

# ISS Annual Conference 2008 Report

European Union Institute for Security Studies

## Partnerships for Effective Multilateralism: Managing Global Crises

A conference organised by the  
EU Institute for Security Studies

This report was written by  
Luis Peral under the aegis of  
Álvaro de Vasconcelos  
and with contributions from  
Sabine Fischer, Giovanni Grevi,  
Damien Helly, Walter Posch and  
Jean Pascal Zanders

### I. THE EMERGING GLOBAL SYSTEM AND THE RELATIONS AMONG GLOBAL POWERS

The world is becoming multipolar – even if there is still asymmetry between poles – as decisions taken by a handful of states have a global impact, with the exclusive predominance of the West being eroded and interdependence rapidly gaining ground. The relations between major Western and emerging actors in Asia, Africa and Latin America tend to develop as a network of bilateral ties, frequently outside the sphere of international institutions, in spite of the fact that the world's problems are extremely complex and require multilateral responses. This fundamental idea, which was also stressed during the 2007 Annual Conference, contradicts the belief that prevailed during the 1990s that the basic units of the future world order would be regional organisations. The question today is thus what kind of relations the most powerful states are willing to create among themselves, and particularly what kind of global governance system they are able to establish in order to tackle regional and global problems, going beyond the level of rhetorical admonitions. In particular, their ability to shape effective regional institutions which are able to engage all actors at different levels will be revealing of their commitment to effective multilateralism.

The two main options for the future are to establish an expanded 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century model of the balance of power, within which the main actors would confront each other and form alliances according to circumstances; or to reinforce multilateralism in the direction of a system of global governance. Both options seem to be open at present. In spite of the dangers of unilateralist behaviour in a multipolar world, the possibility cannot be ruled out that the relevant actors will not be able to compromise on their respective degree of responsibility as regards the main global challenges, thus making global governance a utopian pipedream. However, a shift of paradigm seems inevitable.



It is already a truism that the existing framework of international institutions failed to adapt itself to interdependence and to the power shift that took place after the Cold War and no longer meets the needs and expectations of states and citizens. In this context, attempts are being made to consolidate effective multilateral governance by reforming the existing structures. A renovated multilateral system cannot just constitute a deterrent against confrontation – the balance of power model also renders a generalised war unlikely – but must also provide the basis for effectively addressing the global problems and crises the world is facing today, from the prevention of mass atrocities to the resolution of the food and health crisis, as well as protracted conflicts whose resolution particularly requires the involvement of regional organisations.

The present situation can be described as a kind of combination of both unilateral and multilateral options. Certainly, multilateralism does not exclude leadership and necessarily includes regional frameworks of cooperation. Regional institutions are of course better suited to dealing with regional issues and even to resolving bilateral disputes within the respective region; and effective multilateralism is perfectly compatible with processes led by certain states provided that the basic international rules and obligations are respected and multilateral goals are not jeopardised. In fact, leadership of this kind is sometimes needed in order to establish new multinational frameworks and achieve multilateral goals.

The balanced combination of multilateral fora and regional and unilateral or unilaterally-led initiatives allows for a more flexible approach to address the growing complexity of the present world. However, perceptions of what multilateralism should be remain diverse, particularly among the new global actors, and there is a need to understand the respective definitions of national interests. Not only are the imposition of unilateral views and interests and the subsequent erosion of the legal limits on coercion in the international order incompatible with the trend towards multilateral governance, but they are also insufficient in a world of growing interdependence.



Director Álvaro de Vasconcelos welcomes EUHR Javier Solana at the opening of the 2008 Annual Conference

From a more radical perspective, it was argued that the growing global interdependence corresponds to a con-

comitant difficulty in controlling the world by recourse to the 'power to destroy'. The dilemma of the unilateralist trend is that the power to destroy no longer entails the power to control, so that the consequences of the recourse to the first make the world even more uncontrollable. Thus, a genuine dialogue on the limits of the use of force must be urgently instituted in order to allow for a wider discussion on other acute threats to international security. The more pessimistic views suggest that only a catastrophe of vast transborder dimensions will be able to curb the world's march towards self-destruction. According to this view, the financial and economic crisis we are facing will not lead to a consensus on how to confront future challenges if global actors keep putting their exclusive national interests first.

## II. PROSPECTS FOR REFORMING THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM

There is however a need to take advantage of the window of opportunity offered by the common will to reform international financial and economic governance following the financial crisis and by the incoming Obama Administration in Washington, so as to overcome the obstacles. According to the discussions that took place during the Conference, the new legal architecture should be comprehensive and all-inclusive both regarding actors and issues:

- On the one hand, in spite of the leadership of the so-called global actors, no system will be effective in providing long-term stability if not all states are included and their values and interests taken into account. In this regard, it was particularly stressed that the solution of regional problems – including stabilising countries that suffer internal strife – not only lies with major regional actors, but that it requires the cooperation and goodwill of all countries in the region. Any divisive scenarios would thus jeopardise cooperation with all actors at regional and international levels. In this context, the US Republican presidential candidate John McCain's proposal on the creation of a League of Democracies – which was to some extent echoed by certain members of Barack Obama's team during the election campaign – was not endorsed and was even considered counterproductive by some participants. The risk of a new form of confrontational bipolarity was mentioned.
- On the other hand, the complexity and interdependence of global problems is such that they may only be tackled through a multifaceted negotiation process in which the main global players are able to adjust and constrain their respective particular interests so as to reflect global needs and aspirations. In this connection, it was suggested that a major new departure, a kind of 'grand bargain', is needed so that security and governance issues are discussed together with financial, economic and trade issues, environmental and energy issues, and climate change concerns. In this way it would

be possible to create 'win-win situations' in which countries are prepared to make mutual concessions and compromises in a coherent manner, the negotiations being a reflection of the deep interconnection between the major global challenges. This long-term process should perhaps be initially led by a broad international *ad hoc* coalition that includes the most relevant actors, a sort of expanded G-20. The process should not exclude the establishment of different clusters in which different groups of states take the lead as part of the common endeavour of adapting the global system to the present needs.

The call to reform the international financial institutions should not overshadow the need to address other equally important reforms which are still pending in the broader international context. On the contrary, it has been proven once again that postponing such reforms may have severe consequences. Moreover, the successful completion of the reform of Bretton Woods institutions necessarily entails a broader consensus regarding other interconnected issues such as trade, food security, energy security or climate change, which should involve all relevant actors and ultimately all states of the international community.

It was stressed in this regard that the time is thus ripe for the US and the EU Member States to make concessions in order to guarantee a more balanced representation of the new global actors in the architecture of the international system. This should not only apply to the financial sphere, but also to other equally relevant areas such as the security structures. Although it was acknowledged that the international community might have lost momentum in terms of launching the reform of the UN Security Council, the critical need for such reform means that it is imperative that efforts in this direction are pursued with renewed intensity. In contrast, the need for reform was not perceived so sharply as regards the regional security frameworks, although strengthening the capacity to prevent is considered crucial in some cases.

As discussed particularly in the relevant Working Group, most experts believe that in spite of the failure to prevent the Georgian-Russian conflict in South Ossetia, the existing institutions should be able to manage the security challenges in the pan-European region, although certain reforms are required to avoid blockages. The key is future genuine dialogue about the European security order so as to remove political obstacles that undermine institutional capacity, including prevention of imminent and foreseeable conflicts. In the case of Africa, the efforts should be even more intensively concentrated on making the AU Peace and Security Council a fully operational institution. Brazil's proposal to create a South American Security Council is still in its infancy, whereas no similar plans are taking shape in Asia as such. The security architecture of the Gulf region would most probably require the involvement of Iran and Iraq together with members of the Gulf Cooperation Council in order to be effective. At all different levels, the contribution of the regional security institutions is an essential step towards establishing a common foundation for the content of international security.

### III. THE CONCEPTS OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND HUMAN SECURITY

As the international community emerges from a period of military unilateralism, the definition of a common approach to security seems to be of the utmost importance, so as to counter former UNSG Kofi Annan's admonition in 2004 that the war in Iraq, the terrorist attacks in the United States and other events had breached the consensus on the concept of threat to peace. Some indications of a renewed consensus are already noticeable, particularly in the practices and statements of some of the so-called emerging powers. This consensus is grounded on a strong rejection, at least at the level of rhetoric, of any form of unilateral recourse to force against the territorial integrity of other countries, a primary rule of the international legal order that is proclaimed by all relevant actors. The aspiration to play a greater role in the international realm is reflected in efforts to legitimise their respective leverage at the UN level, i.e. by increasing contributions to peacekeeping as in the case of India or by contributing to shape and implement international rules, including by punitive measures, in the case of China and Russia, as demonstrated in respect of UN Security Council action in Iran and North Korea.



Plenary Session I. Towards a more effective global multilateral governance: how to engage new global players?

Although there seems to be consensus between the new global actors on the pairing of peace and development and on the need for holistic approaches to peacebuilding, some fundamental challenges remain at the practical level. During the discussion in the relevant Working Groups, these challenges were reflected in the form of questions: how to find a common ground on approaches to conflict management, including on the choice between conflict containment and conflict resolution?; how to reconcile 'sovereignty perspectives' with multilateral efforts as regards protracted conflicts? It should also be noted that the growing diplomatic machinery of the new global actors is reinvigorating attempts to resolve conflicts through dialogue and mediation, especially in their respective neighbourhoods. However, this regionalisation of conflict resolution also entails a certain unilateralism of the local hegemon. Although there is a general consensus that all bilateral agendas are becoming

and should ultimately become multilateral, it was also stressed that global actors tend to behave as unilateral actors at regional level.

As regards the formulation of universal principles, the recognition of the need to react in the case of mass atrocities is slowly gaining ground among those who were so far reluctant to advocate any kind of coercive intervention. India only tacitly acknowledges the legality of such international interventions. She has not expressed too much opposition to action taken in relation to events in Sudan and Burma/Myanmar, but has not offered her endorsement to the reformulation of the responsibility to protect populations in danger that is taking place at the UN. China's official position of non-intervention has to some extent been transformed in practice, her participation in a handful of peacekeeping operations being intensive. Brazil, for its part, has fostered semi-institutionalised coalitions for cooperation on different fronts, such as IBSA (India, Brazil and South Africa), that could have a beneficial impact on regional security. Brazil is also leading the creation of the abovementioned regional security body, but has not yet pursued a meaningful discussion on how to adapt the concept of security and the global security system to the challenges ahead.

For different reasons, the regional security organisations in Europe and Africa are not proving able to prevent and adequately respond to the need to protect civilian



Working Group 1 — Interplay between regional and international security: the case of the Gulf Region

populations. South Africa however prefers that military interventions in Africa be legitimised by the African Union unless the UN Security Council is able to incorporate African views on a consistent basis, and has been actively advocating for a change in the composition of the Council during her term as non-permanent member. Also Brazil and, albeit more cautiously, India contest the present *status quo*, which is seen as an impediment to their full participation in the resolution of international security problems. The lack of efficient security structures at the regional level further contributes to the unilateral attitudes of the main players in their respective neighbourhoods, in contrast with their proclaimed multilateral values. However, in spite of the recent armed conflict between Georgia and Russia, and leaving aside the US-led interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq, the emerging

trend seems to be that of selective and cautious multilateral interventionism to protect populations at risk through the UN Security Council.

There is of course a very close link between global institutional reform and the ability to shape new concepts, but the main challenge remains that of implementation. In particular, the lack of means of action at the disposal of the UN Secretary General and other executive non-political bodies has rendered Security Council Resolution 1296 (2000) on the protection of civilians – as well as other similar resolutions – ineffective in many situations, in spite of no vetoes being raised by the Permanent Five. New challenges to peacekeeping and peacebuilding were also identified, particularly the proliferation of non-state actors whose criminal activities both generate and feed off of low-intensity conflicts, in parallel with difficulties in controlling the trend towards the privatisation and fragmentation of the international response.

However, it was consistently recalled throughout the Conference that prevention is and should remain the main element of the principle of the responsibility to protect (RtoP), starting with the proper early-warning systems and including close monitoring of the most vulnerable groups. The EU is generally seen by most international experts as having great potential in this respect, in spite of the need to significantly strengthen its capacities for crisis management, notably those of a civilian character, in order to have a greater impact on the ground.

Taking into consideration the lessons from the military failures in Iraq and Afghanistan and the inadequacy of conventional war as a way to promote democracy, RtoP as well as the concept of Human Security were proposed as substitutes for the Bush doctrine of pre-emption and even as the foundations of a renewed system of international governance. In this connection, the need to involve local authorities, local political parties and civil society in the international response to conflict situations, notably by the principle 'nothing about you without you,' should be operationalised at all levels of international intervention. Local ownership and bottom-up peacekeeping and peacebuilding are also the basic principles of an efficient prevention strategy as regards the potential and still too frequent resumption of conflict. In this connection, as part of the civilian expertise in conflict resolution, independent mediators and facilitators should help in building long-lasting peace towards and beyond peace agreements on the basis of the local institutions and culture.

#### IV. THE INTERPLAY BETWEEN REGIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Discussions in the Working Groups particularly addressed the relationship between regional and international security in the cases of the Gulf Region and Europe at large. The myriad of proposals made during the last few months on what precise diplomatic tools

and/or sanctions are appropriate as regards the Iran nuclear programme and the conflict in South Ossetia are only the reflection of a major debate on how international and regional levels should jointly articulate effective and fair responses to the most acute security dilemmas.

The Gulf Region is rising economically, politically and diplomatically, in spite of a certain fragility of the Gulf countries. The background is both the decline of Arab leadership – especially that of Egypt – and of Arab nationalism and the rise of Iran, which is to a great extent a result of US policies in Afghanistan and Iraq. The region is facing growing tensions exacerbated by a bipolar situation, with one pole being Iran and the other Israel. Only in this context can the impact of Iran's nuclear programme on regional security and its international implications be properly assessed. In parallel, Iran's nuclear programme has revealed the weaknesses of the NPT and constitutes a serious call to policymakers to prepare for the next NPT review conference in 2010. The main question is whether or not the main global actors are willing to accept Iran as a 'nuclear threshold state' – a threshold which some other countries have already crossed. In this respect, the European approach of seeking to engage Iran actively was widely appreciated by participants.

The question of how to set up an effective regional security architecture in the Gulf was also discussed, and there was some degree of consensus in that only a Gulf Cooperation Council+2, namely Iran and Iraq, formula would be feasible. It was also argued that any regional security architecture will need a basic US-Iranian understanding – perhaps an agreement – in spite of the idea not being welcomed by Arab countries. However, in the light of a possible American troop drawdown in Iraq and perhaps throughout the region, Arab countries may have an opportunity to shape the security design of their region proactively.

As regards pan-European security, it was stressed that none of the international organisations involved, be it the OSCE, the UN or the EU, was able to effectively prevent the conflict in South Ossetia despite visibly escalating tensions during the weeks leading up to the confrontation. It was pointed out that the OSCE had been paralysed by its internal decision-making process, which requires political consent of all member states. The need to rethink and review the OSCE's decision-making process was persuasively argued during the Conference. While the negotiation initiative of the French Presidency of the EU and the deployment the Monitoring Mission (EUMM) were broadly seen as a success and a demonstration of constructive engagement in the region, the EU was criticised for its failure in conflict prevention before the war, including what was perceived as an uncritical approach towards the Georgian government. The fact that different member states pulled in opposite directions had already led to divisions over the relations with Russia that greatly affected EU policy towards the Eastern neighbourhood. The EU should thus develop a comprehensive strategy

for conflict resolution in the former Soviet Union, involving all instruments and frameworks the Union has at its disposal, particularly including the Black Sea Synergy and the Eastern Partnership. The strategy should range from confidence-building measures to the empowerment of civil society, political parties and free media on both sides of the lines of conflict and in the region at large. While there was consensus that the existing security structures in Europe are in deep crisis, participants' views diverged on how to respond to Russian President Medvedev's proposal for a new pan-European Security Treaty. It was argued that it is most important now to demonstrate that the West and Russia are able to engage and achieve something through their engagement on a more functional level and on a case-by-case basis. Some other participants suggested that the West must not shy away from a debate on the European security architecture, and that Russia must be involved in such a debate. The Turkish proposal to create a Caucasus Stability and Cooperation Platform was also discussed as a means of fostering stability and security in the region. Its comprehensive regional character and its positive potential, particularly for Turkish-Armenian relations, were much welcomed, whereas it was stressed that the initiative is not yet inclusive enough and needs to be developed further in communication with regional as well as external actors.

## V. THE INTERSECTION BETWEEN GLOBAL CHALLENGES

In spite of a partial revival of the balance of powers as a system of governance and hence of realism as the prevailing ideology, the protection of human rights and the improvement of democracy should remain the overarching goals of international action. Since these have also been the proclaimed goals of some unilateral armed interventions, there is a need to re-establish consensus on how they can be pursued within the existing multilateral frameworks, which should even be reflected in the eventual redesign of some international institutions. Likewise, the fact that certain very prominent global challenges hijacked the international agenda in the second part of 2008, namely the financial crisis and the war between Georgia and Russia, should not entail a downgrading of a consolidated agenda of issues, the neglect of which will lead to instability and could have a devastating impact on the future of mankind.

The connections between the financial turmoil and questions of energy and climate change are manifold. Slowing global growth already entails a sharp fall in energy prices, which in turn reduces incentives for much-needed investment in infrastructure, new explorations and in better exploiting existing reserves. On the other hand, a smart economic agenda can emerge from the current crisis, e.g. investing in green technologies and jobs as an opportu-

nity to re-launch growth. Among the most acute problems, growing investment in coal plants, mainly in Asia but also in Europe, is simply environmentally unsustainable, while the future of biofuels is still uncertain.

In parallel to the financial crisis, geopolitical tensions continue to affect energy politics and security. The increasing nationalisation of natural resources remains a serious problem across the world, and particularly in Latin America. National oil companies control around 80% of global oil and gas reserves. The concentration of energy resources in a few countries entails huge wealth transfers from energy importers to producers, thereby multiplying the political influence of the latter. The war in Georgia in summer 2008 and ensuing tensions have made the stability of the EU Eastern neighbourhood, a vital region for the transit of energy flows, more volatile. At a global level, the map of energy routes is being progressively redrawn, with Western Africa becoming a primary source for US oil imports and China and India increasing their dependency on the Gulf region. Over the long term, the exploitation of the vast oil reserves discovered off the coast of Brazil will make it a new major oil producer.

It is clear that all emerging powers, which will account for most of the growth of emissions in the next two decades, must be part of a strategy that includes flexible formats and *ad hoc* structures – and which will require in the view of some participants the establishment of an international agency for renewable energy – to deal with the intersections between energy security, sustainable development and climate change. The major obstacle remains the fact that while policy matters are deeply connected, governance is disjointed and this limits its effectiveness. For example, energy and environmental considerations feature only marginally in ongoing trade talks, while disagreements on the definition of ‘environmental’ goods and on the intellectual property regime that could facilitate technology transfers persist. Also, there is little evidence of convergence between developed and developing countries on fixing targets for capping and reducing emissions, albeit with a differentiated approach, nor is there agreement on the parameters against which to measure emissions.

Despite the technological progress, the overexploitation of natural resources, and the (perhaps purely rhetorical) international concern voiced over, the minimum levels of some of humankind’s most basic requirements are not fulfilled. Food and health crises are a recurrent phenomenon and therefore pose long-term challenges that need to be addressed at a structural level, the figure of almost one billion people suffering from chronic malnutrition having remained virtually unchanged over the past few decades. The difficulties in tackling these problems start with the growing demand for proteins (expected to increase 50% by 2020), which requires a dramatic expansion in livestock and poses serious problems of environmental sustainability. Moreover, the fragmentation of actions undertaken by a multitude of international organisations means that some high-profile diseases, such as HIV or malaria, attract a lot of attention, while others that are equally debilitating or lethal receive much less attention and fund-

ing. The need for consistency, which entails integration and optimisation of international and national action, is overwhelming, but it is equally essential that the legal and logistical infrastructure is in place locally in order to be able to assimilate the structural assistance organised on the global level.

The interaction of the global and local levels is evident from the way in which food production has become globalised, which has led to disinvestment in agriculture in many poorer regions. The resulting dependence on food imports in combination with the recent volatility in the global food market has now led to the poorer countries paying high prices for their imports. The rising prices also create major budgetary constraints regarding food aid, the structural outcome being the permanency of the dependence of the poor countries on the rich ones. The implications of this situation for global security are evident, not only due to the fact that many protracted conflicts originate in countries with severe problems of health and food which are consequently aggravated. Security is needed for development and sustainable development promotes security.

## VI. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE EUROPEAN UNION

The advent of a new US administration constitutes a much-needed opportunity to reinvigorate the transatlantic agenda and perhaps to write a new chapter of EU-US relations after a long period of uneven bilateral relations between US and different EU Member States. Europe has to formulate common clear proposals instead of simply reacting to US-led endeavours. The broad long-term agenda should include a genuine discussion on the limits of the use of force and the primacy of basic human rights. In the coming months, perhaps the most pressing aspect of that agenda is the necessary agreement on the specific modalities of supporting the governments of Afghanistan and Pakistan, including additional resources provided by Europe. Since there is consensus on the fact that there is no military solution to the situation in Afghanistan and Pakistan, a need for further European engagement of civilian capabilities seems particularly appropriate. However, the challenge of effectiveness is necessarily linked to a deeper involvement of the recipient governments in the reformulation of the strategy as well as in its implementation. It was constantly stressed during the discussion that only indigenous civilian structures are able to provide enduring peace and reconciliation in the affected areas.

As regards the Russian Federation, economic interdependence between it and the EU is irreversible. The realisation of bipolarity in Europe should thus be framed in strong regional and international interdependence. The need to maintain a fluid relationship between the EU and Russia should not be overshadowed by different perceptions on both sides as regards the post-Cold War

period. In spite of not sharing some of the grievances expressed by Russia, the EU should strive to understand her current position on core security interests. In this broad context, the proposal of a new European security treaty, although still too vague, can be explored, as well as the option to enhance the functioning of those institutions that are inefficient and obsolete. The mediation efforts undertaken under the aegis of the French Presidency and the rapid deployment of an ESDP Monitoring Mission in Georgia, show the commitment and determination of the EU, but it is now necessary to maintain this effort and help move towards a final resolution of the Georgian-Abkhaz and Georgian-Ossetian conflicts. The momentum could otherwise be jeopardised and hence the ability to reinvigorate a pan-European security system capable of preventing further conflict in the region.

European Member States, and the US, should be ready to make concessions in order to upgrade the position of the new global players in the architecture of the present international system, starting with the financial institutions. Only in this way can the trend towards sidelining the main international bodies be avoided and can the international system be fully relevant in the future. Bilateral relations among the main global actors should aim to strengthen regional and international organisa-

tions which are absolutely necessary to maintain stability in the medium and long term. A multipolar system does not provide stability unless it enhances effective multilateralism and regional frameworks that are able to prevent conflicts and build and sustain peace. In the face of the complexity of current challenges, Europe can contribute to develop rules and mechanisms for global governance by sharing the experience acquired in the integration process and backing the ongoing efforts of emerging global players to become rule-makers. Arguably, some of the ideas for international governance proposed by the emerging actors, from peace through development to the importance of mediation and dialogue, are in line with the most characteristic European perspective on the world order. The EU is particularly well placed to channel initiatives for crisis management and crisis resolution with a strong civilian component regarding prevention, monitoring of vulnerable groups, and peacebuilding.

The emergence of new global players is incontestably a prominent feature of the present world order, and is thus receiving increasing attention from the EU institutions and Member States. However, the achievement of effective multilateralism calls for the enhancement of regional schemes and for engagement with small and less 'powerful' countries so as to build consensus on global issues.

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**Abdul-Hadi, Mahdi** – Chairman, Palestinian Academic Society for the Study of International Affairs, Jerusalem

**Allard, Patrick** – Conseiller (Questions économiques internationales), Centre d'Analyse et de Prévision, Ministère des Affaires étrangères et européennes, Paris

**Andersson, Magnus** – Deputy Director, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Stockholm

**Antonenko, Oksana** – Senior Fellow, Programme Director (Russia and Eurasia), International Institute for Strategic Studies, London

**Archer, Toby** – Researcher, The Finnish Institute of International Affairs, Helsinki

**Ardeleanu, Viorel** – Ambassador, Permanent Representative to the PSC, Permanent Representation of Romania to the European Union, Brussels

**Arteaga, Félix** – Senior Analyst on Security and Defence, Real Instituto Elcano, Madrid

**Benaissa, Mohamed** – Former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Morocco, Secretary-General of the Assilah Forum Foundation, Assilah

**Bensarsa, Faouzi** – Energy Adviser, Head of the Energy Security/Nuclear Safety Task Force, DG Relex, European Commission, Brussels

**Bergamini, Patrice** – Chef de Cabinet adjoint du Secrétaire Général/Haut Représentant (PESC, liaison avec l'UP, coordination RSUE), Secrétariat général du Conseil de l'Union européenne, Bruxelles

**Bermann, Sylvie** – Directeur, Direction des Nations unies et des Organisations internationales, Ministère des Affaires étrangères et européennes, Paris

**Biato, Marcel** – Special Adviser, Office of the President of Brazil, Brasilia

**Bindi, Federiga** – Counsellor to Minister Franco Frattini, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Rome

**Bobinski, Krzysztof** – President, Fundacja Unia & Polska, Warsaw

**Borg, Stephen** – Acting PSC Representative, Permanent Representation of Malta to the European Union, Brussels

**Bulut, Esra** – Research Fellow, European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris

**Caballero-Bourdôt, Corine** – Head of External Relations, Press Counsellor, European Security and Defence Assembly, Paris

**Cardoso, Fernando Jorge** – Research Director, Instituto de Estudos Estratégicos e Internacionais, Lisbon

**Cherubini, Piergiorgio** – Ministre plénipotentiaire, Coordinateur PESC/PESD, Ministère des Affaires étrangères, Rome

**Chevallier, Eric** – Porte-parole, Conseiller au sein du Cabinet du Ministre, Ministère des Affaires étrangères et européennes, Paris

**Chuzeville, Aymeric** – Rédacteur au Service de la Politique étrangère et de sécurité commune, Ministère des Affaires étrangères et européennes, Paris

**Cross, Marie** – Ambassador, Permanent Representative to the PSC, Permanent Representation of Ireland to the European Union, Brussels

**Csernelházi, Carmen** – Deputy Member of the EUISS Board, Permanent Representation of Hungary to the European Union, Brussels

**Cutileiro, José** – Ambassador, Special Adviser to the President of the European Commission, Brussels

**Daaboul, Christopher** – Academic, Department of International Relations, Boston University

**Délétroz, Alain** – Vice-President, International Crisis Group Europe, Brussels

**de Moraes Vaz, Maria do Rosário** – Director of Programmes, Instituto de Estudos Estratégicos e Internacionais, Lisbon

**de Vasconcelos, Álvaro** – Director, European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris

**de Villepin, Xavier** – Sénateur honoraire, Paris

**Dietl, Gulshan** – Professor, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi

**Dokos, Thanos** – Director-General, Hellenic Foundation for European & Foreign Policy, Athens

**Domenach, Muriel** – Directeur adjoint, Centre d'Analyse et de Prévision, Ministère des Affaires étrangères et européennes, Paris

**Driss, Ahmed** – Professeur, Université de Tunis

**Dzwonek, Piotr** – First Secretary, Permanent Representation of Poland to the European Union, Brussels

**Edwards, Geoffrey** – Reader in European Studies, University of Cambridge

**Ehteshami, Anoush** – Head, School of Government and International Affairs, Durham University

**El Sayed, Ahmed Maher** – Former Egyptian Foreign Minister, Member of the Shoura Council, Cairo

**El Shobaki, Amr** – Head of Arab-European Studies Unit, Al Ahram Center for Political and Strategic Studies, Cairo

**Eralp, Atila Y.** – Director, Center for European Studies, Faculty of Economics & Administrative Science, Middle East Technical University, Ankara

**Everts, Steven** – Special Counsellor, Cabinet of the Secretary-General/High Representative, General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union, Brussels

**Faaborg-Andersen, Lars** – Ambassador, Permanent Representative to the PSC, Permanent Representation of Denmark to the European Union, Brussels

**Feichtinger, Walter** – Director, Institute for Peace Support and Conflict Management, Vienna

**Feng, Zhongping** – Professor and Director, Institute of European Studies, China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations, Beijing

**Fernández-Arias, Carlos** – Ambassador, Permanent Representative to the PSC, Permanent Representation of Spain to the European Union, Brussels

**Fischer, Sabine** – Research Fellow, European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris

**Flockhart, Trine** – Senior Researcher, Head of the Security and Defence Research Unit, Danish Institute for International Studies, Copenhagen

**Fogada, Juraj** – National PSC Delegate, Permanent Representation of the Czech Republic to the European Union, Brussels

**Foghelin, Jan** – Senior Analyst, Engineering Director, The Swedish Defence Research Agency, Stockholm

**Fota, Iulian** – Head of the National Defence College, Bucharest

**Gaertner, Heinz** – Senior Researcher, Austrian Institute for International Affairs, Vienna

**Gallach, Cristina** – Spokesperson for the European Union High Representative for CFSP, General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union, Brussels

**Garcia-Jourdan, Sophie** – Chargée d'études et de recherches, Institut national des Hautes Etudes de Sécurité, Paris

**Georgakelos, Theodoros** – Ambassador, Director CFSP Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Athens

**Ghiles, Francis** – Senior Fellow, European Institute of the Mediterranean, Barcelona

**Gnesotto, Nicole** – Ancien Directeur de l'Institut d'Etudes de Sécurité de l'Union européenne, Professeur de la Chaire sur l'Union européenne, Conservatoire national des Arts et Métiers, Paris

**Gomes Cravinho, João** – Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Lisbon

**Gooch, Adela** – Programme Director 'Key States', Wilton Park Executive Agency, Steyning

**Grant, Charles** – Director, Centre for European Reform, London

**Grevi, Giovanni** – Senior Research Fellow, European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris

**Hamburg, David** – President Emeritus, Carnegie Corporation of New York, DeWitt Wallace Distinguished Scholar, Weill Cornell Medical College, New York

**Hamburg, Margaret A.** – Senior Scientist, Nuclear Threat Initiative, Global Health and Security Initiative, Washington, DC

**Hartzell, Carl** – Deputy PSC Representative, Permanent Representation of Sweden to the European Union, Brussels

**Hassner, Pierre** – Directeur des Recherches émérite, Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches internationales, Paris

**Helly, Damien** – Chargé de recherche, Institut d'Etudes de Sécurité de l'Union européenne, Paris

**Hilger, Michael** – Head of the Political Section, European Security and Defence Assembly/WEU Assembly, Paris

**Hochleitner, Erich** – Director, Austrian Institute for European and Security Policy, Vienna

**Holl Lute, Jane** – Assistant Secretary-General, Peacebuilding Support Office, United Nations, New York

**Howorth, Jolyon** – Visiting Professor of Political Science and International Affairs, Yale University, Brookline

**Hubinger, Vaclav** – Director, Office of Strategy and Analysis, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Prague

**Hutchings, Robert** – Ambassador, Diplomat in Residence, Princeton University

**Ionescu, Mihail** – General Director, Institute for Political Studies of Defense and Military History, Bucharest

**Ipavic, Metka** – Ambassador, Permanent Representative of the Republic of Slovenia to the PSC, Permanent Representation of the Republic of Slovenia to the European Union, Brussels

**Jacomot, Arnaud** – Head of Secretariat, Western European Union, Brussels

**Jopp, Mathias** – Director, Institut für Europäische Politik, Berlin

**Kamerling, Susanne** - Research Fellow, Security and Conflict Programme, the Netherlands Institute of International Relations (Clingendael), The Hague

**Kaski, Antti** – Counsellor, Deputy PSC Representative, Permanent Representation of Finland to the European Union, Brussels

**Keohane, Daniel** - Research Fellow, European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris

**Kos, Andras** – Ambassador, Permanent Representative to the PSC, Permanent Representation of Hungary to the European Union, Brussels

**Kozicki, Waldemar** – Attaché de Défense, Ambassade de la République de Pologne, Paris

**Kühne, Winrich** – Director, Zentrum für Internationale Friedenseinsätze, Berlin

**Kumar, Mohan** – Deputy Chief of Mission, Embassy of the Republic of India, Paris

**Kumar, Radha** – Trustee Director, Delhi Policy Group and Director, the Nelson Mandela Centre for Peace & Conflict Resolution, Jamia Millia Islamia University, New Delhi

**Landau, Georges** – Senior Counsellor, Brazilian Centre for International Relations, São Paulo

**Lannon, Erwan** – Professor, University of Ghent and College of Europe, Head of the EUISS Office, Brussels

**Laughland, John** – Director of Studies, Institute for Democracy and Cooperation, Paris

**Leão Rocha, António** – Deputy Permanent Representative to the PSC, Permanent Representation of Portugal to the European Union, Brussels

**Lee, Roy** – Professor of Law, Adjunct Faculty, Columbia Law School, New York

**Lenzi, Guido** – Former Director of the European Union Institute for Security Studies, former Diplomatic Advisor to the Minister of the Interior, Rome

**Lepage, Henri** – Transatlantic Strategy Network, Michery

**Lessenski, Marin** – Senior Fellow, Institute for Regional and International Studies, European Policies Initiative, Open Society Institute, Sofia

**Levy, Pierre** – Directeur du Centre d'Analyse et de Prévision, Ministère des Affaires étrangères, Paris

**Lopes, Carlos** – Executive Director, United Nations Institute for Training and Research, Geneva

**Luciani, Giacomo** – Director, Gulf Research Center Foundation, Geneva

**Mabey, Nick** – Founding Director and Chief Executive, E3G Third Generation Environmentalism, London

**Makram-Ebeid, Mona** – Former Member of the Egyptian Parliament, Distinguished Lecturer in Political Science, American University in Cairo

**Massari, Maurizio** – Head of the Policy Planning Unit, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Rome

**Matthiessen, Michael** – Personal Representative for Parliamentary Affairs (CFSP) of the Secretary-General/High Representative, General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union, Brussels

**Meléndez-Ortiz, Ricardo** – Co-founder and Chief Executive, International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development, Geneva

**Meloni, Andrea** – Ambassador, Permanent Representative to the PSC, Permanent Representation of Italy to the European Union, Brussels

**Michalec, Andrej** – Troisième Secrétaire, Ambassade de Slovaquie en France, Paris

**Michel, Pierre** – Conseiller, Comité International de la Croix-Rouge, Bruxelles

**Milders, Robert** – Ambassador, Permanent Representative to the PSC, Permanent Representation of the Netherlands to the European Union, Brussels

**Miltiades, Costas** – Ambassador, Permanent Representative to the PSC, Permanent Representation of Cyprus to the European Union, Brussels

**Möttölä, Kari** – Professor, Special Adviser, Policy Planning and Research, Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Helsinki

**Mousseau, Frédéric** – Policy Adviser, Oxfam GB, London

**Narbona Ruiz, Cristina** – Former Spanish Environment Minister, Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Spain to the OECD, Paris

**Neuhold, Hanspeter** – Professor of International Law & International Relations, University of Vienna

**Nikolov, Krassimir** – Secretary-General, Bulgarian-European Community Studies Association, Sofia

**Olljum, Alar** – Head of Unit, Forward Studies, DG External Relations, European Commission, Brussels

**Ortega, Martin** – Head of Policy Planning, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation, Madrid

**Pais Antunes, Luis** – Director, Instituto de Estudos Estratégicos e Internacionais, Lisboa

**Pedersen, Klaus Carsten** – Director, Danish Foreign Policy Society, Copenhagen

**Peral, Luis** – Research Fellow, European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris

**Pietrzak, Pawel** – General Counsellor to the Under-Secretary of State for Defence Policy, Ministry of National Defence, Warsaw

**Planté, Caroline** – OIE Sub-Regional Representative, World Organisation for Animal Health, Brussels

**Posch, Walter** – Senior Research Fellow, European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris

**Poussenkova, Nina** – Scholar-in-Residence, Carnegie Moscow Center

**Quille, Gerrard** – Researcher/Specialist Security and Defence, Policy Department, European Parliament, Brussels

**Rand, Luule** – Deputy PSC Ambassador, Permanent Representation of Estonia to the European Union, Brussels

**Rehrl, Jochen** – Head of Unit, Ministry of Defence, Vienna

**Ries, Tomas** – Director, Swedish Institute of International Affairs, Stockholm

**Roger, Marin** – Director of Analysis Division, Policy Planning Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tallin

**Saaf, Abdallah** – Ancien Ministre de l'Education, Directeur, Professeur du Centre des Etudes et Recherches en Sciences Sociales, Rabat

**Sbai, Soumaya** – Research Fellow, Member of the CERSS, Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches en Sciences Sociales, Rabat

**Schméder, Geneviève** – Professeur des Universités, Conservatoire national des Arts et Métiers, Paris

**Schmid, Helga Maria** – Director, Policy Unit, General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union, Brussels

**Schroeder, Annelize** – First Secretary (Bilateral), Embassy of South Africa, Paris

**Sick, Gary** – Senior Research Scholar and Adjunct Professor of International Affairs, Columbia University, New York

**Sidiropoulos, Elizabeth** – Director, South African Institute of International Affairs, Johannesburg

**Sīlis, Jānis** – Deputy PSC Representative, Counsellor, Permanent Representation of Latvia to the European Union, Brussels

**Silveira Reis, Alda** – Deputy Director, General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union, Brussels

**Silvestri, Stefano** – President, Istituto Affari Internazionali, Rome

**Singh, Manvendra** – Member of Parliament, Parliament of India, New Delhi

**Sochacki, Myriam** – Political Adviser, Bureau of European Policy Advisers, European Commission, Brussels

**Solana, Javier** – Secretary-General/High Representative of the European Union, General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union, Brussels

**Spruds, Andris** – Deputy Director, Latvian Institute of International Affairs, Riga

**Sramek, Ivo** – Ambassador, Permanent Representative to the PSC, Permanent Representation of the Czech Republic to the European Union, Brussels

**Sterckx, Agnès** – Adjoint à l'Administrateur, Service Administratif Paris, Union de l'Europe Occidentale, Paris

**Stonys, Gintaras** – Deputy PSC Representative, Permanent Representation of Lithuania to the European Union, Brussels

**Surie, Nalin** – Secretary (West), Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi

**Swieboda, Pawel** – President, Demos Europa, Centre for European Strategy, Warsaw

**Szombati, Bela** – Head of Strategic Planning Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Budapest

**Tanner, Fred** – Director, Geneva Center for Security Policy, Geneva

**Thorstensen, Vera** – Economic Adviser, Mission of Brazil to the WTO, Geneva

**Trenin, Dmitri** – Deputy Director, Carnegie Moscow Center

**Triantaphyllou, Dimitrios** – Director General, International Centre for Black Sea Studies, Athens

**Trzaskowski, Rafal** – Research Fellow, Natolin European Center, Warsaw

**Valkanov, Vesselin** – Ambassador, Permanent Representative to the PSC, Permanent Representation of Bulgaria to the European Union, Brussels

**Valladão, Alfredo** – Directeur, Chaire Mercosur, Sciences Po, Paris

**van Eekelen, Willem** – Member, Netherlands Advisory Commission on European Integration, former Secretary-General of Western European Union, The Hague

**Vasickova, Gita** – Section of the Deputy Prime Minister for European Affairs, Office of the Government of the Czech Republic, Prague

**Vines, Alex** – Director, Regional and Security Studies, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, London

**von Goetze, Clemens** – Ambassador, Permanent Representative to the PSC, Permanent Representation of Germany to the European Union, Brussels

**Wallace, William** – Emeritus Professor, London School of Economics and Political Science, European Union Select Committee, the House of Lords, London

**Wiedenhoff, Andreas** – Ambassador, Permanent Representative to the PSC, Permanent Representation of Austria to the European Union, Brussels

**Witney, Nick** – Senior Policy Fellow, European Council on Foreign Relations, Paris

**Wouters, Dirk** – Ambassador, Permanent Representative to the PSC, Permanent Representation of Belgium to the European Union, Brussels

**Wright, Richard** – Director, Crisis Platform and Coordination of CFSP, DG Relex, European Commission, Brussels

**Xu, Weizhong** – Deputy Director, Institute of Asian and African Studies, China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations, Beijing

**Zaborowski, Marcin** – Senior Research Fellow, European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris

**Zanders, Jean Pascal** – Research Fellow, European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris

**Zourabichvili, Salomé** – Ancien Ministre des Affaires étrangères de Géorgie, Leader of the political organisation ‘The Way of Georgia’, Tbilisi

## Journalists

**Abdullaev, Nabi** – Correspondent for Defence News, *The Moscow Times*, Moscow

**Alvarez, Indalecio** – Journaliste, Service International, *Agence France-Presse*, Paris

**De Sousa, Teresa** – Journalist, *Público*, Lisbon

**Jehin, Olivier** – Rédacteur en chef, *Agence Europe*, Bruxelles

**Li, Yao** – Correspondent, *Quotidien de la Clarté* (Chine), Paris

**Murphy, François** – Correspondent, *Reuters*, Paris

**Seale, Patrick** – Author and syndicated columnist, *Al-Hayat* (London), *Gulf News* (Dubai), *Al-Ittihad* (Abu Dhabi), *Saudi Gazette* (Jidda), *Jeune Afrique* (Paris)

**Steinvorth, Daniel** – Turkey and Middle East Correspondent, *Der Spiegel*, Istanbul

## Observers

**Bouvard, Jean-Baptiste** – Stagiaire français, Institut d’Etudes de Sécurité de l’Union européenne, Paris

**Chatzimichalakis, Nikolaos** – Network Administrator, European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris

**Cronin, Gearóid** – English-language Editor, European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris

**Crozier, Sarah** – Communications Officer, European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris

**Ferreira, Carina** – Research Assistant to the Director, European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris

**Gatev, Ivaylo** – Visiting Fellow (Bulgaria), European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris

**Glière, Catherine** – Chef des publications et de la communication, Institut d’Etudes de Sécurité de l’Union européenne, Paris

**Mammadova, Gulnara** – Intern (Azerbaijan), European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris

**Napolitano, Valentina** – Intern (Italy), European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris

**Peyrat, Denis** – Chef de l’Administration, Institut d’Etudes de Sécurité de l’Union européenne, Paris

**Pirozzi, Nicoletta** – Visiting Fellow (Italy), European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris

**Ranck, Hanno** – Head of Communications & IT, European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris

**Rogers, James** – Visiting Fellow (United Kingdom), European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris

**Stumbaum, May-Britt** – Visiting Fellow (Germany), European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris

## Interpreters

**Champalle, Anne** – Interprète, Paris

**Nossereau, Sylvie** – Interprète, Paris

**Stuart, Caroline** – Interprète, Paris



