



THE NATO SUMMIT AND BEYOND

SEPTEMBER 15-17, 2006

RIGA

AGENDA

Friday, September 15

Arrival of participants

19:00 Welcome dinner hosted by the Strategic Analysis Commission, with **Vaira Paegle**,
Chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Saeima

Saturday, September 16

10:00 – 11:00 Introductory remarks by **Simon Serfaty, CSIS**
Opening address by H.E. **Vaira Vike-Freiberga**, President of the Republic of Latvia

11:00 – 12:00 **PANEL I: A RENEWED ALLIANCE FOR A CHANGED WORLD – POLITICAL DIMENSIONS**

Remarks: **Julian Lindley-French, Center for Applied Policy (Munich)**

Benoit d’Aboville, Cour des comptes (Paris)

Comment: **Jiri Schneider, Prague Security Studies Institute (Prague)**

- How do the members of the Alliance view the role and missions of NATO in the post-Cold War, post-9/11 world? Is NATO still the most appropriate forum for Euro-Atlantic debate and consensus on issues of security?
- Is the ability of NATO to operate as a unitary actor dependent on institutional reforms and new mechanisms that could streamline NATO’s decision-taking process? If so, how should these be designed, and how urgently?
- What role could engagement of civilian institutions play in NATO’s future missions? How can NATO create links to civilian institutions that maximize collective leverage, and which institutions are most relevant?
- Should NATO focus on a geographically definable area of responsibility, i.e. maintaining stability and encouraging democracy directly east and south of its borders, or should the focus be global?
- Is a new NATO Strategic Concept needed, and what should it look like?

12:00 – 13:00 **PANEL II: NEW NATO STRATEGY FOR CHANGING THREATS – MILITARY DIMENSIONS**

Remarks: **Hans Binnendijk, National Defense University (Washington)**

Rob de Wijk, Netherlands Institute of International Relations (The Hague)

Comment: **Tomas Valasek, Defense Ministry of Slovakia (Bratislava)**

- Have traditional, large-scale capabilities lost their relevance in today’s strategic environment? Can NATO members both maintain sufficient capabilities to meet large-scale threats posed by state actors and develop better capabilities to address security threats posed by non-state and sub-state actors? Must NATO choose to focus on one or the other?
- Are national programs of defense transformation creating the capabilities needed by the Alliance? What capabilities are most sorely lacking? What types of force structure will be most appropriate for NATO’s future missions?

- How much offensive expeditionary capability does Europe need, given its preferences regarding the use of force? Conversely, how much should Europe focus on peacekeeping, stability and reconstruction capabilities? What are the criteria, geographical or otherwise, under which Europe deploys either type of force?
- Is division of labor—U.S. hard, Europe soft—a viable, or even desirable concept, or does it raise more questions than it solves?
- What are the shortcomings of the current system of funding NATO operations? What structural changes would better ensure secure and sufficient funding for operations over the coming years?

13:00 – 14:30 LUNCH

14:30 – 15:30 PANEL III: **MEMBERS, PARTNERS, NEIGHBORS...**

Remarks: **Ivan Krastev, Centre for Liberal Strategies (Sofia)**

Hryhoriy Nemyria, Centre for European Studies (Kiev)

Comment: **Ettore Greco, Istituto Affari Internazionali (Rome)**

- Has NATO finished enlarging? What should be next? What form of association—what prospects for membership—should there be with non-members?
- How does the eastward enlargement of NATO impact the internal dynamics and external outlook of the Alliance? Have the effects of enlargement been sufficiently recognized among NATO's members?
- How well integrated are the new members in the Alliance? Are their capabilities relevant? How can the new members best contribute to the overall capabilities of NATO?
- Does enlargement create a need for further reforms of NATO's internal structures – and if so, how urgently and in what directions?

15:30 – 16:00 Break

16:00 – 17:00 PANEL IV: **...AND FRIENDS: GOING GLOBAL**

Remarks: **Ian Brzezinski, Booz Allen Hamilton (Washington)**

Markus Kaim, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik (Berlin)

- What is the most useful model for forming global partnerships? Should partnership agreements be binding and specific, or general frameworks designed to allow ad hoc arrangements as circumstance requires?
- Which potential partners are the most important, and how widely should partnerships be sought? Beyond countries such as Australia, New Zealand, Japan, and South Korea, who are the targets for partnership? What different types of partnership could there be?
- What should the criteria for partnership be? To what degree could strategic considerations outweigh prerequisites such as democracy and human rights? Could partnership be based on conditionality in some cases?
- Is there a need for NATO to reappraise its approach to Russia and to former Soviet states that are not yet scheduled to achieve membership in the predictable future? If so, how?

17:00 – 17:45 CONCLUSIONS: **THINKING ABOUT THE RIGA SUMMIT**

Remarks: **Walter Slocombe, Caplin & Drysdale (Washington)**

DISCUSSION

19:00 DINNER

NATO AT 60: AFTER THE COLD WAR AND BEYOND IRAQ

Remarks: **Robert Hunter, RAND Corporation (Washington)**

Sunday, September 17

9:00 – 10:15 **PANEL V: WHAT NOW, WHAT ELSE: DOES ESDP HAVE A FUTURE?**

Remarks: **Jukka Valtasaari (Helsinki)**

Alexandre Vulic, EU Council Secretariat (Brussels)

Comment: **Sven Biscop, The Royal Institute for International Relations (Brussels)**

- Assuming European defence budgets will not or cannot increase significantly, the pooling of resources, specialization and defence integration is the predominant logic for leveraging Europe's capabilities. Is this process moving at an acceptable pace? Is there any way to facilitate it?
- What are Europe's preferences regarding interoperability with the U.S. versus independent capabilities?
- How significant is the transfer of the peacekeeping mission in the Balkans from NATO to the EU as a precedent for future operations? What does the EU mission to Congo indicate about European willingness to undertake out-of-area operations?
- Does the failure of the constitutional treaty diminish Europe's potential as a future security partner?
- What would a Europe with deeply integrated militaries and ESDP do differently than it does now?

10:30 – 12:00 **PANEL VI: WHAT'S NEW, WHAT'S NEXT: NATO AND THE EU**

Remarks: **Daniel Keohane, Centre for European Reform (London)**

Kori Schake, Hoover Institution (Washington)

Comment: **Michael Emerson, Centre for European Policy Studies (Brussels)**

- Does NATO have a role to play in homeland security? How can this take shape, given the obstacles posed by intelligence sharing issues?
- What possible configurations of NATO-EU responsibilities are there? Which are the most logical; the most flexible in meeting potential threats; the most realistic? How should resources be divided and shared?
- Can/should a formally structured arrangement be devised and implemented, or is cooperation fated to remain ad hoc?
- How to organize NATO-EU cooperation for post war reconstruction and stabilization missions?
- How closely should the EU, NATO, and the U.S. coordinate their policies? Given the need for deeper strategic dialogue, are there advantages in independent decision-making and action-taking ability? What are the drawbacks?

12:00 – 12:45 **CONCLUSIONS: THINKING ABOUT THE SUMMIT**

Remarks: **Frank Kramer, National Defense University (Washington)**

Zaneta Ozolina, Strategic Analysis Commission (Riga)

13:00 **LUNCH**

Concluding Comments: **Simon Serfaty, CSIS**