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Draft Talking Points

The primary challenge of institutionalized cooperation on hard (or soft) security issues is that most institutions or regimes develop in response to past crises rather than in anticipation of future ones. If we look closely at the development of European institutions, the primary catalyst for institutionalization of cooperation has been response to previous conflicts or immediate current crises; i.e., the Cold War and post-Cold War conflicts in Europe. Asia, for the most part, has had the luxury of a security environment in which US hegemony and relative distance meant fewer conflicts and that a result has catalyzed less localized institutionalization.

Other considerations, obstacles, or prior conditions regarding development of transparency and verification regimes for East Asia include the following:

* **Political Will**—Are political leaders committed to prioritizing external cooperation to assure a peaceful environment conducive to economic growth? Will domestic political conditions permit external cooperation?
* **Overcoming/managing security dilemmas**—Are regional trends exacerbating or easing threat perceptions among neighbors in Asia? Can leaders move past these dilemmas to establish conditions of détente or regulate competition among neighbors?
* **Not Learning From the Cold War**—The application of transparency and verification measures and CSBMs from Europe may be more difficult in Asia today precisely because no party wants to admit the Cold War experience as relevant to the current Asian security environment.
* **Need to Establish a Robust Institutional Basis for Maintenance of International Norms**—What specifically is necessary to strengthen EAS? How might NAPCI initiatives complement a broader regional approach?
* **Need to Cultivate Habits of Cooperation**—Is institutionalization or informal cooperation more effective as a means by which to secure cooperation in East Asia?

*Recommendations for continued progress:*

**Seek Continued Progress in Implementing Unilateral Vs. Cooperative Confidence Building Measures—**East Asia made progress in the late 1990s in increasing transparency primarily by implementing unilateral measures such as publishing defense white papers, but willingness to accept cooperative/binding measures have been more limited; are there additional unilateral steps that may be taken to enhance regional stability?

**Apply New Technologies to Enhance Transparency and Apply It to Incipient Conflict Situations—**Satellite monitoring and remote sensing regimes have been particularly useful behind the scenes in informing intelligence assessments. These capabilities are arguably more important than state commitments to meet prescribed troop levels. Is there a third party that can impose real time transparency in ways that can reduce/minimize accidental conflict and address questions regarding intentions? Would greater transparency in disputed maritime areas shift perceptions and costs associated with coercion or unilateral actions?

**Actively Utilize New Crises as Opportunities to Further Build Cooperative Capabilities**—Typhoon Haiyuan response in the Philippines provided regional militaries with opportunities to strengthen crisis response capacities, and in some cases, to strengthen cooperation with each other on HADR.

**Code on Unplanned Encounters at Sea—**The recent Western Pacific Naval Symposium produced a consensus on the need for a regime to avoid and manage accidental maritime conflicts; however, it is declaratory and not accompanied at present by commitments in implementation. How best to take next steps to implement the regime? Is it possible to move from unilateral declarations to cooperative steps in day-to-day protocols so as to avoid unintended or accidental conflict?