



GLOBAL CHALLENGES
F · O · R · U · M

Report of the Initial Planning and Review Conference
THE GLOBAL SECURITY CHALLENGES ROUNDTABLE

21-23 September 2009

U.S. Mission to the UN
Geneva, Switzerland

from Challenges... to Opportunities...to Solutions

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Letter to Participants	1
II. Conference Report.....	2
1. Introduction	3
2. Significant existing or emerging threats and risks in different areas	7
2.1. Human security 	8
2.2. Economic security 	11
2.3. Energy security 	13
2.4. Cyber security 	14
2.5. Maritime security 	16
3. Regional and sub-regional political, economic or social geography factors that contribute to risk... ..	17
4. Emerging technological advances and social or economic trends with positive or negative impacts on risk	19
5. Current policy initiatives which could improve the ability of governments, NGOs and/or IOs to tackle threats and address risk	20
6. Other measures needed to improve national and regional capacity to manage threats and risks	21
7. Current levels of support for policy innovation and obstacles to action	23
8. Best case scenarios for policy innovation	24
9. Recommendations: an Inclusive Vision.....	25
10. Conclusion	26
III. Appendix	28
1. U.S. Naval Postgraduate School - University of Geneva Letter of Accord.....	29
2. Talal Abu-Ghazaleh, Keynote, Talking Points, and Concept.....	32
3. Daniel Oliver, Dinner Speech	38
4. Participating Organizations	42
5. Strategic Alignment: Global Partnership Initiative.....	43

REPORT OF THE INITIAL PLANNING AND REVIEW CONFERENCE THE GLOBAL SECURITY CHALLENGES ROUNDTABLE

I. Letter to Participants



THE GRADUATE INSTITUTE | GENEVA

CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL
GOVERNANCE

Dear Participants of the Global Security Challenges Roundtable:

Whether you came from continents afar or crossed town, we heartily thank you for your contributions to the “Global Security Challenges Roundtable” held on 21-23 September 2009, at the United States Mission to the United Nations in Geneva, Switzerland. You were “present at the creation” in a venture that began on the occasion of the United Nations designated “International Day of Peace” with the kick-off event in the historic “Alabama Room” at the City Hall of Geneva, the birthplace of international humanitarian law.

The document that follows provides the formal conference report of your efforts, with a summary of all discussion on a non-attribution basis, consistent with Chatham House rules. We fully achieved our goal of exploring emerging global security challenges from a variety of viewpoints in order to foster global public policy research and educational partnerships at the nexus of globalization and security. Your input and collective recommendations has informed the establishment of a future-oriented, annual global research and development forum, the “GLOBAL CHALLENGES FORUM”, that will be visionary and global security-based, while seeking to help move a changing world from challenges to opportunities to solutions.

We wish to thank Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) President Daniel Oliver and Mr. Talal Abu-Ghazaleh as the distinguished keynote speakers whose remarks were inspirational in guiding the vision of this event toward a permanent endeavor. Their remarks are included for future reference. We are delighted to have witnessed the signing of a Letter of Accord between the NPS President and the University of Geneva and its Rector, Professor Jean-Dominique Vassalli for the furtherance of this endeavor. We congratulate all of the organizers, with a special note of thanks to Dr. Walter Christman of NPS and Dr. Sophie Huber of the Graduate Institute for their leadership in bringing together this historic discussion and producing this report.

The stellar cast of contributors to the Roundtable and this report was assembled from three continents. In analyzing together emerging global risks and threats and in making future recommendations, you represented eleven universities, seven research organizations, three international organizations, five humanitarian non-governmental organizations, and five private sector business entities, as well as three national diplomatic delegations (from China, Switzerland, and the United States). Among you were numerous serving and retired diplomats of Ambassadorial rank, Flag rank military officers, globally prominent businessmen, distinguished professors and research scholars, top university administrators, and leading experts in diverse subjects related to global security in the 21st Century.

Thank you again for your important contributions. We trust this report will be an important document of your participation in the development of a continuing endeavor to address through partnership and collaboration the world’s most pressing problems at the nexus of globalization and security.

Leonard A. Ferrari
Executive Vice President and Provost
Naval Postgraduate School

Daniel Warner
Director
Centre for International Governance

II. Conference Report



Participants attending the entire Roundtable and present for group photo above:

Front row left to right: Nisha Manjooran, Melodie Vaury, Daniel Xu, Cynthia Irvine, Daniel Warner, Talal Abu-Ghazaleh, Leonard Ferrari, John Garofano, Harold Jones, Leo Tin Boon.

Back row: Frank Barrett, Alexandre Hedjazi, Ivan Labra, Karen Guttieri, Mely Caballero Anthony, Werner Schleiffer, Jeffrey Kline, Maria Pineda, CJ Lacivita, Michael Corrigan, Walter Christman, John "Jamie" MacIntosh, Salem Al-Agtash, Craig Smith, Peter Foot, Jeffrey Galli, Clayton Stewart

Participating in the Roundtable but not present for the picture were:

Mie Augier, Frederick "Skip" Burkle, Maria Cattai, Andrew Clapham, Xavier Comtesse, Paul Dembinski, Manuel Escudero, John Gault, Douglas Griffiths, Sanjana Hattotuwa, Sophie Huber, Matthew Lim, Giacomo Luciani, Brunson McKinley, Robert McNab, Alexander Ntoko, Phillippe Oeschlin, Daniel Oliver, Ivan Picte, Jacques Pitteloud, Seeram Ramakrishna, Kelly Richdale, Jose Romero, Daniel Stauffacher, Marc Ventresca, Luzias Wasescha, Barabara Weekes, Hans-Pieter Werner, Theodor Winkler, Huo Yan, Dong Zhihua.

REPORT OF THE INITIAL PLANNING AND REVIEW CONFERENCE THE GLOBAL SECURITY CHALLENGES ROUNDTABLE

“The world is at an important crossroads as we move into the 21st century.

We face new, non-traditional threats from a weakened global economy, international terrorism, energy security, global warming, water shortages, population growth, increased poverty and cyber-terrorism.

These problems are extremely complex and often interrelated. I believe their solutions will require the work of multi-disciplinary, multi-national teams of subject matter experts and policy makers utilizing new technologies and improved approaches to open collaboration.”

**Daniel Oliver,
NPS President**



1. Introduction

Today it is widely accepted that in addition to “traditional” security challenges such as wars between states, nuclear proliferation, etc. a whole host of new issues are emerging which pose significant threats to global security. This development necessitates a new “toolbox” of policies and approaches to complement existing ones.

On 21-23 September 2009, the Centre for International Governance of the Graduate Institute, in collaboration with the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School hosted a roundtable on “Global Security Challenges.” This event was held at the U.S. Mission in Geneva. It was an initiative of the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School and prominent research organizations from the USA, Europe, the Middle East and Asia. It was intended to explore some of the existing applied policy research on security challenges and threats and to facilitate the exchange of multidisciplinary experiences at the interface of globalization and security. The event was attended by more than 60 military and civilian experts as well as by stakeholders from the Geneva international community, China, Jordan, Singapore, Switzerland, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom and the United States.

The roundtable was organized around a series of sessions; each dealt with a different security challenge and risk profile. Topics included energy security; human security; economic security; cyber security and protection of critical infrastructure; and emerging global security issues. In each session participants were asked to consider security-related issues from global and regional perspectives; discuss the driving forces behind the different security issues and their impacts; and examine possible options for multilateral policy initiatives aimed at ensuring better management of emerging security threats. The following report summarizes the main points which emerged from the discussions that took place in each session. The event was conducted in accordance with the Chatham House rule. Accordingly, it does not quote individual participants nor does it make any mention of their affiliation.

The structure of the report reflects the structure of the meeting agenda. It begins with a discussion of the most critical or long-standing risks in each area, and looks at the

potential regional, sub-regional, political, economic, or socio-geographic factors which contribute to them. It then looks at the policy initiatives already being implemented to improve the capacity of governments to meet these challenges, and considers possible future policy options. Finally, it examines technological, social and economic developments that may have an impact on the different threats identified. It concludes with an examination of the conditions and current levels of support for policy options that could be implemented to counter and mitigate the different security threats.

What is security all about?

The event started with a discussion on how to define and frame “security.” It examined in what measure the themes identified could be considered to involve security risks and in turn whether such risks are truly global. Difficulties surrounding the “globalized” nature of security risks were a recurrent theme throughout the two days of the event.

There was broad agreement that issues including energy, cyber space, infrastructure, health and human security do indeed carry a certain level of risk and that this necessitates rapid responses at national, regional and international levels if harmful impacts are to be avoided. There was broad agreement that tackling such issues requires participation of governments, military organizations, civil society, international governmental and non-governmental organizations as well as business.

Despite convergence of opinion, questions were raised about whether all the issues identified genuinely carry national or international security implications and about the wisdom of classifying them as such. Categorizing issues as security risks or threats may have negative impacts. In particular, adopting the language of security could lead to a dilution of the concept of security; equally, it could increase the power of the military and result in abuses by military organizations. Such an approach may also be perceived as posing a threat to the sovereignty of states. Following debate, participants arrived at a loose consensus that the issues identified do have a place in the contemporary security debate. Creating awareness of non-traditional security risks associated with contemporary global issues – energy, cyber space, etc. – is an area often sorely neglected in current discussions about security and needs to be remedied.

REPORT OF THE INITIAL PLANNING AND REVIEW CONFERENCE THE GLOBAL SECURITY CHALLENGES ROUNDTABLE

Dealing with security in a complex world



“The financial and economic crisis, just starting, is a long lasting process of change embodying painful great risks.

Is this the beginning of the end of globalization?

What lessons does the current global crisis offer for cooperation leading to a more stable world and perhaps avoid a real world war?

...Will China continue to purchase US Treasuries or diversify its holdings? In other words, does China have a greater role to play in shaping the state of global development?”

**Talal Abu-Ghazaleh,
Keynote Speaker**

To what extent do traditional approaches to security challenges remain valid today? Traditionally, hard power – meaning primarily military force – has been the approach of choice when addressing security challenges. In the light of new challenges presented by today’s complex world, this may be an outmoded approach. Similarly, existing standards and regulations may no longer be adapted to many of the highly complex processes at work today; equally, this same complexity makes conventional top-down approaches to rule-setting extremely difficult. The plethora of new actors involved in issues like cyber security necessitates an inclusive multi-actor, multi-layered response.

Soft power could offer an alternative approach to dealing with contemporary security threats. Soft power often takes the form of soft law and promotes the use of regulations, as opposed to hard law which is about rules. It implies the use of non-coercive means to influence and shape global affairs. This includes addressing security threats through culture and ideology or through international organizations. In this, communities of interests, interdependent communities, collaboration and voluntary compliance with systems, norms and values play an important role.

Several participants expressed the opinion that the hard power versus soft power paradigm should be replaced altogether by a state-centered versus a non-state actors-centered paradigm; this would provide a more accurate reflection of the current distribution of power as illustrated by the Internet and Internet governance. Other participants insisted that it is only through a combination of soft and hard power that it will be possible to effectively address emerging security challenges.

While soft power mechanisms, including discussion platforms, are critical for communication and exchange, there is a risk that the knowledge generated could result in greater power – possibly in the wrong hands – or an expectation to act. This poses a risk in itself and requires caution. Decision-making and action are not key objectives of soft power approaches. Caution needs to be exercised to avoid the creation of false expectations and misunderstanding. For instance, taking the example of the World Economic Forum (WEF), thanks to its capacity as a convener, bringing together actors and stakeholders for the purposes of discussion and exchange on diverse issues of global concern, this organization yields considerable soft power. As a result, the WEF is often criticized for failing to produce concrete decisions and results from its high-level meetings. However, such outcomes are not in the mandate of the organization. This example demonstrates that it is important to be clear about the mandate and intended outcomes of a soft power approach and to communicate these effectively.



REPORT OF THE INITIAL PLANNING AND REVIEW CONFERENCE THE GLOBAL SECURITY CHALLENGES ROUNDTABLE

2. Significant existing or emerging threats and risks in different areas

Existing and emerging threats to global security discussed during the conference included among others threats to energy security resulting from conflicts; threats to maritime security on account of piracy; threats to economic security posed by environmental degradation; threats to cyber security and critical infrastructure protection posed by hacker attacks; and threats to human security caused by urbanization, water scarcity, and pandemics.





2.1. Human security

Human security encompasses a wide variety of issues including public health emergencies and infectious diseases, new conflicts and post-war situations, climate change and migration, and the financial crisis and deficiencies in international norms.

In an effort to frame health security, participants attempted to define the circumstances under which a health issue should qualify as a national or global security threat. Some argued that only those health issues that pose a threat to the stability of a state or to the international order should be considered global security issues. Others insisted that many health issues, which on the face of it appear harmless, should qualify as global security concerns by virtue of the potential scale of the threat they pose to huge numbers of people.

The use of the term security in relation to health has deep-seated political implications, as health governance is intimately linked to questions of legitimacy, participation and inclusion of a variety of stakeholders. Framing health as a security issue could be interpreted as a form of norm-building. Yet, creating commonly accepted norms on a global level might prove impossible.

During the debate, several Asian participants noted that many of the poorer countries in their region might be reluctant to consider some global health questions as security issues because of the high number of other development-related issues in urgent need of public resources and investment. They might consider it their sovereign right to define priorities in this regard. For instance, taking the example of infectious diseases, there are currently seventy emerging and re-emerging pandemics worldwide; and increased travel and higher population densities facilitate transmission of disease. Despite the fact that several Asian countries have experienced pandemics, including Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS), they remain reluctant to frame these as global security threats. This could be in part because a global security threat would entail surveillance and monitoring of what individual countries are doing to counter the threat. Those countries might view this surveillance as a threat to their sovereignty.



Adopting a slightly different perspective, several participants questioned how framing infectious diseases in terms of security threats influences efforts to combat them. For example, framing HIV as a national security issue has not necessarily resulted in improvements in the situation of those infected with the virus. It might therefore be more effective and morally sound to separate health from security issues. However, it must not be forgotten that in the past the spread of infectious diseases has been known to topple governments and is therefore relevant to stability and security.

REPORT OF THE INITIAL PLANNING AND REVIEW CONFERENCE

THE GLOBAL SECURITY CHALLENGES ROUNDTABLE

The case of post-conflict situations received special attention. In post-conflict circumstances, public health infrastructure is often entirely destroyed, sometimes resulting in more deaths than those caused by preceding hostilities. Statistically, death rates, especially among vulnerable groups like women and children, often spike in the four to five years following the end of a war, though this is not usually obvious. Furthermore, death rates tend not to reach their baseline until about a decade after the end of hostilities. Compounding this, in many post-conflict situations, cease-fires tend to be shaky at best and in 47% of cases hostilities resume a short time after – in Africa this figure is close to 60% – making it near impossible for health systems to recover. New types of conflicts, such as asymmetrical wars, new, low-tech and inexpensive wars run by warlords using child soldiers are leading to higher rates of civilian suffering resulting in often catastrophic public health emergencies. Going forward will necessitate far greater levels of coordination and governance-related activities than traditional emergency relief situations. At present, donor awareness in this area is sorely lacking and aid to post-conflict situations remains largely underfunded.

In addition to public health emergencies, climate change and related resource-scarcity and human displacement issues are major threats to human security. Scarcity of food, water and energy are already resulting in humanitarian emergencies in different parts of the world. Indeed, scarcity-related emergencies are likely to increase as a result of global climate change. Drought and floods have already become more frequent. They affect vulnerable societies, for example farmers in developing countries. Even in developing countries with sufficient resources, malnutrition is becoming more prevalent as a result of high food prices. This has particularly damaging implications: malnourished women are likely to have underdeveloped children, resulting in a vicious cycle of dependence in developing countries.

Climate change also induces major human migration. Over the next 40 years, some 75 million people in the Pacific alone are expected to be displaced or to migrate as a result of sea-level changes. The implications of displacement and migration on such a huge scale are likely to be far-reaching, resulting in security challenges for both the displaced and the host countries. In addition to the problems of illegal immigration, other consequences are likely to include mass unemployment, mounting crime and social unrest. Similarly, mass-migration and the resulting multi-cultural societies are also likely to create dilemmas. Currently relatively very few governments have in place appropriately adapted social policies to respond to this challenge. This could have serious implications. Past experience has shown that failed integration can result in higher incidences of criminal activity or even provide fertile ground for terrorist activity.



Some participants singled out the current financial and economic crisis as a completely new type of threat to human security, which cannot be solved using existing disaster-response mechanisms. The impacts of the crisis which began in industrialized nations spread to developing countries within months, with consequences of an unexpected magnitude. Prior to the crisis, several of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), for example, halving poverty and hunger, appeared to be within reach; today much of this progress has been undone and the number of people living on less than 1 U.S. dollar per day has increased significantly. The 2005-2008 food crisis had already taken its toll by increasing the number of people living in extreme poverty; the financial crisis seems to have exacerbated the situation by adding another 180 million people to the ranks of the very poor. Compounding this, the World Bank has estimated that core funding for humanitarian and development projects will be further compromised as a result of the crisis. The World Food Program (WFP), for example, has only received about one-third of the contributions required to satisfy demand for food aid. Equally, the drop in remittances, which are expected to decline by between 4% and 15% as a direct result of the crisis, will deal a further blow to developing countries. Overall, current mechanisms for responding to the crisis seem to be too diffuse with too great an emphasis on cash resources. What is needed is a system which combines the strengths of the monetary system with those of the humanitarian system.

Several participants commented on the many deficiencies in the current response mechanisms available to the international community to deal with emerging challenges. The current United Nations (UN) humanitarian system differentiates between man-made disasters, like civil wars, and natural disasters, such as floods. In the mid-1990s, the UN created the Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP) as part of efforts to ensure higher and more secure funding for humanitarian operations. Although the system represents a step forward, it almost always fails to secure the necessary levels of funding with shortfalls ranging from as high as 40% to a catastrophic 85% in some cases, mainly for recurrent emergencies. Part of the explanation for this lies in the failure to remove the political dimension from supposedly neutral humanitarian financing.

Looking more closely at conflict situations, deficits in international norms pose a major challenge to human security. International humanitarian law only applies to conflicts between states; as such it cannot be used to address many of today's conflict situations, especially those involving non-state actors or rebels. Any cease-fire agreement needs to include all belligerent parties, including non-state actors. Yet, they are neither accepted as signatories to treaties, nor are they bound by international law – yet. In addition to the legal issue, there is also a political problem: that of legitimacy. Should non-state actors be accepted as interlocutors by governments? Should their wrong-doings be discussed in the Human Rights Council? Citing by way of example the PKK in Turkey or the FARC in Colombia, participants expressed concerns that negotiating with these non-state actors risks giving them an undeserved degree of legitimacy. By that same token, focusing attention in the Human Rights Council on human rights abuses committed by non-state actors, such as the Hezbollah or the Tamil Tigers, might provide governments with an excuse to wash their hands of their own responsibilities. Resolving this dilemma remains a major challenge to human security.



2.2. Economic security

What is economic security and how can it be defined? For some the simple condition of having an income which guarantees a decent standard of living represents economic security. For others it is the availability of stable resources now and for the foreseeable future which constitutes economic security. Whatever the point of view, it seems clear that economic security goes beyond mere physical survival to include a situation wherein an individual or groups of individuals and communities have sufficient resources to participate in society economically, socially and politically. Attempts to evaluate current economic security on a national and global level, resulted in participants pointing out that while globalization and particularly trade have resulted in increased standards of living, they have not been without their problems and that there have been with both winners and losers in the process. If economic security is defined in terms of stability, then globalization and trade, with their consequent reliance on foreign suppliers, are in fact a threat to security. That said, trade partners have been shown to be less likely to engage in conflict with each other than non-trading states. Looked at from this perspective, trade could be seen as fostering national and global security. Above all, this discussion revealed diverging perspectives on security and the difficulties inherent in defining the concept when faced with new challenges that fall outside the traditional security paradigm.



Looking to the future, certain sectors, such as the energy, telecommunications and pharmaceuticals sectors, will play an increasingly important role in economic security. Similarly, the development of environmentally-friendly processes and materials will also be a key factor. In this respect, natural resources are of vital importance. In order to achieve economic security countries with limited resources will need to maintain stable relations with foreign suppliers. Countries with an abundance of resources, on the other hand, will need to diversify their exports to include products that are less dependent on global market price fluctuations. Russia and Saudi

Arabia as well as several developing countries in Africa are examples of countries where economic diversification is limited. By that same token, several highly-developed countries have witnessed a shift from manufacturing to services-based economies. While outsourcing the majority of their manufacturing holds tremendous economic appeal, it does pose a security risk. Such nations become highly dependent on nations with production capacity. In the event of a conflict, an inability and/or failure to produce certain strategic products could pose a serious threat.

Turning their attention to the global economic system, participants highlighted several significant changes which have served to exacerbate existing security challenges. Among these figure the rise of inequality across the globe and within countries and the seemingly changed status of humans in relation to the economy: today, people are perceived as servicing the economy rather than the economy being at the service of the human being.

The complexity of the current world order and the diversified and multi-layered structures that characterize today's institutions and processes bring with them a whole new set of security challenges. These institutions and processes are expensive to regulate and manage and are often beyond the control of their supposed agents, the nation states. The rise of transnationalism has served to further reinforce this trend with private actors interfering with or contributing to domains previously reserved for public actors. For example, multi-national corporations (MNCs) are gaining increasing dominance and figuring more prominently in international relations. According to available data, the world's 800 largest non-financial companies generate 10% of global GDP, but only employ 1% of the world's workforce; this relationship is expected to become increasingly disproportionate. However, thanks to their marketing and distribution, MNCs do add value; this increases their share of global GDP from 10% to more than 40%. Given the scale of their influence, some believe that MNCs are now "architects" of the world economy. For this reason, labeling countries as trade winners and losers is too simplistic. World trade is more about flows of goods and funds between and within companies; MNCs should therefore be considered new primary actors of the world economy. Furthermore, these MNCs are also able to co-define the "rules of the game" by influencing the creation of regulatory frameworks. Given this considerable power, there is a feeling that it would be fair to expect MNCs to assume a leadership role in economic security. However, MNCs rarely acknowledge the extent of their responsibility and there are no legal frameworks to provide leverage in this regard.

Several participants considered innovation as critical to economic security. Small to medium enterprises have a crucial role to play in this respect. For instance, taking the example of pharmaceuticals, today half of all patents are no longer registered to large firms but to universities and small start-up firms; even if in the long term they are likely to be bought up by bigger enterprises. Innovation in this field therefore rests with a large and diverse group of actors, which is hard to define and difficult to regulate. From a micro-economic point of view, the challenge, especially for large businesses, is one of intellectual property (IP) to protect investment in innovation. In general, there was agreement that public and private investment in innovation will be crucial. However, they noted that if the percentage of GDP invested in research by governments is considered, EU countries are falling far short of necessary investment. Although the stated goal for the level of investment has been set at 3% of GDP, current investments in innovative technology revolve around the 0.9% mark. Other governments, for example those of South Korea, China or Japan have already reached the 3% goal. On a related question, participants discussed government stakes in the IP of some companies, given that company innovations are often stimulated by government-financed fundamental research. Most participants were of the opinion that the role of governments is to provide initial investment in basic research without claiming ownership of IP so as to allow for innovation in the private sector and by association therefore, growth of the economy.

REPORT OF THE INITIAL PLANNING AND REVIEW CONFERENCE

THE GLOBAL SECURITY CHALLENGES ROUNDTABLE



2.3. Energy security

Supply and demand-side challenges took up a considerable part of the debate on energy-related security threats. Supply-side challenges include the risks associated with exploration of new oil fields; problems inherent to the transport of oil and gas; and conveyance to and reception at destination hubs. Maritime transportation was under much scrutiny since it raises growing concerns surrounding pollution, terrorism and piracy. Demand-side challenges include satisfying growing demand for energy in a world facing increasing resource constraints. One solution rests in increasing energy efficiency and diversifying energy sources to reduce dependency on oil and limit carbon emissions. However, achieving this remains a major challenge.



The differing perspectives between energy suppliers, for example oil-producing countries, and energy consumers, add another layer of complication to the debate. For oil-producing countries, energy security is first and foremost a question of policy tackling incentives for further investment in production. For consumer countries, like the United States, security of the energy supply chain takes precedence. This takes on added importance when one considers that the U.S. Army is the world's largest single consumer of energy.

Combining technical and political approaches to address both the supply and consumption of energy, it appears that energy security is not simply about availability, it is also about timely investment in infrastructure. The current lack of sufficient energy infrastructure constitutes a major source of energy-supply insecurity. This paucity of infrastructure has been attributed to the failure of politicians to give long-term investment signals to the private sector. Equally, incentives for investment in renewable energy remain unstable and weak. Short-term subsidies do not provide sufficient guarantees for investments in renewable energy which typically require 20 to 30-year timeframes. Increased investment in energy infrastructure by the private sector is urgently required. This need is all the more pressing given that lack of investment is resulting in a failure to maintain sufficient idle capacity, which will be vital as a back-up in the event of a failure or overload of current energy-supply systems. Given that there are today no incentives provided to business to maintain this idle capacity, the responsibility falls firmly on the public sector to implement clear public policies to ensure that sufficient capacity is maintained.





2.4. Cyber security

The rise of the Internet and other networks has brought with it a whole new set of security challenges, not to mention threats to national infrastructure. Unlike the energy sector, telecommunications is not bound by physical borders. The near impossibility of simply shutting down and impeding access creates a plethora of security challenges which require both technological and policy responses.

A challenge repeatedly raised by participants was the lack of a globally applicable legal framework to address Internet security governance. Unlike military conflicts, at present, there are no legal mechanisms that could be invoked to address a cyber attack perpetrated by one country against another, for example. Addressing such a situation would require prior bilateral agreements between the states concerned. On an even more basic level, there is no global consensus on what constitutes a cyber security crime. This deficiency assumes a whole new level of importance, given that criminals are not the only source of cyber threats; a considerable number of individuals seek to challenge themselves intellectually and in so doing have made governments their prime targets. Participants noted that while states can be victims of cyber attacks, they can also be perpetrators. In particular, participants drew attention to regimes which target NGO websites and infrastructure to prevent the dissemination of unfavorable advocacy and the spread of information. Similarly, there have been instances of governments trying to exercise censorship by shutting down communication channels such as Voice-over-IP (VOIP). Participants highlighted a case in India, where VOIP was shut down on the grounds that the channel was being used by terrorists. Similarly, in South Africa, VOIP activities are closely monitored. Such government intrusions will likely increase since, unless a standard is found for IP trace-back, VOIP communication remains beyond the control of governments.



While websites and networks are the more obvious targets, cyber attacks also target undersea cables and data “farms.” Effectively chasing down cyber criminals not only requires the creation of a revamped legal framework, but also of a new process with synchronized cross-border cooperation. All stages in the process from the detection of an attack, to the identification of its origin, to transmission to the local police, to arrest and eventual prosecution of the perpetrators would need to be streamlined. Currently no cross-border processes exist to manage this threat.

Among the mechanisms to reduce IT security risks, participants suggested implementing more secure identity management mechanisms and various forms of proxy identification. Passwords are easy to crack; identity and access cards are notoriously insecure with as many as 45% either forged or stolen. Technological solutions to these problems include provision of better encryption methods, biometric passports, facial recognition systems or finger prints for network access. Yet, technology has evolved faster than policy; privacy issues will need to be addressed if biometric systems are to be used on a broader scale. Who should have access to the stored biometric information without encroaching on the privacy of individuals? The same question applies to private data of individuals available online, for example through social

REPORT OF THE INITIAL PLANNING AND REVIEW CONFERENCE

THE GLOBAL SECURITY CHALLENGES ROUNDTABLE

networking sites like Facebook or MySpace, not to mention the danger posed by data mining. There appears to be an incompatibility between the quest for anonymity in computing, and aforementioned efforts to increase and improve identification and authentication technology.

Cyber security encompasses more than just Internet security. It also applies to networks managing critical infrastructure like nuclear power stations, banking facilities, e-voting, or border access. The subversion of such networks represents a major challenge. Recently, the Linux operating system was found to contain a loophole which enabled the external control of computers running this operating system. This discovery was exploited within an hour of being revealed on the Internet. This clearly demonstrates that the potential exists to subvert major infrastructure with no warning. This represents a major challenge in efforts to combat cyber criminals because motive, means and opportunity must be addressed simultaneously – a huge undertaking.

When the Internet is used to manage high-risk infrastructure, for example, energy facilities, the system becomes even more vulnerable. Today, many institutions are moving away from server-client to web-based networks. Under these conditions, back-up management procedures in the event of Internet failure take on an added importance. Given that the Internet was originally conceived of as a U.S.-only network for trusted individuals, security was never a high priority. As a result, some of the early decisions taken during the creation of the Internet as well as its unplanned expansion into a global infrastructure have now become liabilities in terms of security and reliability. The example was given of recent cyber attacks perpetrated in Georgia and Estonia, both directed at critical infrastructure. These two cases highlight the importance of the need to include back-up systems in infrastructure design not only to protect against technical failure, but to protect systems from political attacks.





2.5. Maritime security

Maritime security carries its own specific risks and challenges. The world's oceans play a role in and influence several other security-related areas. For instance, the world's oceans play a crucial role in mitigating global climate change. In addition, they determine weather patterns, are a key vector of transportation and illegal migration, the scene of piracy, host undersea cables, and are subject to fishing rights. Given the complexity of the marine system, there is an urgent need to create an international framework to govern the world's oceans. Although regional frameworks do exist, they are subject to numerous challenges, while bilateral agreements are proliferating. Yet, a holistic approach is missing. Participants stressed the need for the institutionalization of information exchange in order to breed trust among participating nations. On the more concrete issues of piracy and illegal drug smuggling, participants once again highlighted the need for international agreements but also underlined the importance of addressing the root causes of these criminal activities, especially in the offenders' countries of origin.



The Military Sealift Command hospital ship USNS Mercy navigates alongside USS Abraham Lincoln after arriving on station near Banda Aceh, Sumatra, Indonesia, Feb. 3, 2005. U.S. Navy photo by Petty Officer 3rd Class Gabriel R. Piper

REPORT OF THE INITIAL PLANNING AND REVIEW CONFERENCE

THE GLOBAL SECURITY CHALLENGES ROUNDTABLE

3. Regional and sub-regional political, economic or social geography factors that contribute to risk

Throughout the conference, participants used case studies to illustrate security risks and highlight the specific conditions that create or influence a particular threat. This approach was particularly appropriate in the discussion on energy and health security.



Geopolitical and geo-economic factors play a decisive role in energy security. For instance, in Russia and many of its neighboring states, any political friction between energy suppliers and consumers endangers energy security. In response to this volatile situation, the United States and the European Union have attempted to diversify their energy sources by strengthening their efforts to access the oil reserves of Central Asia and the Caucasus. These efforts have yielded several security-related advantages; upstream-downstream cooperation creates interdependent relationships between suppliers and refiners. Another example is that of Venezuela and the United States; despite political discord energy relations remain unaffected.

Politics also shapes the search for energy security. For example, Iranian oil and gas from Kurdistan are currently unutilized has a purely political explanation. From an energy perspective, however, it is not an advisable situation. Finally, while energy security is affected by political friction, energy-related issues can also cause political friction. Examples include the Niger Delta and Southern Sudan where the failure to share energy revenues with the regions where these revenues were generated has created large-scale conflicts.

Drawing on lessons learned from the example of energy projects in the Caspian Sea, participants stressed that energy security must not be allowed to become the monopoly of a single country. Needs of different countries have to be integrated, especially since energy security often directly impacts upon regional security. Participants gave the example of the Baku-Tiflis-Ceyhan pipeline, where attempts to create energy security have failed to provide state, societal and environmental security. Furthermore, the strategy of making the pipeline bypass Iraq and Armenia, as well as Southern Georgia, an area with a large population of Armenians, might have been helpful for increasing energy security but was a lost opportunity in terms of regional security. Instead of helping to integrate the Armenian minority, it increased ethnic tensions. Generally, participants felt that, as the backbone of regional improvement in the Caspian Sea, energy development has failed to fulfil its promise of mitigating social, environmental and energy insecurities in the region.

Participants also analyzed factors contributing to higher risks related to health issues. They looked at the different levels of risk posed by differing health situations and highlighted the differences in perception between Western states and, for example, Asian states. Differences in perception beg the question about whether it is truly possible to create a common health security agenda on a global scale. Different states have different priorities when it comes to health issues. While

developing countries in Asia are focused on eliminating malnutrition and prefer to attribute their resources accordingly, the USA and the EU might be more concerned with the consequences of a pandemic. This is one of the reasons why in Asia regional frameworks are more popular than global frameworks. These regional approaches, also known as security communities, can be formal or informal, but since many Asian states are small and have to cater to many and diverse emerging challenges, they are more adapted to their needs than overarching international structures.

REPORT OF THE INITIAL PLANNING AND REVIEW CONFERENCE

THE GLOBAL SECURITY CHALLENGES ROUNDTABLE

4. Emerging technological advances and social or economic trends with positive or negative impacts on risk

The root causes of many of the threats and risks discussed during the roundtable event can be found in changes or developments in the domains of technology, society or environment. It is likely that future developments in these three areas will influence these threats in turn affecting telecommunications, energy and climate.

The advent of open source systems in the field of telecommunications is a powerful new development. Bringing together millions of actors to develop freely accessible software on a web-based platform is a strong symbol of distributed power. Other potential uses for this form of cooperation should be explored, for example in the domain of security. Similarly, continual advances in the development of telecommunications appliances, including mobile phones, cameras and wireless Internet facilities provide an opportunity to increase exchange of information and communication and therefore to counter security threats.

Turning to the question of energy, participants discussed traditional resources like oil and gas; however they also repeatedly stressed the importance of developing alternative sources of energy. As the transport sector explores alternative technologies, it is likely there will be considerable increases in electricity production required to satisfy additional demand. While there is awareness that current electricity production, in the USA for example, based mainly on coal and nuclear power, is not sustainable, an alternative solution has yet to be found. Participants stressed the importance of clean electricity production and rethinking the future of the energy mix. The rapid pace of change in the energy field in some countries makes it difficult to consider the issue on a global level.



Participants also noted that there are currently two billion people on the planet without access to electricity. Growing demand will pose an additional challenge to energy security in the future.

Climate change remains a major unknown and uncontrollable cross-cutting source of insecurity. Given that already vulnerable populations in developing countries are the ones most likely to be affected by climate change, this increases human security risks. As noted previously, one of the greatest risks of climate change will come from successive major waves of migration as populations flee rising sea-levels.

Concluding this part of the discussion participants noted that the different phenomena including climate change, energy security and telecommunications are too often looked at in silos. There is a need for an integrated and multi-sectoral approach. So far, the strength of the international community rests in its ability to identify the challenges; unfortunately, it has proved less successful in efforts to address them.

5. Current policy initiatives which could improve the ability of governments, NGOs and/or IOs to tackle threats and address risk

Over the course of the different sessions, participants repeatedly noted that a lack of information, communication and overall transparency contribute greatly to exacerbating security challenges. They noted that one approach recently adopted as part of efforts to palliate for this in the area of energy security is the Joint Oil Data Initiative (JODI). Under this initiative, participating nations disclose information on oil production and stocks. The meeting agreed that initiatives such as this one are a useful first step towards increasing transparency.

As part of efforts to better address security risks, several participants welcomed the approach taken by some organizations of conducting simulations with all concerned stakeholders. There was widespread consensus that such table-top exercises can help to streamline cooperation among actors from different domains, and that they can be very effectively applied to different security scenarios.

Still, beyond analysis of good practices, participants urged the drafting of binding international agreements as part of efforts to counter global risks. For instance, participants exhorted the International Telecommunications Union (ITU) to take the lead in creating a mechanism to resolve many cyber security challenges. Originally established to standardize and regulate international radio and telecommunications, the ITU could now focus on efforts to regulate the Internet and online communication. The ITU is already taking steps in this direction and frameworks for cooperation in five areas are already being planned. These include legal measures, technical and procedural measures, organizational measures and capacity-building. A persistent difficulty is identifying the actors who should be involved in this issue. At present, the ITU is working with governments, business and international organizations, civil society and research institutions. Others will be identified as the process progresses.

6. Other measures needed to improve national and regional capacity to manage threats and risks

Participants went on to discuss a series of innovative measures needed to improve national and regional capacity to address new threats. Turning their attention to the crucial issue of risk management, participants reiterated their belief that improving the current situation requires increased communications and better exchange on security risks at a global level. They insisted on the necessity of creating more international standards and agreements to govern risk management. Participants also made a number of specific policy recommendations to tackle energy security, health security and cyber security challenges.

Improved management of energy security will require specific and timely signals to encourage the private sector to invest in energy production. Given the difficulties involved in predicting the evolution of the future energy mix and anticipating the outcomes of future discussions on climate change (e.g. the Copenhagen Conference and beyond), it will be up to the public sector to create incentives for investment. The public sector will also have to take responsibility for funding and maintaining the extra capacity needed to provide back-up for existing energy systems.

On the topic of health security, participants noted the need to come up with common definitions for the conditions that constitute health security risks and to set priorities for action. For instance, it was agreed that tackling epidemics requires a robust and integrated international system, while tackling infant mortality should be the responsibility of national health systems. This implies the need for both global and national health security strategies with the main challenge being one of how best to manage both simultaneously. Focusing on pandemics, the meeting agreed on the value of the nationally and internationally accepted “multi-sector, multi-level response and preparedness” strategy. However, participants noted that operationalizing this strategy remains a challenge. While attempts to achieve cooperation led by different actors like the WHO, national ministries of health and health NGOs are commendable, turf wars between and among organizations are likely to render them inefficient. There is a need to explore different ways to operationalize the multi-sector, multi-level approach.

“This could mean establishing a new ‘Global Challenges Forum’ to provide faculty and students from all of our institutions throughout the globe, and others to come, access to the best ideas, tools and resources. It also means encouraging collaboration, activities and events that give voice to intellectual discourse on a multi-national and multi-cultural basis.”

*Daniel Oliver,
NPS President*



Finally, addressing the issue of cyber security, participants recommended the establishment of mechanisms to bring together technical expertise and law enforcement. They also reiterated their concerns about the lack of cross-border legal frameworks. It was felt that a common framework will not only facilitate the prosecution of cyber criminals but also facilitate the detection of cyber attacks, for example through the creation of a global response centre. Looking at software risks, participants remarked that there is too much “buddy” software in the public domain, and that more standardization is required along with more and better IT training for people using software in security-related fields.

REPORT OF THE INITIAL PLANNING AND REVIEW CONFERENCE

THE GLOBAL SECURITY CHALLENGES ROUNDTABLE

7. Current levels of support for policy innovation and obstacles to action

Faced with so many diverse and often interlinked global security risks, participants repeatedly expressed their opinion that tackling these problems will require a holistic approach and a system-level change. The last such change dates back to the post-World War II era and the Bretton Woods Conference. However, the policy environment is much more complex today than at the time of Bretton Woods and the post-World War II context. In theory, world wars should not be the only sources of innovation and global reform of existing structures or the creation of new ones. Yet, despite this, no major international organizations have been created recently; most of the current intergovernmental organizations located in Geneva were founded after World War II. Following their creation, even incremental attempts at reform have been at best slow and at worst ineffective. Ironically, it was during the Second World War that leaders made efforts to conceptualize a post-war global order and initiated the Bretton Woods Conference. Since then, similar clear-sightedness and strategic thinking on the part of leaders of the international community seem to be lacking, a fact manifested by the Cold War and the current crisis. In a similar vein, participants argued that today many countries are well-administered but under-governed. While this works in time of relative calm, it can prove fatal at times of crisis when there is a real need for leadership to bring about policy innovation.

Roundtable participants pinpointed several factors which they identified as obstructing policy innovation. These include a lack of adequate and good quality communication and exchange of information on global challenges. Similarly, the lack of a clear definition and common understanding of these challenges often puts further brakes on cooperative action. For example, participants had a different understanding and divergent views of what constitutes terrorism. While some considered it in the same category as organized crime, other participants equated it with questions of identity since it involves political goals. Such divergent views have important consequences when dealing with supposed terrorists, especially when faced with parties whose position is “we do not negotiate with terrorists.” Participants agreed that in the interest of cooperation it is important to iron out problems of definition to overcome such differences.

Turning their attention to the field of human security, participants stressed the progress that has been made in policy surrounding civil-military cooperation. While parts of the humanitarian community have and continue to resist such cooperation for fear of being associated with the military, participants acknowledged that the approach has nonetheless at times yielded several positive outcomes. Participants suggested that it would be useful to pursue such cooperation and take it to a higher level. For instance, military personnel could be involved in reconstruction and development through, for example, provision of basic health education for populations in times of conflict.



8. Best case scenarios for policy innovation

Many participants expressed their pessimism at the prospects for major policy innovation in the absence of greater external pressure. Several argued that major policy innovations in areas such as climate change or cyber security will not take place until the most powerful international players begin to suffer negative effects.

Other participants, however, were of the opinion that there were several positive developments that render the current climate ripe for policy innovation and renewed cooperation, particularly in areas such as climate change mitigation or prevention of economic crises. Among these developments participants pointed to the presence in Washington, DC of a new U.S. administration, as well as the positive developments represented by the different intergovernmental meetings including the Copenhagen Climate Conference, which provided renewed hope and fresh impetus for cooperation in efforts to overcome the new global security challenges.



REPORT OF THE INITIAL PLANNING AND REVIEW CONFERENCE

THE GLOBAL SECURITY CHALLENGES ROUNDTABLE

9. Recommendations: An Inclusive Vision



- The Global Challenges Forum should allow for **tools, concrete approaches, and practical engagements** to be made available to social networks and initiatives that currently don't have access to institutional mechanisms
- Drawing inspiration from “open source” community approaches, the Global Challenges Forum should cultivate an **ethic of participation** to **maximize the value** of **diversity and perspectives** available across the global security landscape
- **Mixing traditional and emergent conference cultures**, it should bring together institutional knowledge with the vigor of innovation
- Building sustainable, decentralized, generative collaborative networks it should **push the boundaries of innovation** to address emerging global threats and risks
- Tapping into **mass collaboration** and **social production models** that are creating the “wealth of networks,” the Global Challenges Forum should become a “forum of forums” to energize global partnerships
- The Forum should **promote a platform** to include the next generation of leadership, which is still working to define its frame of reference to engage in global security challenges
- It should serve as a way to **refresh and reinvigorate existing institutions** by recognizing new educational models and social entrepreneurship possibilities
- It should establish **dialogue and shared research** between non-traditional partners (e.g., NATO-China) about emerging global security challenges (i.e., pandemics, climate, cyber, transportation, energy, education, economics)

10. Conclusion

Concluding two days of discussion, participants noted that the extent of current security challenges gives serious cause for concern. Further exchange is needed to debate the issues further and devise policy options to overcome them. Although the two-day roundtable only scratched at the surface of the complexity, inter-linkages and consequences of these security risks, participants felt that discussions between experts drawn from different fields and backgrounds had been a fruitful exercise. Drawing on the analogy of open-source versus proprietary software, some participants likened the discussions to an attempt to create an “open-source security society.” Yet, participants were still undecided about the extent to which some of the issues identified were genuinely security risks and therefore globally relevant.

Given the plethora of threats and risks discussed during the roundtable, some participants pointed out that, while every effort should be made to counter these risks, there is also a risk of indulging in hysterical over-reaction. Several participants cautioned that the world would have to accept that security can never be absolute. Finally, they cautioned that any counter-risk measures must be weighed against their possible adverse effects.

Participants were particularly pleased at the choice of Geneva as the location for the roundtable event. Switzerland’s neutral status as well as the international character of Geneva with its huge number of international governmental and non-governmental organizations and research institutions made Geneva an ideal setting for exchange and community-building. In light of Geneva’s status as an international center for humanitarian organizations, some participants suggested that it might be a particularly good location for further dialogue between military and humanitarian actors. Looking forward, participants suggested other topics that could form the basis of similar discussions including global crisis management and the role of research in global policy development.



III. Appendix

REPORT OF THE INITIAL PLANNING AND REVIEW CONFERENCE
THE GLOBAL SECURITY CHALLENGES ROUNDTABLE

1. U.S. Naval Postgraduate School - University of Geneva Letter of Accord



On 22 September 2009, President Daniel Oliver and Rector Jean-Dominique Vassalli signed a Letter of Accord between the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School and the University of Geneva to guide future collaboration in the area of globalization and public policy.

Letter of Accord



**LETTER OF ACCORD TO COLLABORATE
BETWEEN
THE UNITED STATES NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
AND
THE UNIVERSITY OF GENEVA**

Subject: *Exploring potential activities between the Naval Postgraduate School and the University of Geneva*

Considering that:

The United States Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) and the University of Geneva have been exploring areas of common interest, competences, and possible collaboration for over twelve months.

Both institutions have jointly worked on the development of educational materials supported by a film symposium, and potential curricula for a series of academic options in the area of globalization and public policy, and have established that they have specific and complementary resources and networks.

They jointly recognize the importance of academic exchanges in terms of teaching and research, as well as the special opportunities provided by strengthening contacts between Faculty members of both institutions and students at both institutions.

Accordingly:

The University of Geneva and the Naval Postgraduate School declare their intent to develop research and academic programs concerning issues of globalization, policy and security, and other issues of mutual interest by drawing upon the unique resources of the international community of Geneva.

REPORT OF THE INITIAL PLANNING AND REVIEW CONFERENCE
THE GLOBAL SECURITY CHALLENGES ROUNDTABLE

The activities undertaken will be discussed and more fully described in Program Agreements to be drafted by the parties and which would cover particular collaborations, prepared as and when necessary.

The two participating Parties express their intention to encourage exchanges between students, researchers, professors and other members of their respective teaching staffs, in the fields they represent.

The parties intend to direct efforts towards establishing other forms of scholarly collaboration, such as the organization of certificates, colloquia, seminars, conferences, and cooperative research projects, including the exchange of relevant academic material.

The parties will designate representatives for matters relating to academic coordination and the execution of collaborative activities. The representatives will propose programs of exchanges and/or other collaborative options to be discussed and approved in due course.

Nothing in this mutual letter of accord obligates either party to the ultimate establishment of such a program of cooperation, which if it occurs will be carried out consistent with the laws and regulations of each participating organization, subject to the availability of funds.



Daniel T. Oliver
President
Naval Postgraduate School

Date 22 Sept. 2009



Jean-Dominique Vassalli, Ph.D.
Recteur
University of Geneva

Date Sept 22, 2009

2. Talal Abu-Ghazaleh, Keynote, Talking Points, and Concept

GOING FROM CHALLENGES TO OPPORTUNITIES... Future Peace & Security Risks

Tabal Abu-Ghazaleh
Keynote Speech
Global Challenges Forum

at the US Mission to the UN
21 – 23 September 2009
Geneva, Switzerland

FIRSTLY

We live in a world of endless multiplying and growing challenges to peace and security, including:

- Risks created by nature and man in partnership and in complicity.
- Risks that are cause and effect at the same time.
- But let me at the outset remind us of Article's saying: "I love Socrates, but I love truth more".

I accordingly plead for your tolerance, and if you disagree with me, as I expect many would, remember that Winston Churchill said: "The greatest lesson in life is to realize that idiots are sometimes right".

REPORT OF THE INITIAL PLANNING AND REVIEW CONFERENCE
THE GLOBAL SECURITY CHALLENGES ROUNDTABLE

GOING FROM CHALLENGES TO OPPORTUNITIES...

Future Peace & Security Risks

Tabal Abu-Ghazaleh
Keynote Speech
Global Challenges Forum

at the US Mission to the UN
21 – 23 September 2009
Geneva, Switzerland

SECONDLY

Allow me now to list some selected challenges to global security in no particular order:

1. The financial and economic crisis, just starting, is a long lasting process of change embodying painful great risks. Is this the beginning of the end of globalization?
2. The speed and magnitude in which wealth is moving from West to East. In 2007, the West hosted 70% of global FDI. Not any more in future. Does this pose a challenge or an opportunity to global governance?
3. The emergence of a new economic World Order. Brazil, Russia, India and China (BRIC) will match the G7 in 30 years. We are witnessing Chinese – Japanese marriage, to be followed by Russia marriage. Two centuries ago Chinese GDP was 30% of the globe (Asian 60%). It dropped to 5% 50 years ago. In 30 years, China will regain its share as the super power again. Would this take place in peace?
4. Increase in violence against injustice.
5. Increase in unregulated state violence (pre-emptive strikes) and state terrorism (to suppress freedom fighters).
6. Wars for economic motives and for resources.
7. Exceptionalization of Arabs. (David Brooks in Herald Tribune, March 2006 – McCain on Obama’s religious and ethnic roots).
8. Shift from democracy to benevolent dictatorship.
9. Anti-Americanism.
10. Internet Blackout.
11. Oil peak (2030?) – Post oil ambiguity.
12. Energy insecurity.
13. Marginalization of the UN.
14. Water insecurity.
15. Climate change.
Environment abuse.
16. Food shortages.
17. U.S. depression (from recession). And deflation.
18. Domestic vulnerabilities (by Provost Leonard Ferrari)
 - Power Grid Network infiltration.
 - Oil Supply disruptions.
 - Communication and transportation disruptions.
19. Population Growth.
20. Unemployment and social and political insecurity.
21. Wars against continued long occupation (Palestinians against Israeli forces).
22. Lesser leadership capabilities (US relative decline in strength and leverage).
23. Ambivalence (even frustration) toward international systems and institutions.
24. Growing protectionism (post WTO?).
25. A multipolar world without multilateralism . (Historically, multipolar worlds are more unstable than unipolar or bipolar worlds).
26. Nuclear proliferation (Israel included).
Biological weapons (of the poor).

GOING FROM CHALLENGES TO OPPORTUNITIES...

Future Peace & Security Risks

Tabal Abu-Ghazaleh
Keynote Speech
Global Challenges Forum

at the US Mission to the UN
21 – 23 September 2009
Geneva, Switzerland

THIRDLY

These challenges pose some opportunities:

1. What role should global partners in Europe, the Middle East and Asia play in developing a better outcome?
2. What should the emerging super powers contribute to prevent disorder and chaos?
3. What lessons does the current global crisis offer for cooperation leading to a more stable world and perhaps avoid a real world war?
4. Will the world follow success stories of Islamic Finance and of Chinese political and economic models?
5. Will the world come up with feasible alternatives to oil before its crash leading to global economic collapse?
6. Will the world develop feasible sea water desalination technologies before a water shortage catastrophe?
7. Will there be an end to the so-called war on terror? Or is the war yet to come?
8. Will China continue to purchase US Treasuries or diversify its holdings? In other words, does China have a greater role to play in shaping the state of global development?

REPORT OF THE INITIAL PLANNING AND REVIEW CONFERENCE
THE GLOBAL SECURITY CHALLENGES ROUNDTABLE

GOING FROM CHALLENGES TO OPPORTUNITIES...

Future Peace & Security Risks

Tabal Abu-Ghazaleh
Keynote Speech
Global Challenges Forum

at the US Mission to the UN
21 – 23 September 2009
Geneva, Switzerland

FINALLY

2. Peace and Security risks constitute a “real storm” in process.
9. Cause and effect are too complex to diagnose.
10. It is likely that humanity will survive.
11. But it is questionable that human civilization will survive as we know it today.
12. We have lived through the information age. (lions more than gazelles).
13. We are struggling through the knowledge age: Using ICT for knowledge development (lions more than gazelles).
14. We are yet to go, should the world service its own self-inflected risks, into the wisdom age: the use of knowledge wisely and not destructively.
15. Churchill said: The further back your look, the further forward you see.
16. Surely I will not live to see that future.
17. Hopefully you will, and hopefully wisdom, rule of law, fairness and compassion will prevail in your future world over injustice, double standards, greed, brutality, arrogance, rule of power, abuse of nature, disregard for others and the inequality in which we live and write the prescription for peace and security risks.
18. Emerson said: *Man lives not by bread alone but with love passion and sympathy.* I encourage you in your deliberations about various challenges to global security to look past them to opportunity.
19. To that end, we need to consider what a “Global Challenges and Opportunities” Forum might look like. I suggest that it should be:
 - Futuristic
 - Research oriented
 - Focused on global cooperation
 - Security based
 - Visionary
 - Positive
20. Such a Forum should:
 - Be multi-disciplinary focusing on political, economic, social, and cultural opportunities for change.
 - Move a changing world from challenges to opportunities leading to solutions.
 - Include both short and long term perspectives.
 - Focus on risk identification and prevention.
21. The future Forum should make a special effort to move past Euro-Atlantic dominated discourse and create in Geneva a neutral venue that opens the door to participation by Chinese and Arab scholars on a large scale basis. Of course other regions should be represented too, but the voices of emerging powers have been submerged in Western dominated discourse. There are many ways to move from challenges to opportunities and I believe it particularly essential to bring China into the discussion of global security.
22. The agenda of this Roundtable allows you to explore all of these issues over the next two days. I hope that I have given you some food for thought to get you started. I look forward to our discussions.

THANK YOU

TALKING POINTS

Tabal Abu-Ghazaleh
Keynote Speech
Global Challenges Forum

at the US Mission to the UN
21 – 23 September 2009
Geneva, Switzerland

* Note: I ask my colleague and advisor Dr. Salem Al-Agtash (TAG College – GJU, Jordan) to circulate my talking points to facilitate deliberations and action, together with my written speech and concept paper, which I urge you to read.

- I. THE WORLD is in transition, always – faster – now because of ICT
 1. Major Geo-political-economic changes are in process
 2. Global structural changes are inevitable (financial, economic, etc.)
 3. A recession/ depression will be with us for the next decade
 4. From liberalization to protectionism is the trend
 5. The need to revisit MDG (ICT as enabler by GAID)
 6. Global challenges are increasing (listed in my speech circulated)
- II. WHY do we need this FORUM (my concept paper on the proposed structure is circulated)
 3. To predict by shaping not by blaming
 4. A global think tank of selected institutions
 5. Independence by structure
 6. Global inclusion
 7. A forum of forums
 8. Visionary, futuristic, positive, cooperative
 9. Global security goals
 10. Pre-emptive thinking
 11. Political, economic, cultural, diversity of interests
 12. Building two-way traffic bridges
(e.g. our Orient Express from China, and Silk Road from Germany revival projects)
- III. NEXT: Delegate to our co-hosts to:
 1. Draft charter of Forum
 2. Invite willing institutions present here to be founders
 3. Issue press release (as co-hosts) on this meeting
 4. Select name and acronym and domain name: suggested (GOCFORUM or FOROC, or GLOCFORUM, or OCFORUM)
 5. Nominate Director
 6. Nominate Chairs/ deputy chairs/ director
 7. Register Forum in Geneva
 8. Establish domicile in Geneva
 9. Invite selected institutions to join (US/ Europe of course) put plans BRIC/ Turkey/ UK/ Africa/ France/ Iran/ Others/ UN Organizations
 10. Call for the first AGM
 11. Propose operational methodology

REPORT OF THE INITIAL PLANNING AND REVIEW CONFERENCE
THE GLOBAL SECURITY CHALLENGES ROUNDTABLE

TALKING POINTS

Tabal Abu-Ghazaleh
Keynote Speech
Global Challenges Forum

at the US Mission to the UN
21 – 23 September 2009
Geneva, Switzerland

12. Propose agenda for the first AGM
13. Delegate to a chair cabinet (chairs and deputy chairs/ director/ venue hosting organizations) executive powers
14. Set the theme for 2010 research (crises management?)
15. Propose funding models

Let us move NOW. Time does not wait. At the AGM we can review every thing

In closing I wish to borrow Victor Hugo's wisdom:

"Nothing is worth bowing to but Genius, and nothing deserves kneeling to but Goodness"

Let us combine genius and goodness

THANK YOU

3. Daniel Oliver, Dinner Speech



Daniel Oliver, President

Dinner Speech to the “Global Security Challenges Roundtable”

NPS President Daniel Oliver, Geneva Switzerland

22 September 2009

Dear Distinguished Guests, Colleagues and Friends, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Thank you for joining us this evening.

I am proud and honored to join you in this important meeting and want to thank our partners in this endeavor, the Graduate Institute’s Centre for International Governance for graciously hosting this dinner.

I want to thank our Executive Vice President and Provost Leonard Ferrari and our co-host Dr. Daniel Warner for organizing this splendid Roundtable event. I would also like to extend our deep gratitude and appreciation to our dear friend Talal Abu-Ghazaleh for joining us and giving such an insightful keynote speech. And, special welcome to Professor Jean-Dominique Vassalli, Rector of the University of Geneva, who has joined with the Naval Postgraduate School in launching several collaborative endeavors. Also, this event could not have happened without the outstanding support and cooperation of the US Mission to the UN in Geneva. Thank you all.

These important discussions have joined, from three continents, a total of eleven universities, ten research institutes, four international organizations, four humanitarian NGOs and four private sector corporations in an intensive two-day interdisciplinary dialogue. Globalization and the emerging security challenges are the primary topics of discussion. Our discussion will inform the establishment of a future-oriented, annual global research forum in Geneva that is visionary and security-based, while seeking to help move a changing world from challenges, to opportunities, to solutions.

Today’s panel discussions also provided a wonderful introduction to Geneva as the City of Peace. We could not have assembled a better team of experts and dialogue partners. Nearly two years ago, Provost Ferrari and Professor Walter Christman convinced me of the critically important partnership role of International Geneva in support of the new US Cooperative Maritime Strategy. To understand why this is indeed the case, I need to explain the new “Cooperative Maritime Strategy” of the United States.

The fact that 90% of the world’s commerce travels by sea, linking every country on earth, that the vast majority of the world’s population lives within 100 miles of the world’s oceans and waterways, and that nearly three quarters of the earth’s surface is covered by water led the maritime forces of the United States—the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard—to come together, for the first time, to create a unified maritime strategy.

REPORT OF THE INITIAL PLANNING AND REVIEW CONFERENCE
THE GLOBAL SECURITY CHALLENGES ROUNDTABLE

Dinner Speech

22 September 2009

Global Security Challenges Roundtable

Daniel Oliver

Geneva, Switzerland

But what is new? Well many things. One key difference is where the old strategy made clear that the Navy was to help win America's wars, the new strategy now places preventing war on an equal basis. Allow me to quote the authors:

"Our citizens were involved in development of this strategy through a series of public forums.....three themes dominated these discussions: our people want us to remain strong; they want us to protect them and our homeland, and they want us to work with partners around the world to prevent war."

The final strategy document says and I quote:

"We believe preventing wars is as important as winning wars"; and

"Increasingly, governments, non-governmental organizations, international organizations, and the private sector will form partnerships of common interest to counter these emerging threats." and,

"Although our forces can surge when necessary to respond to crises, trust and cooperation cannot be surged. They must be built over time so that the strategic interests of the participants are continuously considered while mutual understanding and respect are promoted."

Therefore, if the US Maritime Strategy places preventing war as important as winning war, and it will do so in partnership with partner nation states, international organizations and non-governmental organizations dedicated to preventing war, then International Geneva emerges as a Cooperative Maritime Strategy partner of first rank.

Geneva has been the scene of peace negotiations and security related treaties of every kind. It is the home of over 200 international organizations and non-governmental organizations and to an outstanding university community, devoted not only to peace, but also to global cooperation in every field imaginable. This Global Security Challenges Roundtable, in linking the US Cooperative Maritime Strategy with global partners from three continents – and in collaboration with the Geneva international community and its leading educational institutions – in my opinion is an undertaking of historic proportions.

We are very pleased that the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies and the US Mission were willing to join us in this venture. We look forward to working with our co-host, the Centre for International Governance, on this project for a very long time to come.

As many of you may know, the Naval Postgraduate School, which is currently celebrating its 100th centennial anniversary, also joined forces this year with the University of Geneva, celebrating its 450th anniversary.

Our initial endeavor was a joint venture to bring documentary films highlighting the challenges of globalization to the international community of Geneva. Nobel Peace Laureate, the Reverend Desmond Tutu, was the honored keynote speaker, and the University of Geneva did a splendid job of organizing an event in which over 1,000 people participated. Provost Ferrari originally proposed this cooperation project as a kick-off event and we were pleased to support the University of Geneva in its celebration. This particular effort will continue and I am told that the Naval Postgraduate School will be a continuing stakeholder with the University of Geneva as part of the governing board for its future activities. I believe

Dinner Speech
22 September 2009

Global Security Challenges Roundtable

Daniel Oliver
Geneva, Switzerland

that this partnership is of particular strategic importance, as it allows military voices to join in an open forum, to consider the challenges to peace, and to participate in the opportunities to overcome them.

Our initial endeavor was a joint venture to bring documentary films highlighting the challenges of globalization to the international community of Geneva. Nobel Peace Laureate, the Reverend Desmond Tutu, was the honored keynote speaker, and the University of Geneva did a splendid job of organizing an event in which over 1,000 people participated. Provost Ferrari originally proposed this cooperation project as a kick-off event and we were pleased to support the University of Geneva in its celebration. This particular effort will continue and I am told that the Naval Postgraduate School will be a continuing stakeholder with the University of Geneva as part of the governing board for its future activities. I believe that this partnership is of particular strategic importance, as it allows military voices to join in an open forum, to consider the challenges to peace, and to participate in the opportunities to overcome them.

As the Naval Postgraduate School embarks on its next hundred years of service, we have taken time to think about the future. Since our founding, NPS has graduated more than 60,000 alumni. They are leaders, they are Secretaries and Chiefs of the military services, they are business and political leaders and they are located all over the globe. We have graduated countless leaders across the landscape of American defense. One alumnus is the current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Michael Mullen, USN. Our alumni include three dozen astronauts, who have piloted Space Shuttles and have walked on the moon. Our alumni invent new systems that have changed the face of conflict and promote peace ... they create new policies and new technologies ... in short, our alumni are helping to change the world.

Our international student programs are having an equal impact, educating new leaders for countries across the globe. Nearly 5,000 officers from 100 countries have attended the Naval Postgraduate School, reflecting an international contribution to global stability that very few institutions can claim. Included among them is His Majesty King Abdullah II of Jordan. And just as we often describe our own U.S. students, our international students are truly no different – they are professional, they have been selected by their respective nations as leaders, and they are dedicated to career and country.

These accomplishments are meaningful but merely scratch the surface of the depth of academic vigor and spirit that span the breadth of the Naval Postgraduate School. It is important to note that over the past few decades, the Naval Postgraduate School student population and programs have evolved to the point where NPS is no longer a purely naval institution. It is currently home to 1,800 resident and 1,000 distance learning graduate students from our Navy, Marine Corp, Air Force, Coast Guard. We also educate a growing number of US government agency civilians and nearly 250 international military officers and government officials engaged in advanced graduate education.

In sum, NPS is a first-rate graduate university, with a combined annual income of some \$300M for education, research and service. It is comprised of four schools, four major institutes, 14 departments and some fifty masters and PhD level degrees, covering a broad spectrum of subjects in science and technology, business, public policy, international studies and operational sciences.

The world is at an important crossroads as we move into the 21st century. We face new, non-traditional threats from a weakened global economy, international terrorism, energy security, global warming, water shortages, population growth, increased poverty and cyber-terrorism. These problems are extremely

REPORT OF THE INITIAL PLANNING AND REVIEW CONFERENCE

THE GLOBAL SECURITY CHALLENGES ROUNDTABLE

Dinner Speech
22 September 2009

Global Security Challenges Roundtable

Daniel Oliver
Geneva, Switzerland

complex and often interrelated. I believe their solutions will require the work of multi-disciplinary, multi-national teams of subject matter experts and policy makers utilizing new technologies and improved approaches to open collaboration.

In Monterey, the Naval Postgraduate School recently established the Global Public Policy Academic Group as a multi-disciplinary academic group to study the impact of globalization on non-traditional threats and more generally on national and human security. The group will draw faculty from all disciplines at NPS in order to conduct research studies and develop research-led educational programs. By broadening the understanding of the forces of globalization and their potential impact on US and international security policy, NPS endeavors to not only inform, but to also help shape, national and international policy at home and abroad. We believe a more inclusive, more open approach to international cooperation will be needed to successfully address the complex Global Security Challenges of the 21st Century.

We are especially pleased that the PRC Mission to the UN has sent a representative to work with us at this week's roundtable discussion. We all recognize that the PRC must play an important role in future discussions if we are to move forward and find solutions to some of the world's most pressing and important problems.

It is my hope that all of you, assembled here in Geneva, will continue to work with the NPS and its Global Public Policy Group to shape and define the broad based multi-national cooperation and programs that are needed to take us from these global challenges---to global solutions for our most pressing and urgent security problems.

As I look at the next 100 years, I reiterate how proud I am to be a part of the Naval Postgraduate School, right now – ready to enjoy the fruits of what we have done, and seek with anticipation the next challenge. The “Cooperative Maritime Strategy” of the United States has drawn us to this great partner for Peace, the City of Peace--Geneva.

With our international partners gathered here from Europe, the Middle East and Asia, I invite you to join us on the next journey. We must together be the drivers of change. We must foster an environment of cooperative inquiry, imagination and discovery.

This could mean establishing a new “Global Challenges and Opportunities Forum” to provide faculty and students from all of our institutions throughout the globe, and others to come, access to the best ideas, tools and resources. It also means encouraging collaboration, activities and events that give voice to intellectual discourse on a multi-national and multi-cultural basis.

Formal sharing of education and research findings is a hallmark of a research university, but equally important are the smaller colloquia and seminars that provide informal introductions of scholars and scientists – and ideas. Careful stewardship of this environment is attentive to these ingredients for growth and we have come together from around the world to explore possible shared roles in that stewardship.

I wish you continued success in your discussions tomorrow as you work together to shape the establishment of a future-oriented, annual global research forum in Geneva that is visionary and security-based, while seeking to help move a changing world from challenges to opportunities to solutions.

Thank You!

4. Participating Organizations

Universities

German-Jordanian University
 Harvard University
 Nanyang Technological University
 National University of Singapore
 Oxford University
 The Graduate Institute
 U.S. Naval War College
 University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA)
 University of Geneva
 UK Defence Academy
 U.S. Naval Postgraduate School

Research Institutes

Geneva Center for Democratic Control of Armed Forces
 Geneva Centre for Security Policy
 Global Compact Research Center
 Gulf Research Center
 Lawrence Livermore National Lab
 Office of Naval Research
 U.S. Navy Naval Warfare Development Command

Non-Governmental Organizations

Association for International Mobility
 Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations
 Geneva Security Forum
 Global Hope Network International
 World Economic Forum

International Organizations

International Telecommunications Union
 World Health Organization
 World Trade Organization

National Diplomatic Missions

Chinese Mission to the United Nations in Geneva
 Swiss PermRep to the WTO
 United States Mission to the UN in Geneva

Corporate Organizations

Avenir Suisse
 L1 Identity Solutions
 Objectif Sécurité
 Pictet & Cie
 Talal Abu-Ghazaleh Organization

5. Strategic Alignment: Global Partnership Initiative

Global Partnership Initiative

"Today's threats demand new partnerships across sectors and across societies -- creative collaborations to achieve what no one can accomplish alone....In short, we need a new spirit of *global partnership*' and 'this spirit of *partnership* is a defining feature of our foreign policy. ..."

President Obama, 23 Sept 2009



U.S. State Department Definition of Partnership

"A collaborative working relationship with non-governmental partners in which the goals, structure and governance, as well as roles and responsibilities, are mutually determined and decision-making is shared. Successful partnerships are characterized by complementary equities, openness and transparency, mutual benefit, shared risks and rewards, and accountability."

