

XI CMDA - Arequipa, Republic of Peru, 2014

Thematic Focus I:

COORDINATION OF THE SPECIALIZED CONFERENCES OF THE ARMED INSTITUTIONS WITH THE CMDA

Moderator Country: Republic of Peru

Rapporteur Country: Republic of Argentina

Co-Rapporteur Countries: Federative Republic of Brazil, Republic of Chile

Goal:

Within the framework of the review process of the Inter-American Defense System promoted by the CMDA since 2010 (IX Conference, Bolivia), this report has the purpose of proposing guidelines aimed at strengthening the role of the ministries of defense brought together in the CMDA for the coordination of the inter-American military conferences. With that, it is sought to reflect the current democratic order in our countries, to secure the management by the constitutional authorities on defense affairs, and to promote an inter-American military interaction paradigm based on mutual trust, transparency, and cooperation.

Content

1. Inter-American Military Conferences Background and Characteristics

Since the middle of the twentieth century, it has been considered that the Inter-American Defense System -SID- (incorrectly referred to as "system", as it is not an articulated group of elements with a common objective) is mainly made up of the Inter-American Defense Board -JID-, the Inter-American Defense College -CID-, and the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance -TIAR-. However, even when the Armed Forces hemispheric conferences are not formally integrated or do not depend at all on any of these documents and bodies, they cannot be left aside in any analysis made of the defense inter-American relationships: **Inter-American Naval Conference, Conference of American Armies, and American Air Chiefs Conference, which includes a System of Cooperation Among the American Air Forces -SICOFAA-**. Finally, we should also consider the recent publication of related forums, among which the **Conference of Defense Ministers of the Americas (1995)** stands out.

The origin of the SID could be located within the framework of the engagement of the United States and other countries of the hemisphere in the Second World War, with the creation in 1942 of the Inter-American Defense Board (JID). Subsequently, in 1945, in Mexico, the “Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace” (Act of Chapultepec) established the principle of collective security or defense as the main doctrinal and organizing element of the System, in order to prevent an extra-continental attack. In fact, this principle constitutes the basis of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance (TIAR) or Rio Treaty, signed in 1947. One year later, in 1948, the Pact of Bogota was signed, which established the commitment to pacific conflict settlement. During the same year, the Organization of American States (OAS) was created as a regional body contained in the Chapter VIII of the United Nations (UN) Charter, with the purpose of promoting peace and security in the hemisphere. These three documents, the Rio Treaty, the Pact of Bogota and the OAS Charter, shaped up the political-institutional structure in which the Inter-American Defense System falls within.

From that point, as the Cold War logic started to dominate the international and hemispheric scene, the specialized military bodies mentioned above were created: the Inter-American Naval Conference –CNI– (1959), the Conference of American Armies –CEA– (1960) and the American Air Chiefs Conference –CONJEFAMER– (1961) which led to the creation of the System of Cooperation Among the American Air Forces –SICOFAA– in 1965. Since then, these military conferences have been organized in a scheme of exchange and horizontal cooperation, military-military, with autonomous hemispheric political-institutional bodies and, in many cases, autonomous national authorities in defense affairs.

Inter-American Naval Conference

The CNI appeared in 1959, in the city of Balboa, Panama, when the navies of the countries of the continent were invited to attend the bi-annual Marine Leaders of the Americas Conference.

It is made up of eighteen American countries, nine of which are South American¹. Its purpose is to study the common naval problems and to foster the permanent professional contacts. The Inter-American Naval Telecommunications Network and the JID are observer organizations. Its functioning is governed by an agreement or commitment letter. Every two years, the host country, designated on a rotating basis, constitutes a Secretary in charge of organizing and recording the corresponding meeting, without establishing any permanent delegations.

Starting from the year 1979, the Specialized Inter-American Naval Conferences (CNIE) are established, which seek to standardize the systematic procedures in the different operations of each Navy. Its purpose is to carry out combined naval operations among different countries with a high level of efficiency and effectiveness

¹ Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, El Salvador, United States, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Dominican Republic, Uruguay, and Venezuela. Ecuador left in March, 2014.

in favor of the continental maritime security. The CNIE's deal with particular areas of interest, such as Helicopter Operations (HOSTAC) since 1979; Intelligence since 1991; Maritime Control since 1994; Science and Technology since 1994; Telecommunications since 1999; Interoperability since 2005; and Education since 2008; as well as Directors of Naval Intelligence, Health, Schools, etc.

In September 2014, in Buenos Aires, Argentina, the XXVI Edition of the Conference will be celebrated, focusing on “The inter-American maritime security in the defense field. The challenges to the multilateral cooperation in the extension of sovereign rights up to the 350 mile.”

Conference of American Armies

The Conference of American Armies (CEA) was founded in 1960, in the Amador fort of the Republic of Panama, as an international organization of Chiefs of Army Staff in the Western Hemisphere. It appeared as a military organization of international nature, made up of and presided by the armies of the American countries, with the authorization of their respective governments, the purpose, structure and functioning of which are contained in its regulations. It has an organic structure of flexible and rotating nature, as the responsibilities not only managerial but also related to event planning and forming committees are undertaken in each cycle by the different host Armies.

The CEA is made up of the armies of nineteenth American countries², nine of them South American, five of them participating as observers,³ and of organizations as the JID and the Conference of Central American Armed Forces (CFAC). Same as the CNI, its functioning is governed by a letter of agreement or commitment, which is conducted every two years, and the organization rotates among the member countries.

The CEA has prepared a Procedural Guide for the assistance operations in case of disasters (2009) and has approved the Peacekeeping Operations Manual. Its activities include, apart from the most recent exercises, related to peacekeeping operations, radio contact, civilian-military relations and activities, communications and disasters office.

CONJEFAMER and SICOFAA

In 1961, also on the initiative of the United States, the **American Air Chiefs Conferences (CONJEFAMER)** began at Randolph air force base in that country. It was created as a non-political organization of volunteer nature, with the purpose of promoting efficiency in the mutual cooperation and support among the American Armed Forces and their counterparts. Expressing its respect to values such as integrity, solidarity, reciprocity, and excellence, and through the exchange of

² Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, El Salvador, United States, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, Dominican Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, and Venezuela. Ecuador left in March, 2014.

³ Barbados, Belize, Guyana, Jamaica and Surinam.

experiences, knowledge and training, it seeks everything that facilitates the drawing up of procedures to act in a combined way, in compliance with the provisions of the respective governments. Later, in 1965, the CONJEFAMER fell within a more complex structure with the establishment of the **System of Cooperation Among the American Air Forces (SICOFAA)**.

The SICOFAA's main purpose is to constitute an integration and cooperation system among the American Armed Forces, favoring the exchange of experiences, training and education of the staff, and everything that facilitates the drawing up of procedures.

Seventeen countries have signed the SICOFAA's Charter⁴ (nine of them are South American) and seven countries are observers⁵, apart from the JID. The System works with fixed delegations in the member countries and there exists an Information Technology System that entails a real network of linked computers and communications among the Air Forces integrating the System.

The conferences take place annually, they rotate among the countries, and a Permanent Secretariat has been established, with its headquarters at the Andrews Air Base. The Secretary (a US Air Force Colonel) serves five years to provide continuity to it. There are also special committees and annual exercises. The member countries pay a fee to support the system. This is the most institutionalized mechanism of the three that are being analyzed.

The main topics dealt with in the conferences are the following: Air operations; human resources, education and training; search, rescue and assistance in the case of disasters; unidentified flights control; computing and telecommunications; logistics; aerospace medicine; meteorology; air accidents prevention; scientific and technological development; aeronautical law and doctrine. In order to analyze these topics, five permanent committees have been created: *Staff Affairs, Information, Operational, Logistics Affairs, Science and Technology*.

In 2011, the SICOFAA's Manual of Combined Air Operations on humanitarian aid and disasters was passed. In order to ensure the operational enlistment, the Cooperation Exercises II (Virtual) and III (Real) have been performed.

2. Evolution of the Conferences

The theme evolution of the Conferences has followed in parallel the dynamic of global international relations and their impact on the hemispheric context, generally, from the perspective of the main continental power. Basically, we can distinguish three stages:

⁴ Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, El Salvador, United States, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama (National Air-Sea Service), Paraguay, Dominican Republic, Uruguay, and Venezuela. Ecuador left in March, 2014.

⁵ Belize, Costa Rica (Air Surveillance Service), Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, and Mexico.

1) Cold War

During the three decades in which the Conferences were developed within the framework of the Cold War, these forums aimed at exchanging ideas and information, as well as defining common doctrinaire guidelines to face situations derived from the so-called "Revolutionary War".

From the beginning of the Conferences, the main topic of the agenda for the three Forces has focused on the debate, exchange of information, support and cooperation for the terrestrial, maritime and air control, covering the geographic area set forth in the TIAR. Concern was centered on the enlistment and training of the forces, since it was observed at that time, that it was necessary to be protected against possible extra-continental aggressions.

Likewise, local uprisings were considered as threats coming from abroad and that is the reason why many conferences focused on their confrontation. In fact, topics such as "the creation of a doctrine against the communist aggression" (CEA, 1961) or "Enlistment and Intensification of the Revolutionary War Armies Preparation" (CEA, 1964) show up to what extent these conferences have turned into instruments to hegemonize the counter-revolutionary doctrine of the Armed Forces in the continent's countries.

Within this framework, the naval exercises "UNITAS", for example, organized by the United States and in force until today emerge from the CNI. Their objective has been to foster the interoperability among the navies, exercise in different operational techniques and update proceedings and doctrine of naval war.

2) The first years of Post-Cold War

The characteristic approach of the bipolarity of the Cold War is left behind in the second half of the eighties, when the issue of the role of the Armed Forces in the "new" Latin American democracies appears.

With the end of the Cold War, the strategic certainty environment shifted into another of uncertainty, which gave rise to deep changes that had an impact in the conferences functioning. USA was not the predominant one in the formulation of agendas, hence new topics, such as trust measures, peace operations in the United Nations, the role of the armies in the development of countries, the regional blocks formation, the Armed Forces, and the access to new technologies, assistance in case of disasters, and not exempt from controversies, the challenge of facing transnational threats became important.

3) From 2001 up to today

The 9-11 terrorist attack in the USA set a new stage in the Inter-American Conferences, since regional bodies started to be considered pursuant to the global security agenda, in light of the major powers' concerns. International terrorism

acquired, in this context, special importance within the conceptual framework of multidimensional security.

In fact, since the Special Conference on Security (Mexico 2003) and its Declaration on Security in the Americas, which established the security conception at a multidimensional scope, there has been a greater intention to treat the role of the military forces when facing "new challenges", which vary from the challenges posed by new technologies up to public security issues, which are expected to be labeled as "new threats". However, this trend is not entirely shared by the member states, many of which distinguish clearly in their legal systems the issues of defense and public security, and limit accordingly the functions inherent to their Armed Forces. This has given rise to explicit restrictions to reach consensus in the recommendations or agreements, or to the abstention of some countries' Armed Forces, which, logically, cannot commit themselves with proposals that infringe their legal functions.

Basically, it can be stated that the Inter-American Military Conferences, in terms of their origin and their agenda and functioning reasoning, have gone through consecutive historical processes, in which there were long periods of clear influence of the North American perspective regarding the global agenda and its impact in the region.

Besides, the conferences are not formally included in the OAS organizational diagram and do not respond to Inter-American political bodies, such as the Summits of the Americas or the CMDA. This has given them the opportunity to enjoy a vast autonomy margin.

In spite of that, as years go by, the concerns of the Armed Forces Conferences were centered on a more technical path, related to their specialization. The preparation of the forces in cases of natural disasters, humanitarian aid, peace operations' intervention, means interoperability, technological research and development cooperation, naval security, air and terrestrial control, and the protection of natural resources, are recurrent topics in military agendas.

Likewise, it is also true that the conferences have allowed to keep the communication channels among the Armed Forces of the hemisphere open, which has contributed to the creation of mutual trust and technical cooperation, facilitating the interoperability in combined operations, technology transfer and the update of proceedings and means employment tactics.

To conclude, even though the conferences constitute valuable stages in military diplomacy, their agendas, meetings and deliberations cannot be exempt from the spaces of political management of the Ministries of Defense. That is why, in spite of the fact that the above mentioned autonomy is softened by the military delegations' own responsibility, coming from countries of consolidated civil leaderships, there is a need to find the mechanisms so that defense national authorities establish, together with their hemispheric peers, the political and strategic guidelines to frame the professional and technical discussion given in these conferences.

3. The Conference of Defense Ministers of the Americas

The changes in the international environment after the Cold War favored the creation of new political coordination bodies in the hemisphere, over the basis of a renewed relation among Latin America, USA and Canada. The Summit of the Americas held for the first time in 1994, in Miami, was one of the most important ones and gathered the presidents of the American countries, originally every two years.

In those years, new institutional bodies related to continental defense and security were also established, such as the Hemispheric Security Commission, created in 1992 as a dependent organ of the OAS Permanent Council, to deal with hemispheric issues in defense and security matters.

A few years later, as we have already mentioned, the Special Conference on Security, carried out in Mexico in 2003, also addressed the issue of new challenges and introduced changes in the system. The previous creation of the Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission (CICAD), of the Inter-American Committee against Terrorism (CICTE), and later the creation of the Secretary of Multidimensional Security and more recently, the Meeting of Ministers Responsible for Public Security in the Americas, laid the groundwork for a more specific and appropriate path to face the current challenges, without confusing the security and defense fields as well as their instruments and institutions.

To complete this new scenario, there appears the Conference of Defense Ministers of the Americas (CMDA), institutionalized in 1995 as the first debate and consultation forum in which defense political leaders participate, represented by their Ministers of Defense.

In reality, the USA, fostering at that time a cooperative security model, proposed through its Defense Secretary, William Perry, to call that year for what would later be the first meeting of Ministers of Defense of the Americas. In most of the countries of the continent, this process was welcomed with a positive perception from the beginning, which was seen as a strategic twist in the way hemisphere states relate, going from the unilateralism of military-military relations to a dialogue among democratic political authorities.

It was understood that the central idea of the process of Defense Ministerial Conferences was to create a new form of dialogue among the hemisphere countries, where the topics of discussion were related to defense and continental security, gathering those responsible for creating topic-related policies. The CMDA has turned into an important debate forum to exchange experiences in defense matters among peers, following the process of summits diplomacy.

Actually, the CMDA was constituted as a political multilateral meeting, made up of and run by the ministries of defense and organized every two years in different countries (CMDA Regulation, 2006:2). It is the first meeting instance of the political

sector of the defense in Latin America, which is relevant to foster mutual knowledge, debate, analysis and exchange of ideas and experiences.

The Conference gathers the most important political authorities in defense -or their equivalents in the countries where this organization does not exist- of the American continent. Currently, the thirty four OAS members are part of this forum. In institutional terms, the organic structure of the Conference is flexible and rotating, due to the fact that the responsibilities are adopted by different Ministries of Defense that take over the celebration of the CMDA in each opportunity. The topics making up the "Agenda" result from the proposition of the Host Country and from the consensus among its members, which is expressed in the Preparatory Meeting (CMDA Regulation, 2006:2).

The CMDA, as well as the Summit of the Americas, is a process which does not have permanent organizations and is not incorporated to the OAS, even though there are some links, such as the role of assistance to the Pro Tempore Secretariat, which, upon its request, could be played by the JID; the presence of the Secretary General at the conferences; and the receptivity by the OAS Assembly of the CMDA guidelines. This situation is reasonable, since it is a Ministerial Conference, i.e. political authorities who respond to the Heads of State of their respective countries. As such, at a hemispheric level, it is logical that they report to the presidential summits and keep, when appropriate, interrelation with an international entity of diplomatic nature, such as the OAS.

Summing up, if correctly articulated, we have all the necessary elements at a hemispheric level to reach an adequate reflection of what is expected from a Diplomatic Rule of Law in each of our countries. In this regard, the CMDA, representative body of the Ministries of Defense, reports to the presidential summits, i.e., the highest national authorities democratically elected. Because of that, appropriate channels for the Military Conferences to relate to the CMDA must be established, such as the national Armed Forces do with their respective Ministries of Defense.

3. Evaluation and Proposal

The configuration of the purpose and the design of the SID instruments goes back to the emerging context of World War II, and it had its development and subsequent performance in the Cold War period. After the end of that conflict, characterized by the political-ideological and strategic confrontation between these two blocks, the world strategic scenario changed radically: it passed from being bipolar to opening new perspectives to dialogue and multilateral cooperation. If we add that to the consolidation of democracy and peace in the region, it is clear that a new scenario has been created, in which the SID's architecture started to look increasingly anachronistic.

Likewise, during the last decades, the American countries have gone through a process of transformation not only internal but also in their foreign relations, from which there emerges a situation that can be included in the concept of “Cooperative Defense”, characterized by:

- The emergence of a “positive agenda” on defense matters, which replaced the “negative agenda” of the Cold War. That is to say that the traditional logic of conflict hypothesis has been overcome by inter-state relations in which the dialogue and the respect to the internal political and legal systems, the mutual trust actions, and the acts of cooperation and complementarity on defense prevail. It is not limited to the hemispheric level; it is also observed with the counterparts of the remaining continents.
- It is a process of widespread institutional change on a hemispheric level, which recognizes and strengthens the political and civic management of the national defense systems, where the military bodies implement the national management's decisions within the framework of their legal power.
- The consolidation of a trend towards the regionalization of cooperation on defense, which may be observed, for example, in the strengthening of the South American Defense Council of UNASUR (Union of South American Nations), in the increase in the activities of the Conference of Central American Armed Forces (CFAC), and in the cooperation agreements among the Caribbean states or among the members of the ALBA (Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America).

As expressed in the 2012 Ministerial Conference, in the current context of the inter-American relations, the instruments and components of the SID present, each of them in a higher or lower level, a number of political and institutional **malfunctions**. The following have a particular impact on the military conferences:

- The establishment of autonomous institutional agendas, based on the self-designation of missions and functions, reflecting an insufficient guidance by the national and/or hemispheric political bodies, which is why the institutional order governing our countries is not copied on an inter-American level.
- A trend towards dissolving the limits between the defense and the public security issues, materialized in the constant attempt to regard questions related to the internal security of the states and transnational criminal phenomena as work material.
- The low level of representation caused by the decrease in membership and the scarce active engagement in these bodies by many countries of the hemisphere, which also has an impact on its level of legitimacy. None of the military conferences has more than 20 members, far from the 35 American countries.

- The scarce concrete and relevant results satisfying the needs of the member countries as regards defense cooperation. The lack of consensus observed in recent military conferences, which is a consequence of the failed attempts to impose issues that may result unacceptable for the Armed Forces that have legal impediments to tackle them, shows to what extent the political lack of coordination threatens the effectiveness of the recommendations arising from those conferences.

Based on the above-mentioned considerations, it is necessary to face a deep reform of this scheme urgently, which is the only way to prevent the increase in the denouncement of the agreements or the withdrawal of the existing bodies, as has been the case in many countries during the last twelve years. As it has been set out in several editions, we believe that **this CMDA constitutes a favorable forum to discuss and agree on a number of actions aimed at the systematic reform of the scheme of hemispheric relations on defense, starting with the coordination of the military conferences.**

The CMDA's concern about this matter is not new. In the VII Conference (Canada, 2008), the possibility of an improvement in the articulation of the Armed Forces conferences by a potential executive secretariat of the CMDA was analyzed; however, in the end, the Declaration of Banff, only mentions the decision to “order the executive secretariat of the CMDA to take notes of the work done by the Inter-American Naval Conference (CNI), the Conference of American Armies (CEA) and the System of Cooperation Among the American Air Forces (SICOFAA)”. But the need to optimize the functioning of the military conferences also falls within the mandate given by the Ministries in the IX CMDA (Santa Cruz de la Sierra, Bolivia, 2010), when they recommended the OAS, within the framework of that Organization, to call a conference to deal with the future of the mission the functions of the instruments and components of the Inter-American Defense System, with the participation of the representatives of the ministries of defense.

To that respect, however, in its Assembly of June 2014, through its resolution No. 2866, the OAS renders the mandate in paragraph 11 of the resolution AG/RES. 2809 (XLIII-O/13) satisfied. It deals with the relations between the OAS and the hemispheric defense meetings; the JID; as well as the actions to promote the cooperation, and the notes on the report by the Presidency of the Informal Work Group formed in the core of the Hemispheric Security Commission. The mere reading of this document shows that no substantial consensus has been reached in that diplomatic environment that allows to glimpse a revision of the system in the sense suggested herein. In that sense, the Ministries of Defense of the countries of the continents themselves, gathered in this ministerial conference, have to undertake the task to prepare the necessary instruments available to them to update and optimize the hemispheric relations of defense cooperation.

As the starting point for that, it is necessary to understand that any interaction mechanism thought of has to satisfy the principle of subordination of the Armed Forces and Security to the democratically constituted civilian authorities, which is present not only in the Williamsburg Consensus, but also in the “Consensus of the Conferences of Defense Ministers of the Americas”, signed in the VII CMDA (Managua, 2006)-, within the framework of a cooperative defense model, where the hemispheric bodies seem to be particularly relevant to the subsidiary articulation of the regional initiatives.

Following these guidelines, we can see that nowadays in the hemispheric scenario there exists, on one hand, the body of political decision from the highest level of the defense, such as the CMDA, and on the other hand, a set of military instruments, which are the Armed Forces Conferences and their related structures. But it is not possible to talk about a duly articulated system. There are no formal channels reconciling the guidance by the political level to the military level, and there is no joint action among the various conferences.

In the current historical context, characterized by the democratic institutionality and the multilateralism, it is necessary to consolidate as a fundamental criterion **the political management of the defense**, materialized through an institutional structure centered on the representation of the national Ministries of Defense, and the subsequent role of the Armed Forces as advisers and executors on the military level, professional and technical, of the constitutional authorities' decisions.

As a consequence, taking into account the situation described and this background, we suggest the following **courses of action**:

1. To support the formalization and institutionalization of a new *Inter-American Defense Cooperation System (SICD)*, guided by the Conference of Defense Ministers of the Americas (CMDA) as the main forum for dialogue, consultation and agreement for the cooperation in defense matters at a hemispheric level.
2. **To include the military conferences within this scheme**, so that they become part of the SICD, as dialogue, agreement and professional counseling bodies. To do so, the CNI, the CEA and the CONJEFAMER schedules should be adjusted to the CMDA's, so in every Ministerial Conference celebration, the reports of the previous military conferences taking place in the previous period can be received. Likewise, the ministers should agree on and approve the strategic guidelines, including the central issues of the agenda of the conferences to take place until the next CMDA.
3. For this purpose of coordination and follow-up of the conferences of the armed institutions, it would be convenient to **establish, within the framework of the CMDA, an executive body of representatives of the Ministries of Defense**, which is virtually connected on a permanent basis and gathers periodically (every six months, for example) in between each CMDA. Under the supervision of this body, the administration of the coordination

process of the military conferences shall be in charge of a **Coordination Committee**, made up of representatives of the Pro Tempore Secretariat of the host country of the following CMDA, the previous host and up to three countries which voluntarily propose to be part, renewable in each ministerial meeting.

4. By using this same scheme, **the SICD could keep a cooperation relation with the OAS and its dependent bodies** (the Hemispheric Security Commission, in particular), seeking the inter-organic collaboration in mutual interest issues. In this new architecture, the JID and the CID maintain their nature as OAS specialized entities, adjusting their functions to the strict compliance of their statute, until the hemispheric organization agrees fully with its member states its comprehensive reform or its deactivation by complying with the objectives they were created for.
5. As the culmination of this renewal process, it should be convenient to translate the changes into a new *Inter-American Cooperative Defense Treaty (TIDC)*, signed by the highest national political authorities, which evidences the principles, objectives and commitments taken over by the member states, hence surpassing the anachronism of the existing legal instruments.

In this treaty, **the scopes and spaces of defense cooperation** among member countries should be defined, contributing to consolidate the peace and regional security through measures of mutual trust, transparency and cooperative actions, not only among States but also among sub-regional schemes. Likewise, it should contain a clause that guarantees the absolute respect to the legal framework of each member state, especially in terms of their power to define the competent bodies and means to perform international cooperation actions in defense and security matters.

Finally, the TIDC should guarantee that this new cooperation structure in hemispheric defense be useful as a true debate and inter-regional agreement space or forum; subsidiary of the sub-regional mechanisms in defense cooperation (for example, the South American Defense Council of UNASUR or the Conference of Central American Armed Forces), therefore performing a role that is not currently being performed by any instance.

6. To support that the new hemispheric scheme on defense cooperation be **fully participatory**, giving all the countries of the continent the possibility to be part or reincorporate to it.

4. Conclusions

For more than five years, several American countries have been consistently promoting the necessity and importance of discussing and updating the nature, the role and the functions of the components of the **Inter-American Defense System**.

This is due to the fact that, despite the several attempts of modernization of the SID's instruments and components after the end of the Cold War (such as the reform of the JID's statute in 2006 and the recent discussions and resolutions in the core of the OAS), it has been verified that these elements are still clearly behind the times when compared to the current hemisphere reality.

As a consequence, we believe that this XI CMDA must not only confirm in its Final Statement the willingness of the Ministries of Defense of the American countries to definitively modernize their defense cooperation relations, beginning with the coordination of the military conferences, but also take concrete steps towards this path. For that purpose, we propose signing a **Joint Ministerial Resolution** gathering the fundamental guidelines to establish a mechanism enabling the coordination of the military conferences, so that there exists a comprehensive use of the agreements and capabilities generated by said bodies. **A project for that purpose is attached hereto.**

The basis of this proposal is that the full respect to the political and legal framework in which the Armed Forces of each country develop is imperative for any international cooperation and coordination mechanism suggested. The continent has made a huge progress during the last decades in terms of peace, cooperation, peaceful conflict resolution, regional integration, the rule of law, and the political management of defense affairs. At the same time, we are aware of the fact that the multilateral institutionality is the best way to guarantee the nations' sovereign equality in the modern international relations. Within that framework, the adaptation of the hemispheric bodies to this new scenario becomes a fundamental element for the consolidation of a cooperative defense scheme and to ensure a future of mutual trust and peace among the American nations.

XI CMDA - Arequipa, Republic of Peru, 2014

Thematic Focus I:

COORDINATION OF THE SPECIALIZED CONFERENCES OF THE ARMED INSTITUTIONS WITH THE CMDA

Annex: Joint Ministerial Resolution Project

Moderator Country: Republic of Peru

Rapporteur Country: Republic of Argentina

Co-Rapporteur Countries: Federative Republic of Brazil, Republic of Chile

Having regard to:

What has been proposed and agreed on as regards the Thematic Focus I of the XI CMDA on "Coordination of the Specialized Conferences of the Armed Institutions with the CMDA"

Whereas:

Within the framework of the review process of the Inter-American Defense System promoted by the CMDA since 2010 (IX Conference, Bolivia), it is necessary to agree on guidelines aimed at strengthening the role of the ministries of defense brought together in the CMDA for the coordination of the inter-American military conferences.

With that, it is sought to reflect the current democratic order in our countries, to secure the management by the constitutional authorities on defense affairs, and to promote an inter-American military interaction paradigm based on mutual trust, transparency, and cooperation.

The following corresponding hemispheric conferences of the Armed Forces cannot be exempt from the considerations of the inter-American relations: Inter-American Naval Conference, Conference of American Armies, and American Air Chiefs Conference, which includes a System of Cooperation Among the American Air Forces -SICOFAA-.

Even though said conferences constitute valuable stages in the military diplomacy, their agendas, meetings and deliberations cannot be exempt from the spaces of political governance of the Ministries of Defense.

That is why it is necessary to find the mechanisms for the defense national authorities to establish, together with the hemispheric peers, the political and

strategic guidelines to frame the professional and technical discussion given in these conferences.

In that sense, we believe that this CMDA constitutes the appropriate forum to discuss and agree on a number of actions aimed at the systematic reform of the scheme of hemispheric relations on defense, starting with the coordination of the military conferences.

As a result, the Ministers of Defense gathered in the XI CMDA

DECIDE:

7. To support the formalization and institutionalization of a new *Inter-American Defense Cooperation System (SICD)*, guided by the Conference of Defense Ministers of the Americas (CMDA) as the main forum for dialogue, consultation and agreement for the cooperation in defense matters at a hemispheric level.
8. To include the military conferences within this scheme, so that they become part of the SICD, as bodies of dialogue, agreement and professional counseling. To do so, the CNI, the CEA and the CONJEFAMER schedules shall be adjusted to the CMDA, so that in every Ministerial Conference celebration the reports of the previous military conferences can be received. Likewise, the defense ministers gathered in the CMDA shall agree and approve the strategic guidelines, including the central issues of the agenda of the conferences to take place until the next CMDA.
9. To the effect of complying with what is set forth in the previous paragraph, the adjustment of the schedules shall be ready to be fully in force as from the XII CMDA, to be held in 2016.
10. With the aim to progressively constitute the SICD and, specially, to the effects of coordinating and following up on the conferences of the armed institutions, within the framework of the CMDA, a new Executive Body of representatives of the Ministries of Defense shall be established. This Executive Body of the CMDA (IE-CMDA) shall be permanently and virtually connected and shall meet periodically, every six months approximately, in between every Ministerial Conference. Each country shall appoint an officer and an alternate member to be part of the IE-CMDA, which shall be constituted by March 2015, at the latest.
11. Under the supervision of the IE-CMDA, the administration of the coordination process of the military conferences shall be in charge of a Coordination Committee, made up of representatives of the Pro Tempore Secretariat of the host country of the following CMDA, the previous host and up to three countries which voluntarily propose to be part, renewable in each ministerial meeting.

12. As part of its functions, the IE-CMDA shall work on the project of a new *Inter-American Cooperative Defense Treaty (TIDC)*, signed by the highest national political authorities, which evidences the principles, objectives and commitments taken over by the member states, hence surpassing the anachronism of the existing legal instruments.

The basic content of this agreement shall do as follows:

- a) to define the scopes and spaces of defense cooperation among member countries, contributing to consolidate the peace and regional security through measures of mutual trust, transparency and cooperative actions, not only among States but also among sub-regional schemes.
- b) to have a clause that guarantees the absolute respect to the legal framework of each member state, especially in terms of their power to define the competent bodies and means to perform international cooperation actions in defense and security matters.
- c) to guarantee that this new cooperation structure in hemispheric defense be useful as a true debate and inter-regional agreement space or forum, subsidiary of the sub-regional mechanisms in defense cooperation, therefore performing a role that is currently not being performed by anybody.
- d) to establish a scheme by which the SICD keeps a cooperation relation with the OAS and its dependent bodies, trying to obtain inter-organic collaboration in mutual interest issues.
- e) to support that the new hemispheric scheme of defense cooperation be fully participatory, giving all the countries of the continent the possibility to be part or reincorporate to it.

The IE shall draft a proposal to be sent to the national Ministries of Defense at least six months in advance of the XII CMDA, with a view to its approval therein, to be later submitted in the next Summit of the Heads of State of the Americas.

7. To request the Pro Tempore Secretariat of the XII CMDA (SPT-XII CMDA) and the Secretariats in charge of each following Inter-American Military Conferences to exercise all due diligence to make this Resolution effective. In particular in regards to the CMDA, the SPT-XII CMDA is entitled to propose and put into practice on a temporary basis the amendments to the CMDA Regulation that shall be deemed necessary to this end, ad referendum of its definite approval in the next CMDA.