private companies, now participate in space activities beyond legal restraints. Some countries have different approaches towards antimissile and anti-satellite defence, which prevents the creation of an actual international space treaty. Mr. Gimalov warned that the arms race in space will become dangerous in the near future. He also called for NATO and Russia to set a moratorium on the deployment of new missile defence elements in Europe.

Another extremely important space-related issue raised is that of space debris. Because of almost uncontrolled activities of launching states, the amount of space debris is increasing and may paralyze activities in space in the next 20-30 years to come. Weapon testing in space poses a particular risk in this regard. Currently, there are no effective methods of outer space purification and the main attention must be paid to internationally coordinated efforts to prevent the further formation of debris.

**27 MAY 2007**

### **Defence and Security Committee**

The joint meeting of the Defence and Security Committee and the Science and Technology Committee, held on 26 May 2007, has been covered above in the section dealing with the Science and Technology Committee.

On 27 May 2007, opening remarks for the meeting of the Defence and Security Committee were delivered by the Chairman, Julio Miranda Calha (Portugal).

After some routine administrative activity, the Committee moved on to consideration of the *Comments of the Secretary General of NATO on the Policy Recommendations* adopted in 2006 by the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, after which they heard a presentation by Nuno Severiano Teixeira, Minister of National Defence, Portugal.

Mr. Severiano Teixeira stated that prior crises in transatlantic relations were over, and reaffirmed Portugal's commitment to the Atlantic Alliance. NATO and the EU, which he characterized as the two fundamental pillars of the Euro-Atlantic security system, must be pragmatic and find ways to effectively cooperate in theatres in which both are engaged. Portugal, a security provider, has recognized the changing international security environment, and has contributed its part to peace operations throughout the world. It bases its interventions on three basic principles: respect for international law, democracy and rule of law; equilibrium of participation in missions of the EU and NATO; and limiting the geographic and numerical spread of operations, in order to maximize the positive impact of Portuguese participation. Mr. Severiano Teixeira stated that operations abroad have been critical to the restructuring and modernization of the Portuguese armed forces. Finally, he laid out the priorities of the Portuguese presidency of the European Council, pledging that Portugal would seek to promote cooperation between NATO and the EU through a greater number of formal and informal meetings at many levels and between the bureaucracies. Portugal also planned deeper cooperation with Africa and with the Mediterranean.

Responding to a question, Mr. Severiano Teixeira stated that there needed to be greater emphasis on reconstruction and nation-building in Afghanistan, and this required more than NATO-only efforts. There could be no reconstruction without security, and no security without reconstruction. Portugal would not be increasing its participation, he said, while underlining that Portuguese forces were under no caveats in Afghanistan.

Mr. Claude Bachand raised the NATO-EU relationship, expressing concern that some European countries are deliberately keeping the two institutions apart.

Responding to a question Mr. Severiano Teixeira underlined the need for political will to develop a strong European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) as well as improving the institutional relationship with NATO. He suggested that better capabilities for the EU meant a stronger ally for NATO and the US.

The next item of business was consideration of the draft Report of the Sub-Committee on the Future Security and Defence Capabilities, on *The three Adriatic Aspirants: Capabilities and Preparation* by Sverre Myrli (Norway), Rapporteur.

A Dutch delegate noted that Croatian public support for NATO membership was low, and wondered why this might be the case. Kresimir Cosic (Croatia) offered updated poll data on Croatian opinion, citing a poll from May 2007, in which 52% stated support for NATO accession, which Mr Cosic attributed to the positive impact of successful reforms. He suggested public support would rise further due to deliberate communications campaign.



General Luís Valença Pinto, Chief of the General Staff of the Portuguese Armed Forces addressed the Committee. He described Portuguese military transformation efforts, including organisational changes, acquisition of equipment and the establishment of a permanent Joint Operational Command, all intended to shape the Portuguese military into a high-level expeditionary force. Portugal currently had 680 personnel involved in crisis response and peacekeeping operations under the UN, NATO and the EU, in places such as Afghanistan, Lebanon, and Kosovo. Portuguese units took direct part both to NATO's Response Force (NRF) and EU's Battle Groups.

Mr. Shimkus (US) highlighted that the 1.3% of GDP spent by Portugal on defence is below NATO's informal standard of 2%, and asked whether a larger defence budget would mean more Portuguese units in high-priority NATO operations. He also asked about how Portugal seeks to balance commitments to national defence as well as to the EU and to the NRF. General Valença Pinto replied that an increase in the defence budget is unlikely before 2009-2010. However, spending approximately 1.8% of GDP on defence would likely allow for additional capabilities and contributions to operations abroad. The General also underscored the importance of increasing the flexibility of both the NATO Response Force (NRF) and EU battle group concepts, which would ease some of the difficulties associated with their coordinated use. He laid the blame for NATO-EU difficulties largely at the feet of the civilian bureaucracies of both organizations, rather than their political or military leadership.

Mr. Frank Cook, General Rapporteur, then led consideration of the draft *General Report on Afghanistan: Assessing Progress and Key Challenges for the Alliance*.

Francesco Bosi (Italy) suggested that the political dimension of ISAF should be reaffirmed. He praised the Italian contribution for its sensitivity to the humanitarian dimension of intervention and contested implied criticisms of some of the contingents, for instance regarding national caveats. Another Italian delegate suggested Italian public opinion was poorly described in the report; the majority of Italian public opinion was against a continued, endless military operation in Afghanistan, but supported continued civilian and humanitarian assistance. She underlined the problems of the role of warlords in Afghanistan, as well as the plight of women in Afghan society.

Mr. Claude Bachand stated that civilian casualties must be avoided at all costs, and inquired whether NATO is considering an Alliance agreement with the Government of Afghanistan, on the issue of detainee transfers.. He also suggested consideration of possible mechanisms for rotating troops from North to South and vice-versa.

After underscoring the importance of public opinion and of the "media offensive" conducted by the Taliban, Mrs. Cheryl Gallant raised the problem of opium production and the Senlis Council's proposal for re-directing opium into medical and pharmaceutical purposes.

Nikolay Kondratenko (Russia), noting the defeats of the USSR and the UK in Afghanistan, asserted that the presence of foreign troops unified Afghan tribes. He added that NATO cohesion was at risk if political solutions were not implemented soon. A Germany delegate lamented the fact that national approaches differed so greatly in Afghanistan despite a consensus on overall strategy. His delegation remained committed to working for increased German public support for the ISAF mission.

Jean-Guy Branger (France) stated that NATO countries should provide the necessary resources to address continuing challenges in the country, but stressed that there remains confusion about NATO's final objectives in Afghanistan. He called for clear deadlines for the end of the NATO commitment, which would prevent further deterioration of morale in member countries.

Mohammad Khalid Pashton (Afghanistan) underlined the gravity of the problem of civilian casualties of NATO operations. Mr. Pashton also expressed the gratitude of the Afghan delegation for NATO's contribution in Afghanistan. He Pashton added that other problems Afghanistan faces include corruption, opium, and terrorism, and that Afghanistan's neighbours must also be a part of the solution.

Mushahid Hussain Sayed (Pakistan) regarded many of the problems facing Afghanistan as originating from the American strategy for toppling the Taliban using only a small permanent contingent, which forced a reliance on local warlords, an approach that eventually backfired. Unity of command between ISAF and Operation Enduring Freedom remained a significant problem. Mr. Sayed also proposed the establishment of a Tripartite Commission between the Afghan Parliament, the Parliament of Pakistan and the NATO PA.

In response to the extensive debate, the General Rapporteur stressed the progress made in Afghanistan since 2001 at the military, political, economic and social levels. He endorsed calls for greater involvement of women in Afghanistan, and condemned 'unacceptable' civilian casualties while emphasizing their unintended nature and their partial inevitability given the presence of al-Qaida forces hiding among civilians. He reaffirmed that NATO is seeking political solutions and not only working using military tools.

The Rapporteur stressed the need for member countries to abide by the terms and responsibilities set out in NATO's Treaty. Mr Cook explained the downsides to any new troop rotation scheme, including the time required for each contingent to become familiar with their surroundings. Mr Cook reminded the Committee that 37 countries are engaged in Afghanistan, including all NATO Allies – not only the US and the UK. He underscored the need for sustaining public support in member countries for the operation, as this is a key pre-condition of winning the hearts and minds of the Afghans. He resisted calls for precise deadlines for allied commitment to Afghanistan, due to the fluidity of the situation there. Finally, he underlined that while counter narcotics is not NATO's direct responsibility, the many different organizations working on this problem must coordinate better if they hope to find success.

The Sub-Committee on Transatlantic Defence and Security Cooperation proceed to present their draft report on *NATO-EU Operational Co-operation*. Mr. John Shimkus (US) was the Rapporteur. Ms. Gomes supported the conclusions of the report and proposed a joint meeting with the European Parliament's Sub-Committee on Security and Defence, but Robert Walter (Western European Union - WEU), Chair of the WEU Defence Committee, was quick to remind all that it was national parliaments that make decisions on committing to EU operations and not the European Parliament. He also reminded the Committee about the WEU's historical role in security issues, and suggested that the EU should not create a separate planning and command unit, as

there were enough resources in SHAPE (NATO's Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe) and national commands to support national operations.

Mario Salmas (Greece) stated that a strengthened EU was not a challenge to NATO. He suggested that discussions between the organizations were blocked not by Cyprus, but rather by Turkey's opposition to NATO-EU cooperation beyond the Berlin Plus framework. Mr. Claude Bachand remarked that this debate was not new, and sought explanation from his European colleagues on why some European states sought to limit cooperation with NATO in order to resist American influence.

Sub-Committee Rapporteur John Shimkus felt the discussion had reaffirmed the need to solve communication problems between the two institutions.

The final presentation to the Committee was given by Lawrence J. Korb (US), Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress, on the subject of *National Security Strategy in an Age of Terrorists, Tyrants, and WMD*. Mr. Korb offered an extensive critique of the Bush administration's security strategy that contested the terminology of the "war on terror". The principal threats to the US today in the shorter term were violent, extremist non-state actors, violent and extreme regimes and weak and failing states. In the longer term, managing the rise of Chinese power peacefully was critical. The current US national security strategy was based on three pillars: preventive war, the imposition of democracy through force, and military superiority. These three elements, together with their underlying premises of a belief in American exceptionalism and American power, lead the US to consider military force as a tool of first resort. Mr. Korb suggested instead pursuing an "integrated power," combining elements of hard and soft power in a more multilateral approach.

Leading off a wide-ranging debate, Ms. Tauscher raised the challenge of differences in threat perception and intelligence analyses. Senator Joseph Day asked whether the concept of preventive war was gaining acceptance at the international level.

Responding to the extensive discussion, Mr. Korb noted that the US needed to strike a better balance between hard and soft power. He emphasized the need to make strategic decisions based not on political pressures but on their merits. Mr. Korb expressed concern that although the neo-conservative viewpoint had been discredited, there was still a danger of an isolationist reaction by the American public to the current strategic situation. Mr. Korb also cited the need to engage in dialogue with strategic adversaries, as with the Soviet Union and China during the Cold War. He lamented the "over-reaction to 9/11," which was used as a political tool; 9/11 did not change everything in international relations as had been claimed. He advocated reenergizing the NPT, and preventing the development of new nuclear weapons and the weaponization of space. Finally, Mr. Korb insisted that military force remained an option that should never be excluded, but that all diplomatic solutions should be pursued first.

### **Committee on the Civil Dimension of Security**

The Committee on the Civil Dimension of Security met on 27 May under the Chairmanship of Michael Clapham (UK).

The first presentation was by Fernando Rocha Andrade, Under Secretary of State at the Ministry of Interior of Portugal, on Civil Protection in Portugal. He discussed two topics:

first, the structure of civil protection in Portugal; and second, the priorities for Portugal's presidency of the EU in the area of civil protection. In Portugal most of the responsibility for civil protection lays with private humanitarian organizations. The challenge has become how to better co-ordinate these efforts. The Portuguese government has responded by reinforcing the state's role in civil protection through the creation of a civil protection authority and a civil protection force based on the model of the French gendarmerie.

On a European level, the Portuguese government has set three priorities for its upcoming EU presidency: establishing a tsunami early warning system; adopting easily identifiable emergency alert signs; and enhancing the sharing of civil protection resources on a European level, including, if appropriate, through the creation of a common European Civil Protection Force.

Minister Andrade confirmed that the force would have capabilities to handle a nuclear, biological or chemical attack. Consultation has already begun to establish expert contact groups. Barbara Haering (Switzerland) asked whether, since Switzerland clearly faces different risks than Portugal, it would make more sense to have a Europe-wide network of experts, rather than a common force. Mr. Rocha Andrade replied that many crisis situations require similar response techniques regardless of their initial cause.

Andrea Mancini, Project Coordinator, Europe and West /Central Asia Section, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, and Emmanuel Reinert, Executive Director of the Senlis Council, delivered a presentation on *Drugs, Security, and Development in Afghanistan*.

Andrea Mancini addressed the nexus between opium and insecurity in Afghanistan and its implications for the reconstruction and development of the country. He explained that an analysis of recent trends in poppy cultivation shows a clear correlation between areas of cultivation and areas of conflict and insecurity. Whereas the northern parts of the country seem to be responsive to the deterrent effect of the state's intervention, the South remains a stronghold of illegal poppy cultivation benefiting from the power vacuum there. Eradication has been stepped up - from 15,000 hectares in 2006 to over 23,000 in the first part of 2007.

However, Mr. Mancini insisted that eradication alone is not enough, just as promoting alternative livelihood for farmers alone will not convince them to switch to licit activities. He pleaded for a balanced and an integrated approach using 'sticks', such as eradication, interdiction and criminalization, as well as 'carrots', such as loans, infrastructure building and alternative livelihood programs. He also stressed the importance of addressing the big picture - including regional trends, trade in chemical precursors, etc., and punishing traffickers.

If this strategy, which focuses on incentives for farmers to co-operate with the government and law enforcement authorities, were thoroughly implemented, half the country, according to Mr. Mancini, could be opium poppy free by 2012, as called for by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) opium poppy free roadmap. Mr. Mancini suggested NATO could expand its role to aid the counter-narcotics effort by enhancing security sector reform assistance, further strengthening the Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs), promoting further police reform and training; fostering

policy co-ordination with other stakeholders and encouraging co-operation with neighboring countries, in particular with Pakistan.

Emmanuel Reinert, of the Senlis Council, agreed that opium production and trafficking has become one of the main impediments to NATO's success in Afghanistan. He asserted, however, that the current methods of dealing with the opium are ineffective and sometimes counterproductive. They tend to undermine stabilization, development and reconstruction efforts, as well as local support for the Afghan government and for the international community. As a result, policies that are not designed by NATO, undercut the Alliance's efforts in Afghanistan. In the ensuing discussion, many delegates agreed on the importance of providing sustainable livelihood and alternatives at the local level and agreed that an integrated approach to the problem is important.

The next agenda item allowed consideration of the *Draft General Report on Independent Montenegro: Early Assessment and Prospects for Euro-Atlantic Integration*, introduced by Vitalino Canas (Portugal), General Rapporteur.

Mr. Canas welcomed the Montenegrin delegation to their first meeting as Associate Members of the NATO PA and congratulated them on the first anniversary of their country's independence. He highlighted the positive accomplishments Montenegro has made during its first year of independence. This includes the adoption of an ambitious reform agenda, the successful negotiation of relations with Serbia and an unambiguous commitment to Euro-Atlantic integration. He also mentioned three challenges, however, that Montenegro will have to overcome, including the adoption of a new Constitution, the potential spillover effects from negotiations over Kosovo's final status and the long road to full integration into the EU and NATO.

Vasilije Lalosevic (Montenegro) thanked the Committee for the report and pointed out a few updates. Regarding the constitutional process, he said that Montenegrin political forces had now reached consensus on everything except language, church and the use of state symbols. Another outstanding issue is also the organization of the judiciary and the guarantees for its independence. Mr. Lalosevic explained that relations between minorities in the country are good and that there is a strong level of protection of minority rights. He presented recent developments in the field of defence and police reform and concluded by stressing Montenegro's strong commitment to Euro-Atlantic integration.

Gjorgi Orovcanec (Macedonia) welcomed the good report on its neighbour and also noted the progress the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia has made in fighting corruption, improving rule of law, reforming the defence sector and increasing regional co-operation.

Before moving to the next point on the agenda, the Chairman recognized Toktarkhan Akhmetov (Kazakhstan), who explained that Kazakhstan has recently adopted a number of amendments to the Constitution, which he believes make his country more democratic. The presidential term was reduced from seven to five years and the number of parliamentarians was increased. Members of the lower house will now be elected by proportional representation, to increase the role of political parties. The parliament will now have to approve the nomination of the Prime Minister and the use of parliamentary control mechanisms has been simplified. He also explained that the role

of local government has been strengthened and a number of reforms implemented in the judicial system, including banning capital punishment in all cases except terrorism, assassination and war crimes.

Consideration of the *Draft Report of the Subcommittee on Democratic Governance on State and Religion in the Black Sea Region* was led by Bert Middel (Netherlands), Rapporteur. The report assesses the role of religion as a security factor in the Black Sea region. It argues that the current security environment tends to emphasize the relevance of religion to domestic and international security.

The report is divided into two sections. The first examines domestic measures adopted by states in the region to deal with religion, while the second looks at the relevance of religion in terms of security. Briefly presenting the situation in the three states of the South Caucasus, in Russia's North Caucasus and in Turkey, the Rapporteur stressed the differences in the relationship between state and religion across the region. The common themes, however, were a significant religious revival, often connected to increased nationalism; the growing presence of foreign-based religious groups; and the emergence of radical religious elements. The second half of the report shows that the treatment of religious minorities has become a domestic security issue, but the unresolved conflicts in the region are not of a religious character. The report concludes that religion is a soft, and not a hard security issue in the region and that it is a domestic, rather than a foreign policy issue.

Ziyafat Asgarov (Azerbaijan) challenged assertions made in the report regarding amendments to the new law on freedom of religion; relations between the Spiritual Board of Muslims of the Caucasus and the State Committee for Work with Religious Organizations; the situation of non-Muslim religious groups; aspirations of religious groups to become political actors; the activities and influence of radical religious groups; and the non-religious character of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. The Rapporteur thanked the Azerbaijani delegation for their comments and promised to take them into consideration.

Lord Jopling (UK), in the role of Special Rapporteur, led consideration of the *Draft Special Report on The Protection of Critical Infrastructures*. He stressed that Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) is becoming increasingly important, and yet that it is impossible to protect every infrastructure against every potential threat. The report, therefore, looks at the approaches that several nations and international organizations have taken on this topic. In general, CIP is the responsibility of national governments, in conjunction with private companies, which own and operate the vast majority of critical infrastructure. Yet international co-operation is necessary as well. The Rapporteur expressed scepticism of the EU's plan to create a list of European critical infrastructure however, as he feels it could become a shopping list for terrorists. Lord Jopling ended by stressing the importance of co-operation between the EU and NATO in this area, and mentioning the progress made on this as a result of the Committee's visit to Brussels in February.

An Azerbaijani delegate stated that the security of oil supplies to Europe is threatened by the unresolved conflicts in the Caucasus region and asked for assistance from NATO and the EU in solving these conflicts. NATO should also protect Azerbaijan and

Georgia against the potential threat from Iran and assist with the resolution of the ongoing dispute over waters in the Caspian Sea. The Rapporteur agreed that Europe's energy supply would be more secure if Russia's monopoly over energy routes were reduced and new pipelines were built in the Caucasus and the Caspian region. However, he expressed scepticism that the regional conflicts could find an easy solution.

A US delegate stated that the US has invested heavily in CIP, and has learned from this experience. He believed these lessons need to be more fully shared with US allies. Faced with a broad range of potential threats, NATO allies need to consider ways to pool resources and develop a disciplined and systematic approach to assist each other in times of crisis.

Jurgen Ligi (Estonia) reported briefly on the recent cyber-attacks on Estonian government and commercial computer systems, explaining these were centrally organized and of Russian origin. Thankfully, Estonia's defences were good enough to resist the attacks, but the lesson from this episode is that cyber-attacks are a real and serious threat. Additionally, Mr. Ligi stressed that international co-operation is crucial and it should be a priority for NATO. Senator Pierre Claude Nolin asked that the Estonian case be included in the final draft of the report as it would be very useful to other countries. The Rapporteur agreed to this suggestion.

Respectfully submitted,

Mr Leon Benoit, M.P.  
Chair  
Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association (NATO PA)

## Travel Costs

<b>ASSOCIATION</b>	Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association (NATO PA)
<b>ACTIVITY</b>	Spring Session of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly
<b>DESTINATION</b>	Madeira, Portugal
<b>DATES</b>	May 25-28, 2007
<b>DELEGATION</b>	
SENATE	Senator Raynell Andreychuk Senator Jane Cordy Senator Joseph A. Day Senator Percy Downe Senator Pierre Claude Nolin
HOUSE OF COMMONS	Mr. Claude Bachand, M.P. Mr. Leon Benoit, M.P. Mr. Blaine Calkins, M.P. Mrs. Cheryl Gallant, M.P. Mr. Joseph McGuire, M.P.
STAFF	Mr. Jim Cox; Mr. Denis Robert
<b>TRANSPORTATION</b>	<b>\$69,335</b>
<b>ACCOMMODATION</b>	<b>\$8,058</b>
<b>HOSPITALITY</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>PER DIEMS</b>	<b>\$3,823</b>



<b>OFFICIAL GIFTS</b>	<b>\$260</b>
<b>MISCELLANEOUS / REGISTRATION FEES</b>	<b>\$68</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$81,544</b>