

18 September 2007

## **From Suez to Afghanistan**

*Canada's Evolving Contribution to  
International Peace Operations*

It is a pleasure and a great honour for me to have the opportunity to address such a distinguished audience of legislators today. My long experience in Japan has taught me that our two countries have a lot in common, from our unrelenting support for human security to our abiding commitment for international development; Canada and Japan are like-minded in many ways. Thus, I think it is always useful for us to share views and discuss our respective experiences. Such exchanges will, hopefully, allow us to identify new areas in which we can work together and, consequently, have a greater impact on the world stage.

Before I tell you more about Canada's past and present commitment to peace-support operations, let me thank a couple of people for making this event possible. First, my gratitude goes to Ota sensei, with whom I had a fascinating exchange of views in Nagasaki in August and who originally suggested that I address you today. Toyama sensei also deserves our thanks, however, for subsequently making all the necessary arrangements allowing us to meet today.

As you all know, I am here mainly to discuss Canada's recent involvement in Afghanistan. However, before I explain why we decided to support the Afghan mission and how we continue doing it, I think it is important that we spend a bit of time reviewing Canada's proud

peace-keeping tradition. Such an exercise will give us the opportunity to better understand how these operations have changed over time. In fact, only by doing so will we be able to understand why, at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, Canada has decided not only to get involved in Afghanistan, but also to deploy financial and human resources across more than a dozen theatres, from Sudan to the Sinai and Haiti.

There are two important messages I would like to leave with you today, both of which are strongly held by our Government. The first one is that Canada continues to be a world leader in support of international peace and security, particularly through our on-going multilateral peace operations efforts. The second one, on which much of my speech will focus, is that the nature of Canada's participation in peace operations has changed significantly over the last half-century. Unsurprisingly, no single "peacekeeping" mission is alike: Cyprus is not Kosovo; Kosovo is not Haiti; Haiti is not Sudan; and Sudan is not Afghanistan. Therefore, our role, and the role of our partners, has evolved with the missions themselves and the changing nature of the threat posed to international peace and security. The world today is not what it was 50 years ago. It will also be vastly different fifty years from now. Thus, we must constantly reassess how we can best lay the foundations for sustainable peace.

Let me begin this discussion with an overview of some of the recent changes to the international context. This is important to help us to better understand the structural, conceptual, strategic, and tactical changes which all Canadian government departments involved in peace operations have had to undergo. This includes my own Department of Foreign Affairs, but also

the Canadian military, the Canadian International Development Agency, or CIDA, which is our own JICA, as well as the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and Correctional Services Canada, the institution in charge of our prisons. In recent years, all of them have been forced to dramatically reassess the way they do business.

## **Historical Perspective**

In 1956, Lester B. Pearson was not yet Canada's Prime Minister. He was still Minister of Foreign Affairs and it was in this capacity that he played a leading role at the UN to encourage the international community to support a brand new initiative: the deployment of a peacekeeping force under the direction of the UN. At that time, and remember, these were the tumultuous days of the Suez crisis and the Hungarian Revolution, this was a radical idea. It called for neutral troops to deploy to a contested terrain, *after* the negotiation of a peace agreement, *with* the consent of all parties, in order to stand *between* them to maintain the peace. The UN's objective was to have these peacekeepers withdraw once the situation settled, and allow the former combatants, now partners in maintaining peace, to get on with their lives and focus on the reconstruction of their countries.

Unfortunately, the reality is that nowadays, there are very few of these kinds of peacekeeping missions left. Situations where there is a clear peace accord that is simply to be monitored, where there is clearly identified contested terrain, and where we are able to clearly identify combatants representing the formal armies of recognized states, constitute by far the

minority of the conflicts underway in the world today. Traditional peacekeeping, of the Lester Pearson variety, is mostly a thing of the past.

At the end of the Cold War, there was a honeymoon period where it was widely believed that international attention and resources could be re-focussed from military expenditures to international development and other domestic priorities. Many western governments fell for this ideal, Canada included. As many of you know, this was when we trimmed our defence budget and cut down our military forces in order to better address our overall budget deficits. However, the end of the Cold War also unleashed unprecedented ethnic and regional conflicts forcing the international community to react. As a result, Canada had to increase its participation to international peace operations and thousands of Canadians were eventually deployed to places such as the Balkans, eastern and central Africa, and Haiti, to say nothing of Cambodia, southern Africa, Central America and East Timor. Japan as well was forced to adapt to this changing world. In fact, although other factors played a role as well, I do not think it was a coincidence that it was in those days, in 1992, that Japan first adopted a peacekeeping law, the Kokusai Heiwa Kyoryoku Hou.

The conflicts of the 90s were primarily civil wars, and their ethnic and civilian nature created serious challenges for the international community. “Peacekeeping” became a misnomer because we found ourselves deploying to areas where there was no longer any peace to keep. We were working in environments where parties to conflicts were ignoring international human rights and humanitarian law and acting with impunity. Civilians were not only being

disproportionately affected by conflict, they were also deliberately targeted as a war aim.

International missions also grew beyond simple military forces to involve civilian police and other specialities, because fragile states needed the full support of the international community to exercise their sovereignty and uphold the rule of law over their territory. Specific programs to promote peace building and post-conflict reconstruction, security sector reform, disarmament, demobilization and re-integration, as well as to strengthen the rule of law and transitional justice all began to be incorporated into each mission.

Another illustration of the impact of those changes was the increased importance that the UN Security Council began to attach in the late 90s to the theme of protection of civilians in armed conflict. It is in this context that we witnessed the emergence of concepts such as Human Security, in the promotion of which Japan played a crucial role, or the Responsibility to Protect, to say nothing of the creation of the International Criminal Court. All these new developments sprang from the need to provide better protection to civilian populations in conflict zones.

At the same time as we began to employ additional civilian personnel to work alongside international military forces, our understanding and acceptance of the use of force in the context of international peace missions evolved as well. The horrifying events in the town of Srebrenica, in eastern Bosnia, the genocide in Rwanda and the ethnic cleansing in Kosovo, all these forced the international community to re-examine its approach to stabilizing violent conflicts and establishing a secure environment. There was a need to ensure international forces were not mere witnesses to attacks on civilians, but also that they could react to prevent them. As a result, robust mandates with specific provisions relating to the protection of civilians gradually became the norm. In fact, the mandates of the last seven UN Peace Support Operations have all included explicit provisions for forces to protect civilians under imminent threat of violence. I am happy to say that this positive development came about in part as a result of Canada's leadership.

Today, there are over 25 multinational peacekeeping and peace operations worldwide. Most of these are either directly led, or endorsed by the UN. Regional organizations have also come to lead several peace operations. This includes NATO in Afghanistan, the European Union in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and the African Union in Darfur. UN leaders, such as Kofi Annan and Lakhdar Brahimi have consistently promoted the use of regional organizations and multinational coalitions of the willing in situations demanding robust capabilities and the ability to engage in high intensity conflicts. This too, is another important, albeit recent change from the days of Lester Pearson.

In parallel with the changing nature of conflicts, there has been a growing understanding that the roles of all peace-building actors should be much more closely coordinated. Soldiers, police officers, aid workers, diplomats, human rights specialists: none of them can operate in silos without paying attention to what their colleagues are doing. Everybody must work very closely together.

## **Civilian Police: a key component of contemporary missions**

As I mentioned earlier, a momentous development in peace operations over the last 20 years is the increasing demand for civilian police advisors, mentors and trainers. I want to spend some time discussing this change because civilian police is an area in which Japan could make an extremely positive contribution, although I am fully aware that it is still politically difficult for Japan to do so. This is a shame, because as you know, Japanese police officers are very well-trained and extremely professional. As a result, they could contribute immensely to international peace-support operations. What is more, for a post-conflict society, there is much to admire in Japan's community police system, the so-called kooban.

In recent years, the number of civilian police deployed to UN peace operations has increased enormously, from 1677 in 1994 to 9542 in May 2007, and Canada was very much part of that trend. Since we started deploying civilian police in 1989, we have participated in over 35 international policing operations, which have involved more than 2100 Canadian police officers. And the demand keeps growing!

Through the strengthening of indigenous law enforcement capacity, civilian police can make an effective contribution to conflict prevention. Amongst their many duties, civilian police deployed during conflicts help to monitor law enforcement activities, train the local indigenous police, report on compliance with international standards and support international humanitarian assistance. Their presence is required simultaneously with the activities of the military, with

whom it works to assist in re-establishing stability and enabling post-conflict reconstruction. Civilian police are absolutely vital to ensure a smooth transition from military to civilian authority or, in other words, from peacekeeping to peacebuilding.

At the moment, one of Canada's most important civilian police contributions is in Haiti, where approximately 100 officers have been deployed under the UN. Their mandate is to help the Haitian National Police tackle the criminal elements that are holding this fragile state back from the stability it needs in order to develop socially and economically. In other words, our police officers help their local colleagues to undertake certain executive duties such as maintaining public order, conduct searches and seizure, etc. By working together in the field, much knowledge and experience can be transferred from our police force to that of Haiti. This kind of mentoring is, in fact, one of the most important aspects of any peace-support operation.

### **Canada's Current Involvement in Peace-Operations**

Let me now say a few words about some of Canada's most important peace operations at the moment. One region in which we are very active is Sudan. Incidentally, as a sign of the importance Canada attaches to the human rights situation in this country, a special task force was recently created in the Department of Foreign Affairs to monitor developments in this part of Africa. Some of you may wonder why Canada cares about Sudan, a country so far from our shores. I believe the answer is simple: as a G8 nation and one of the world's richest and most successful countries, we have the responsibility to help.

As you know, Sudan has had a difficult history. When decades of confrontation between the north and south finally came to an end, a new conflict began to flare up in Darfur, which produced a humanitarian crisis of extensive proportions. The Government of Sudan was reluctant to agree to an international intervention, but in 2004, it was persuaded to accept the deployment of an all-African force, the African Union Mission in Sudan or AMIS, under the command of the African Union. AMIS was initially intended to be an observer mission to monitor a humanitarian cease-fire agreed to by the warring factions. However, faced with widespread violations by all factions, the AU expanded its mission and eventually adopted a mandate which included the protection of civilians.

Unfortunately, the AU is a new entity, and AMIS is its first peace operation. The African Union thus called for help from its international partners. Canada has become one of the mission's principal supporters, along with the US, the UK and the EU. Our support package of more than \$190 million is designed both to enhance AMIS's ability to protect civilians, as well as to assist in developing the AU's long term capacity to maintain African peace and security.

### **Canada in Afghanistan**

Although Canada's involvement in Sudan is important, it cannot be compared to our work in Afghanistan that, over the last five years, has evolved to become Canada's largest and most important international engagement. I am sure many of you are wondering why Canada decided

to devote so many resources to the international community's effort in Afghanistan. This is a valid question, but before I address it, let me say a few words about the recent and tragic history of this fascinating nation.

At the dawn of the 21st century, and after more than 30 years of conflict and repression, Afghanistan found itself one of the poorest countries in the world. Most its infrastructure had been destroyed, with most roads, schools, government institutions, courts and hospitals largely in ruins. Adding pathos to this already dramatic situation, this complete devastation helped create the conditions for terrorists to operate and coordinate attacks across the world.

One of the reasons why Canada joined the international mission in Afghanistan was thus to ensure that this country would never again become a base for international terrorism. There is another reason, however and, in my mind, this one is no less important. As was the case in Sudan, Canada has the responsibility to support Afghanistan on its road towards reconstruction. It is for those reasons that we continue to deploy so much effort in this part of South Asia. We must help Afghans build the conditions for democratic and economic success. We must build Afghan capacity to fight terrorism and crime.

Canada has been engaged militarily in Afghanistan for over five years. First in Kandahar, under Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) in 2001-2002, and then, in Kabul, as part of ISAF, the International Security Assistance Force. For those of you who do not follow this file closely, ISAF is the name of the NATO mission currently operating in Afghanistan. For those of you

who do follow this file with interest, you probably know that Canada also played a central role in the leadership of ISAF, when, in August 2003, General Rick Hillier, currently Canada's Chief of Defence Staff and thus, our most senior military officer, took command of the mission. More recently, in August 2005, Canada redeployed its forces to Kandahar, first by establishing a Provincial Reconstruction Team, or PRT, and subsequently by deploying a battle group in February 2006. Another Canadian, Brigadier General David Fraser, successfully led the regional command of ISAF in southern Afghanistan from February to November 2006, and Canada will once again take up this command from February to November 2008. Since our engagement in Afghanistan began, over 20,000 Canadian soldiers have served in the country. Our substantial contribution places us consistently among ISAF's top five troop contributors. In short, Canada, as part of its commitment to NATO, is playing a very central role to strengthen security in Afghanistan.

All this being said, our Forces have a difficult job. They are tough, dedicated and highly trained, and they deserve all our support and pride, but they are working under challenging circumstances in trying to help the Afghan Government confront a re-invigorated Taliban insurgency in the South. This makes it very difficult for the international community, including Canada, to carry out vitally important development and reconstruction work. All of us also know that success in establishing a secure environment and laying the groundwork for a sustainable peace cannot be assured by military means alone. We may wish the reality were different, but we must all recognize that there is no security without development, and no development without security.

That is why we have deployed diplomats, development workers and civilian police, as well as experts in human rights, good governance, the rule of law and democracy building, all of whom come together in a common endeavour as part of a wider international effort. That is also why we have announced a development assistance package of more than \$1 billion over ten years, making Afghanistan Canada's largest recipient of bilateral development assistance.

Let me give you some concrete examples. One of our most important priorities is to help build an effective and professional civilian police force in Afghanistan. Since Canada moved the focus of its efforts to the Southern part of the country in August 2005, we have deployed dozens of civilian police officers, whose main task is to help train new Afghan recruits. Although we provide Afghan police forces with very basic training at our Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT) in Kandahar, we will also soon open a new in-service training facility, where local officers will be able to continue receiving training after they start working. In other words, this facility, which is located right next to our PRT in Kandahar, will, so to speak, act as a provider for continuing education. Some of our financial resources are also used to supply the police with uniforms and training equipment, but also to build police stations. Finally, we have contributed more than \$30 million to the United Nations Law and Order Trust Fund to ensure police salaries are paid in full and on time.

I would like to highlight that supporting the development of Afghanistan's police forces is an area where Canada and Japan could collaborate closely. I know how difficult it would be

for the National Police Agency to deploy trainers to work alongside our civilian police forces in Afghanistan, but Japan could still make a very positive contribution to our work, and that of the international community, by providing some of the equipment that the Afghan police operating in Kandahar and beyond, is currently lacking. This, for example, includes trucks and motorcycles as well as some radio equipment.

Canada is also playing an important role supporting Afghan justice sector reform. Since 2002, we have helped to train judges, prosecutors, public defenders and court administrators. We have also been instrumental in setting up legal aid programs. Two Canadian correctional advisors, who are part of our civilian team at the PRT, are currently helping develop a professional correctional service in the city of Kandahar. They regularly visit prisons, mentor local guards, dispense advice on how to improve incarceration conditions and generally ensure that inmates are treated according to international standards, by which Afghanistan is bound to abide.

In terms of our overall development effort, Canada is one of the top five donors to Afghanistan and we have committed more than \$1.2 billion over a ten-year period, i.e. from 2001 to 2011. Although our contribution is supporting real social and economic progress, we still have a long way to go. The good news, however, is that we are moving forward.

Canada is, for example, the lead donor to a microfinance programme that is providing savings and loans to over three hundred and fifty thousand Afghans. What is more, about three-

quarters of them are women. Overall, Canada has contributed more than \$56 million to this programme. These loans have given many Afghans, of all walks of life, the chance to start small businesses or invest in agricultural enterprises. They have also given many families very concrete reasons to hope for a better future.

Nowadays, most of the north and west of Afghanistan is very stable. Even in some parts of the south, things are slowly returning to normal. Around Kandahar City, villages have been resettled, markets re-opened, and streets are bustling again. The Afghan Ministry of Rural Reconstruction and Development, one of the country's most able and professional ministries, has been able to implement hundreds of new projects in the province, and the pace of growth continues to accelerate. The proof? We were able to deliver eight times more development aid in Kandahar last year than the year before.

Another positive development is that more than 500 infrastructure projects have been implemented through locally elected Community Development Councils (CDCs). In fact, these CDCs constitute one of the great success stories of Afghanistan. They are small and somewhat informal councils, at the local level, which allow village members to debate amongst themselves which development projects are most important for their community. Once a consensus is reached, villagers can apply for funding to the National Solidarity Program (NSP), which is managed by the government in Kabul. It is in such a way that numerous roads, wells, and irrigation systems, all necessary for long-term economic sustainability, have been built across Afghanistan. In our view, the NSP is a very important program because it allows Afghans to take

ownership of their own development and thus, it goes a long way towards building local capacity. For this reason, we have supported it generously.

All this being said, I would be lying if I did not admit that plenty of challenges remain. Insurgents, for one, are still present. However, they are increasingly forced to resort to terrorist attacks, never hesitating to target civilians, or even children. This is a sign of their mounting desperation. These tactics have also cut them off from the local population and from Afghan public opinion. They also further discredit the Taliban's aspirations to legitimacy. On the upside, this provides us with an opportunity and it is crucial that we continue to help the government of Afghanistan demonstrate that it is capable of bringing real and tangible improvements to the lives of its citizens in the south.

Let me emphasize once again that Canada is not working alone in Afghanistan. More than three dozen countries are contributing to the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force. More than 10,000 personnel, from over ten countries, are also deployed in the south, including Canada's historic allies the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, the United States and Australia as well as newer partners with whom we are forging close ties, such as Romania and Estonia. 23 Provincial Reconstruction Teams have been established countrywide. The United Nations Assistance Mission to Afghanistan, or UNAMA, is also present throughout Afghanistan, including in Kandahar, and 16 other UN agencies are also on the ground. On top of that, there are dozens of other nations who are contributing to the reconstruction of the country. This, as you well know, includes Japan, who has already disbursed more than a \$1 billion to support aid

projects, to say nothing of the leading role it played to disarm and help reintegrate ex-combatants.

It is also very important to remember that Canada and its allies are in Afghanistan at the invitation of its democratically elected government. Incidentally, it is worth mentioning that the Presidential and Parliamentary elections held in 2005 were the first free and democratic elections in Afghanistan in over 30 years. Also, women hold a quarter of those parliamentary seats, something unprecedented in the history of this troubled nation. I am sure you will agree with me that this is a remarkable achievement for the Afghan people, but one that would have been impossible without the support of Canada, Japan and the rest of the international community. This is one more example of the positive consequences of our participation to this mission.

In discussing stability and reconstruction, I also want to touch upon the work of the Canadian-led Provincial Reconstruction Team in Kandahar, of which I have already said a few words. Our PRT is an inter-departmental team composed of members of the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, the Department of National Defence, Correctional Services Canada, our aid agency (CIDA) as well as the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Civilian representatives from other nations, such as the United States, are also permanently co-located with us, thus making our team an international one.

The mandate of our PRT is to help rebuild key government infrastructure in Kandahar province. It is also working to foster security sector reform and enhance democratic governance,

while supporting Afghan-led efforts to improve the overall living conditions for the Afghan people. During a visit to Canada last year, President Karzai addressed Parliament and said “Thanks to Canada’s contributions, Afghanistan today is profoundly different from the terrified and exhausted country it was five years ago.”

As you can imagine, there is no magic solution to the many problems of Afghanistan. Only the presence of ISAF is, at this stage, strong enough to support the government in extending its reach, along with that of the new Afghanistan constitution. A constitution, let me highlight, which protects the rights of women and girls to be educated, to earn a living, and to live in security. The Canadian Forces are in Kandahar to confront insurgents who want to disrupt these rights. Our efforts to enhance the Afghan Government’s ability to meet the needs of its citizens can only be carried out because of the presence and resolve of ISAF and Canadian troops.

I would now like to spend a bit of time discussing with you some of the key lessons that Canada learned during the course of its many years of peace-building experience. Before doing so, however, let me just say a few more words about the importance of keeping our respective publics well informed of the nature and goals of some of our most controversial peace-support operations, such as that unfolding in Afghanistan. It is hard to overemphasize the importance of such activities. Simply put, they are absolutely critical to gain and retain the support of our populations. For long and risky missions, this support is essential.

When a Canadian dies trying to bring peace to a tormented region, all of us grieve. But it also forces us to reassess the importance and necessity of our commitment. Since more than 70 Canadians have died in Afghanistan over the last five years, you will not be surprised to hear that there is currently a lively debate at home surrounding the nature of our activities in Afghanistan. Many people are asking, quite legitimately, why Canadians should die trying to bring stability to this far-off land? Needless to say, my fellow citizens also expect solid answers from their leaders. It turns out that the more we explain the mission, the more Canadians become supportive. For example, dozens, if not hundreds, of Canadian soldiers have gone on speaking tours across the country, following their time in Afghanistan, in order to better explain the nature of our mission and how they, as individuals, have been able to make a real difference in the lives of many Afghans. When Canadians hear these young officers and non-commissioned officers explain the poverty, the insecurity and the lack of economic opportunities that is the daily lot of a majority of Afghans, they better understand why it is important that we invest so many resources in this mission. They take great pride in the work we have accomplished and realize the importance of our commitment. They also generally become more supportive of the mission as whole. In the coming months, this debate will culminate with a vote in Parliament. This is when our elected leaders will decide what form the security component of Canada's effort in Afghanistan will take beyond February 2009, when the current mandate is set to expire.

## **Lessons Learned**

Now that I have given you a good overview of Canada's current involvement in peace operations and how these have changed over the years, you may be wondering what all those experiences have taught us. The answer is: a great deal. One of the most important lessons Canada has taken on board is that too rapid a transition can endanger sustainable peace. In other words, it is important that the international community not disengage before fragile local institutions have built up their capacity. The requirement for the international community to mount repeated peace operations in Haiti and in East Timor illustrates this mistake. Rushing for the exit is never a good strategy.

Another essential element for a successful peace operation is close collaboration under strong leadership. For example, the unstable and sometimes violent situation in Haiti demands a smooth working relationship between all the security elements working under the UN umbrella. Such close collaboration is also key to ensuring success in a place like Afghanistan, where so many different actors are playing a part.

But this is not all: an impressive amount of coordination is also required in the field, and between participating countries' headquarters in order to bring together the main elements of an integrated, multi-dimensional peace operation. As peace operations incorporate more cross-cutting themes, such as the integration of the whole range of security system reforms into

governance and development, the interplay between institutions and individuals becomes essential to the success of the mission.

This is why Canada has adopted a “Whole of Government” approach to determine the scale and scope of its participation, and in order to achieve more effective and efficient peace operations. Intensive and extensive inter-departmental collaboration is required between the National Defence, Foreign Affairs, the Canadian International Development Agency, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police as well as other government departments that are now contributing expertise to integrated peace operations such as the Departments of Justice, the Border Agency and Correctional Services Canada.

A final and difficult lesson learned is that there is no way to undertake these bold and difficult missions without risk, particularly to personnel. Given the current security context, the challenges faced by participants in international peace operations, in places such as Afghanistan, are daunting. Nonetheless it is important that countries not be deterred from efforts to assist fragile states and countries in crisis. It is in our interest to do so, to say nothing of the responsibility we have towards these nations.

Should the international community choose not to engage, the long term impact for all of us is clear: a greater threat to global peace and security, one which will ultimately affect our domestic peace and security as well.



## **Conclusion**

The Canadian government commitment in Afghanistan is only one example, albeit a very important one, which illustrates our understanding that for peace to take hold, we must first establish a secure environment and ensure the protection of civilians. These efforts have evolved well beyond the origins of traditional peace-keeping, when Lester Pearson first recommended that lightly armed soldiers be deployed to supervise a truce between opposing parties.

As I explained, Canada played a central role in the changes which peacekeeping underwent in the last half-century. We helped to shift the focus of UN and other international mandates in order to allow for the possibility of robust, even combat operations when required. We have argued and continue to argue that the protection of civilians is an issue that is central, not tangential, to the maintenance of peace and security. This was a hard lesson learned through our experiences in Srebrenica and Rwanda, a lesson that we are now putting into practice in Afghanistan.

In order to achieve sustainable progress in fragile states, it is also important to remember that we must promote security, governance and development simultaneously. Our PRT in Kandahar is a multi-disciplinary, inter-departmental, and multinational effort that is trying to do just that. Let me add, however, that this is an effort that recognizes that success is only possible with local ownership and participation. Building capacity, both locally and regionally, in key

institutions, for better governance and security, is crucial to our efforts, and is now a fundamental tenet of our approach

This is the new reality of peace support operations. For better and for worse, this is the new kind of integrated approach that we need in order to meet the security challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Thank you very much for your attention.