INTRODUCTION
This workshop, the first in a series of four in support of the 2016 Strategic Military Partners Conference, took place in Singapore 15-17 September 2015. It was a joint effort between Allied Command Transformation and the Combined Joint Operations from the Sea Centre of Excellence (CJOS COE). The workshop brought together a range of allied and partner representatives to discuss military partnership in the maritime domain.

OVERALL OBSERVATIONS
BLUF: NATO has the tools and direction to innovate partnerships that enable cooperation with a broad range of entities, throughout the international system, based on shared risk and reward, whenever and wherever required.

1. **Information Sharing** is a decades-long effort, but we are aided by technological innovation that makes information sharing easier in the maritime domain, as well as the increased presence of maritime traffic that forces cooperation amongst partners and agencies. Transparency is fundamental to cooperation. Maritime Situational Awareness and information sharing were determined to be the largest opportunities for increased collaboration.

2. **Trust** is built by being present and seizing opportunities, even *ad hoc* ones. In addition, including Asia-Pacific (A.P.) partners in European security considerations could bolster trust over the long term.

3. **Situational Awareness in the Asia-Pacific region:** Prudent to engage with partners across the world, particularly in Asia-Pacific. What happens in this region can affect Europe, and vice versa with profound implications. **Strategic awareness** is a necessity for both sides, with a mutual requirement to understand each other’s priorities and concerns, as well as to identify vulnerabilities and opportunities as soon as possible. Partners reinforced the need for NATO to be present in A.P. activities to listen and learn about the dynamics of the region. **Engagement** needs to be coordinated across all levels—strategic, operational and tactical.

4. **Autonomous Systems:** We need to consider what autonomous systems mean in the future for partners, especially in the maritime domain. Autonomous systems are at the early stage of development, but these systems have the potential to disrupt the fundamentals of military operations.
5. **Strategic Communications:** Improvement required vis-à-vis the Alliance Maritime Strategy, as well as need to better promote COEs to partners and how we organize ourselves internally and leverage their inputs.

6. **Developing a Tailored Partnership Community:** Shifts in the security environment are creating opportunities to deepen cooperation with Coast Guards, police, and border services. While there are statutory—and constitutional—limitations in some allied and partner states, the ground is shifting to make the case for deeper cooperation.

7. **Individually Tailored Roadmaps (ITRs):** AUS, SWE, and JPN expressed interested in this new endeavour as means to deepen cooperation. We will be sure to keep these partners engaged as we develop the concept.

**KEY POINTS FROM SESSIONS**

**SESSION I | THE BIG PICTURE: STRATEGIC FUTURES AND THE MARITIME DOMAIN**

*On the road to the Warsaw Summit, partnership continues to be a growing part of NATO’s core business. As we look to the future, the trend of increasing cooperation with non-NATO entities shows no sign of slowing. What might the future look like in the maritime domain, and what are the implications for allies and partners over the long term?*

1. We operate our forces in congested commons, particularly in the maritime domain. Participants agreed that sustained monitoring, presence, transparency, information sharing, and partnership are essential to assuring access over the long term.

2. There is a deepening, comprehensive interdependence between the states of Europe, North America, and Asia-Pacific. While the security context in each region is different, events in one region can affect the others. Moreover, the capabilities required to navigate the challenges in one region can be applied in all regions.

3. The emergence of new technologies, particularly autonomous systems, has the potential to not only change the character of military operations, but the fundament of them. Defence innovation is likely to produce new capabilities that may affect the type and number of partners NATO will engage in the future.

4. There is an alignment of key priorities and focus amongst allies and partners in the maritime domain, particularly amongst NATO, SWE, FIN, JPN, and AUS. Issue remains how to use tools to shape partnership over long-term with aim to reduce gap between rhetoric and resources. ITRs are a promising means to do so.

5. Need to have clear expectations of what NATO wants of partnership. Recall that partners are learning how to be interoperable and may need coaching about how to cooperate.

6. Exponentially rising costs of military equipment underscore a basic fact: No one nation can afford to go alone—partnerships are no longer a luxury. They are a requirement. We need a "game changer" and it could be UAVs and autonomous weaponry. But it is hard to move from technology to operability. Could be a 20 year cycle to go concept, design, prototype, and operations.

**SESSION II | NATO’S POLICY-STRATEGY RESPONSE: THE ALLIANCE MARITIME STRATEGY**
The Alliance Maritime Strategy (AMS) enables several opportunities for partnership in the maritime domain. How do partners view AMS and what policies are needed to improve cooperation?

1. Operationalising the AMS has elements of partnership, mindful that a large part of the Strategy is about force generation. At its heart are interoperability and logistics enablers.

2. Information sharing and classification remains an issue of concern for allies and partners alike, but is of heightened importance in the maritime domain. Working with partners, allies, and non-military mariners in a congested maritime commons is happening, but demands of the strategic environment behove all parties to share more information.

3. ETEE efforts serve as the basis for military partnership. AMS could be increased if we bolster participation in international maritime exercises, starting as observers—both in NATO exercises and regional ones.

4. AMS and maritime engagement could be aided by better strategic communications. We have a legacy of success and can build on it if we manage to convey the importance of maritime affairs in the Alliance—to include partners.

SESSION III | THE VIEW FROM MARITIME EXPERTS
Moving beyond policy and strategy, this session focuses on the enabling entities that are taking maritime partnership to new levels. What are the issues deemed important for partnerships in the Alliance? How can partners work with various maritime institutions to connect better in the education, training and evaluation domains?

1. Participants agreed that the Alliance Maritime Strategy is a good document, but an under-appreciated one. Half of NATO’s operations have had a maritime component, and there is room to develop the strategy further in key areas: maritime patrol, amphibious operations, and mine deliver for example.

2. Some partners conduct joint maritime exercises based on NATO standards. These are good examples of small regional relationships—a concept that can be expanded abroad to other regions.

3. Individually Tailored Roadmaps (ITRs) have potential to align partnership development along the lines of improving interoperability. This concept has generated interest in partners that seek to enhance interoperability with NATO and sustain links to the Alliance that were forged during ISAF.

4. NATO has the necessary policy and guidance to move forward. There are areas to focus efforts: interoperability, shared platforms, information exchange processes, and standards for autonomous systems.

SESSION IV | THE ROAD AHEAD—WHAT’S MISSING, AND WHERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR COOPERATION
What are the blind spots and areas that we have overlooked? From the partners’ perspectives, what are the important areas for cooperation not yet discussed?

1. Partnerships are in a new context, where maritime operations with partners are important. NATO needs to achieve coherence in terms of its policies toward partners, become clearer regarding desired outcomes, and outline the path to greater interoperability—should partners desire to become so with NATO.
2. There are several areas of cooperation in NATO. None have a specific maritime label. This needs to change, especially in light of increasing emphasis on maritime cooperation.

3. NATO needs to develop better hooks for partners to connect with the Alliance, as well as clarify the ways partners can interact with the Alliance at all levels.

4. NATO’s partnership ecosystem includes COEs and other training facilities. When considering how to bolster interoperability with the Alliance, partners would be wise to look at all the institutions available to them.

5. Lessons learned need to be embraced and shared.
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