John Colston, Philipp Fluri (Eds.)

# PFP Conference on Defence Policy and Strategy, Montreux, Switzerland February 2007

# Defence Co-operation between NATO and Its Partners: Visions of the Future



Geneva – Brussels 2007

**John Colston, Philipp Fluri (Eds.)**

# PFP Conference on Defence Policy and Strategy, Montreux, Switzerland February 2007

# Defence Co-operation between NATO and Its Partners: Visions of the Future

**Geneva – Brussels 2007**

ISBN 978-966-62-64-100

**PFP Conference on Defence Policy and Strategy, Montreux, Switzerland February 2007. Defence Co-operation between NATO and Its Partners: Visions of the Future** / John Colston, Philipp Fluri (Eds.) — Луганск: «Книжковий світ», 2007. — 58 с.

This book offers the material of the conference held in Montreux in February 2007 jointly conceived by NATO's Political-Military Steering Committee on Partnership for Peace and the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF). It contains information intended for the interested public outside the specialised circles normally having access to such information.

В книге представлены материалы конференции, проведенной НАТО в рамках программы «Партнерство ради мира» и Женевским центром демократического контроля над вооруженными силами в Монтеру в феврале 2007 г. Книга предназначена для широкого круга читателей, напрямую не связанных с этой проблематикой.

ISBN 978-966-62-64-100

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

## PREFACE

It is with pleasure that Switzerland accepted the invitation to organise the Montreux Future of NATO Conference in February 2007, and provided the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces with the mandate to implement it. The event was indicative of and reaffirmed Switzerland's commitment to the Partnership for Peace, particularly in the field of PAB-DIB programming.

I am sure that there is lasting interest in the Conference's findings and recommendations, and thus Switzerland is happy to make the proceedings available to a wider audience.

The Future of NATO brainstorming conferences, under Chatham House Rules, are a complement to the annual Oberammergau Planning Conference, and appreciated by all member and partner states. We welcome in particular the opportunity given to introduce the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces and the Geneva Centre for Security Policy to a wider Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council audience, and to put them to good use.

The topics discussed during the conference include the indivisibility of defence in security sector reform, the establishment of an instrument or tool for concrete, practical support to emerging democracies, burden sharing in peace-building operations, and civil military relations and cooperation in peace-building. These are topical issues not only for the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, but for Switzerland as well.

I am convinced that such conferences contribute to the ability of all participating parties to meet the challenges and seize the opportunities for improved security in the Euro-Atlantic region.

*Ambassador Raimund Kunz*

*Head of the Directorate for Security Policy,*

*Swiss Federal Department of Defence, Civil Protection and Sports*

## FOREWORD

Jointly conceived by NATO's Political-Military Steering Committee on Partnership for Peace and the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF), and co-funded by the Swiss Ministry of Defence, the conference held in Montreux in February 2007 was initiated in order to discuss the future of defence cooperation between the Alliance and its partners. It followed on from the conclusions of the November 2006 Riga Summit of NATO Heads of State and Government, in which the importance of NATO's policy of partnerships, dialogue and cooperation was underlined. Allies voiced their aim to maximise the potential of NATO's partnership frameworks, in both operational and reform assistance contexts, thus providing the central focus of this event.

The editors are delighted to make some of the key interventions available in their entirety, as handed in by their authors. Reference to the other interventions can be found in the Conference Report by Mr. John Colston.

The editors would like to thank the Swiss Ministry of Defence for the substantial financial support which made this conference possible.

*Brussels and Geneva, August 2007*

*The Editors*

## INTRODUCTION

The jointly conceived February 2007 conference held in Montreux, Switzerland, brought together representatives of NATO member and partner countries, NATO's International Staff and independent analysts, in order to provide a broad range of perspectives on the future of partnerships.

The keynote speaker, Dr. Graeme Herd of the Geneva Centre for Security Policy, opened the conference by outlining divergent alternative scenarios for the future of the Alliance, on the basis that this would ultimately determine the future of its partnerships. He argued that NATO would either go global, building on out-of-area operations such as Afghanistan, to assist a grand coalition of democracies in establishing a global strategic stability, or it would recoil from the out-of-area role, returning to a defunct collective defence organisation and thus become increasingly marginalised. According to the global NATO scenario, partnerships would expand to form a Global Partnership Initiative (GPI) to reward those countries contributing to strategic stability, from Latin America to East Asia. Challenges of such an initiative would include avoiding duplication with the UN Security Council and how to refrain from ostracising non-members.

Dr. Herd suggested that, in all likelihood, the future trajectory of NATO would lie somewhere between the two scenarios, with no global NATO per se, but a NATO that responds to global threats. Defence and security sector reform would be a key element of the Alliance's future role, and the principal components of NATO's 'soft power' toolbox in order to ensure long term success of stabilisation engagements. He explained that partnership successes to date had been built on the principle of self-differentiation, allowing partner states to choose from different forms of cooperation and assistance. Dr. Herd concluded that NATO now had to decide if it was to deepen and broaden these means of cooperation as its own agenda expanded.

The first session of the event focused on defence policy related aspects of NATO's partnerships and how they could be further developed post-Riga. It was acknowledged that security challenges were qualitatively different in the 21st century, thus demanding qualitatively different approaches, including those in the realm of partnerships. This new environment would require greater interaction with NATO's partners, based on practical means of cooperation, such as in the area of security sector reform. However, it was pointed out that NATO does not yet have a clear agenda in this area, and that this should be developed rapidly in order to provide clearer political guidance to implementers.

One aspect of the discussion was the experience of the Mediterranean Dialogue (MD), upgraded to a genuine partnership at the 2004 Istanbul Summit. It was pointed out by a speaker from the Mediterranean region that, although there was a commitment to reform amongst certain MD countries, the initiative should be driven by the countries themselves and not by NATO. He argued that in the light of today's interdependent security environment, common challenges were readily identifiable and should be tackled through a greater emphasis on cooperation and interoperability. These common threats included: terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, regional conflicts and organised crime. It was suggested that the great success of the PfP format could provide a blueprint

for a reinvigorated MD. However, in order to achieve a more productive engagement in the region, NATO would need to confront the negative image of the Alliance in the minds of Arab populations, who associate it with the actions of individual members. This would require evidence that dialogue, partnership and cooperation are genuine ambitions.

Discussions then turned to the question of defence and security posture transformation within NATO's partnership policies. The perspectives of three PFP member countries: Ukraine, Azerbaijan and Serbia, were offered, as a means to understanding their respective experiences of national security transformation in the partnership context.

It was explained that, in Ukraine, extensive cooperation with NATO through the Joint Working Group on Defence Reform (JWGDR) has allowed for significant defence transformation. The Defence Review, implemented with the assistance of NATO expertise, was the conceptual guide to long term reform. This in turn provided the impetus to expand the reform effort into the wider security sector, covering such areas as intelligence oversight and civil society engagement. The speaker suggested that such engagement could help to overcome lingering negative stereotypes regarding NATO within Ukrainian society. Interaction with NATO partnership mechanisms and its broader value system has evidently been central to Ukraine's security sector reform efforts, offering a model for possible transformation efforts in other countries.

Much like the JWGDR in Ukraine, the Serbia-NATO Defence Reform Group (DRG) had provided an effective platform to transfer advice and expertise in Serbia, encouraging the development of a strategic vision for reform, as highlighted by one participant. Serbia also offered an example of how NATO could initiate deep engagement with a country beyond the status of formal relations (Serbia being awarded PfP status only at the Riga Summit), by providing contact point NATO member states (the UK and Norway in this case) as mentors for reform.

The audience heard that Azerbaijan's experience of defence reform through partnership with NATO had been more challenging, in part due to the problems associated with the ongoing conflict in Nagorno Karabakh, as well as the legacy of Soviet-era institutions. Fundamental challenges, such as the imposition of effective civilian democratic control of the security sector and the adoption of strategic documents, were being tackled through the Individual Partnership Action Plan (IPAP) framework.

As the Azeri case showed, the political context in which NATO seeks to engage partner countries is paramount in determining the potential for successful transformation. Various institutional initiatives to support defence institution building were discussed, such as the wider use of PfP Trust Funds, as established in Ukraine. In considering how to maximise partner access to NATO expertise in the area of security sector reform, the idea of establishing an EAPC Defence and Security Sector Reform Co-ordination Centre was suggested.

The final topic of discussion was the future of NATO's partnerships, in light of the new challenges of the 21st century, as outlined in NATO's Strategic Concept. Despite the need for innovation, the maintenance of the successful existing elements of NATO partnerships, such as: self-differentiation,

inclusiveness and rigorous transformation status reviews, was recognised as equally important. However, it was noted that the prospect of Alliance membership, traditionally the key reform driver in partnership programmes, would not be the priority for many new, global partners; the focus would shift from developing future members to developing effective security contributors. The concept of defence cooperation in this new context would be altered. It could be based on a security and value consensus, underpinned by greater efforts in public diplomacy, dialogue and cooperation with other institutions and civil society. This could, for example, take the form of permanent NATO IS liaison with other international organisations.

One speaker argued that the expansion of NATO's operational commitments - now representing more than 50,000 personnel deployed globally under NATO auspices – demanded a more active participation from partners. This presented two key and related priorities for the Alliance: transformation and interoperability. Both needs would have to be based on an established consensus between NATO and its contributing partners, to achieve interoperable practices in areas such as: training, exercises and communication. As affiliations with global partners would become looser, and no longer based on the lure of membership, Allies called at Riga for the ability to convene ad-hoc meetings with partners that were able to contribute to a given NATO operation. This would allow for greater political agility in responding to insecurity. However, it was pointed out that demanding greater operational contributions would imply a need to provide, in turn, a greater role in decision-making for partners. Contributions, one participant observed, need not be restricted to the military sphere, and could be manifested in a number of ways, from political to material input.

Differentiating between bilateral and multilateral approaches to partnerships was seen as an important step in reconfiguring NATO fora and mechanisms. In the realm of bilateral partnership approaches, a greater focus on capabilities and contributions was likely. In approaching countries with a democratic deficit, cooperation and dialogue in 'softer' areas could be envisaged. It was stated that the profile of NATO partners had become more heterogeneous, thus requiring greater room for differentiation and flexibility. One solution would be to offer elements of PfP cooperation to all partners, based on individual needs and agreements. This approach was named 'a la carte conditionality'. It would, in part, offer a response to the previously discussed new reality of decoupling partnerships from enlargement. In the multilateral context, it was argued that the time was ripe for new innovations. The possibility of establishing a concentric forum within EAPC was proposed, to vary the degree of input from a partner based on its commitment to the issue of the day. This could help to reinforce the political will to act and commit in a crisis, which would ultimately determine the readiness of both partners and Allies to commit much needed resources.

Ultimately, the event highlighted the need to adapt NATO's partnership practices to the new security environment. New, global partners will not respond to the same priorities as traditional Alliance partners, where cooperation was ultimately based on eventual membership. Greater flexibility will be needed to speak to different combinations of partners and to offer varying forms of cooperation.

## FOOD FOR THOUGHT PAPER

*Note by the Chairman of the Conference, NATO Assistant Secretary General for Defence Policy and Planning, John Colston*

### Background

Intended to support discussions at the Partnership for Peace Conference on Defence Policy and Strategy to be held on 19-20 February 2007 in Montreux, Switzerland, this paper sets out a number of recommendations on possible priorities for defence and security co-operation between NATO and its Partners and attempts to identify key drivers which are expected to shape the development of NATO's defence and security partnerships in the future.

### Policy Context

At their meeting in Riga held on 29 November 2006, NATO Heads of State and Government underscored *inter alia* the importance of NATO's policy of partnerships, dialogue, and cooperation including "practical cooperation at all levels with partners, the UN and other relevant international organisations, Non-Governmental Organisations and local actors"[1] .

They also decided to "fully develop the political and practical potential of NATO's existing cooperation programmes: EAPC/Partnership for Peace (PfP), MD and ICI, and its relations with Contact Countries […]" including by increasing the operational relevance of relations with non-NATO countries, including interested Contact Countries; and strengthening NATO's ability to work with those current and potential contributors to NATO operations and missions; and increasing NATO's ability to provide practical advice on, and assistance in, the defence and security-related aspects of reform in countries and regions where NATO is engaged.

### Guiding Principles

These political decisions should form the basis for developing truly comprehensive co-operation programmes between NATO and its Partners to better prepare for a wide range of global security challenges which the Alliance and its Partners are likely to confront in the coming years and decades.

In developing their defence and security programmes, NATO and its Partners could be guided by four major principles, namely:

- the need to fully recognise and reflect in their joint approaches the evolving nature and diversity of threats and risks which NATO and its Partners face;
- the need to be flexible and adaptive in addressing possible new forms of co-operation;
- the need to retain flexibility to refocus co-operation priorities depending on the overall security situation, as required;
- the need to fully recognise the importance of cultural factors in pursuing the co-operation agenda.

---

[1] Riga Summit Declaration, issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Riga on 29 November 2006.

**Global Security Environment and NATO's Partnerships**

Forms of practical co-operation between NATO and its Partners in the 21st century should reflect and keep abreast with the evolution of global security environment. In other words, NATO's defence and security co-operation programmes should be designed to better prepare NATO and its Partners for security challenges which are likely to pose risks to stability across the Euro-Atlantic area. Before addressing proposals on new forms of co-operation, it is therefore important to consider how the global security environment is likely to evolve within the next 10-15 years.

**The Challenge of Globalisation: A Paradigm Shift in Security Thinking**

Most analysts agree that a defining feature of the global security environment between now and, say, 2020-2025 will be the emergence of multidimensional security challenges resulting from globalisation which can be understood as "growing interconnectedness reflected in the expanded flows of information, technology, capital, goods, services, and people throughout the world".

The phenomenon of globalisation is likely to produce both great benefits and serious challenges to global security many of which have yet to be fully apprehended. The most positive impact of globalisation on global security results from its ability and dynamism to lead to greater integration of economies and societies, which, in turn, leads to greater confidence and trust among nations thus making the international order more predictable.

However, globalisation also brings about a number of serious security risks the biggest of which appears to be a widening gap between "the rich and stable" on the one hand, and "the poor and instable" on the other. This widening gap is likely to induce instability in a growingly inter-connected world.

Other security challenges to global security which may emerge within the next 15 years include but are not limited to spread and growing accessibility of new technologies including the lethal; growing dependence of the world economy on IT technologies; a speedy emergence of non-state actors as independent players in international affairs and related challenges to nation state; the emergence of new power centres which could seriously change the structure of the international relations; competition for resources which may lead to conflicts and dramatic re-nationalisation of security policies; growing privatisation and "exclusiveness" of security; new challenges to governance including the emergence – as a strong counter-reaction to globalisation - of transnational ideologies which could make use of internal and regional conflicts, and international terrorism, crime, and religious extremism to advance their objectives; and – last but not least - climate change which may become the most profound security risk of the 21st century. In addition, the re-emergence of traditional military threats in the Euro-Atlantic area and beyond including regional military conflicts cannot be ruled out as the international system continues to be in flux and tensions between nation-states deepen.

The 21st century may therefore see the emergence of an exceptionally complex security environment which will require flexibility in and the ability to adapt security planning to rapidly changing circumstances. No nation will be able to respond to these security challenges acting in isolation from others. "Security autarky" is simply impossible in the 21st century. "The Euro-Atlantic security community" the pillars of which are NATO and its Partners is arguably the framework to be able to cope with these truly global security challenges through co-operation and joint action. Addressing and managing the security challenges emerging in the era of globalisation could therefore

be the principle objective of NATO's defence and security co-operation programmes in the 21st century.

Accordingly, practical programmes of co-operation between NATO and its Partners should aim to prepare NATO and its Partners for joint action not only to manage but also to shape the negative consequences of globalisation.

**Greater Involvement of the Willing Partners in NATO Defence Policy Initiatives: Comprehensive Political Guidance and Partners**

Some of these complex risks and emergencies above will clearly need to be managed by military force. NATO and Partner forces are therefore more than likely to be called upon to operate in complex operations ranging from heavy combat to stabilisation missions. In the defence area, NATO's co-operation programmes should therefore continue to prepare NATO and Partner forces to operate together on the battlefield of the 21st century. As a result, achieving even greater involvement of the willing Partners in NATO defence policy initiatives is necessary.

The Comprehensive Political Guidance, endorsed by NATO Heads of State and Government on 29 November 2006 provides a framework and political direction for NATO's continuing transformation, setting out, for the next 10 to 15 years, the priorities for all Alliance capability issues, planning disciplines and intelligence. Implementation of the Comprehensive Political Guidance should lead to the development of more usable capabilities for future operations and missions.

NATO Allies could decide to involve on a case-by-case basis the willing and interested Partners in the implementation of the guidance. As with a great number of previous initiatives which the Alliance launched, appropriate modalities for Partner involvement in implementing the guidance will need to be developed and the NATO committees and bodies responsible for the relevant planning disciplines could decide to invite the interested Partner countries to contribute to efforts aimed at implementing the guidance.

**Expanding the Scope of Co-operation with the interested Partners in Transforming National Security Postures**

Yet, today's security cannot rely solely on military assets and capabilities as the above-mentioned threats and risks and complex emergencies require carefully planned and well-executed multinational, intra- and inter-governmental, and non-governmental, responses. Therefore, a truly comprehensive approach to defence and security co-operation is required.

In addition to co-operation in the defence area, NATO could therefore decide to extend the scope of its engagement with the interested Partners to address broad approaches to security. Reinforcing NATO's defence and security co-operation programmes through expanding the scope of co-operation with the interested Partners in transforming national security postures to better prepare national security systems to meet the 21st century security challenges and addressing through NATO's co-operation programmes non-traditional areas of security including managing non-conventional threats and risks could become the priorities for NATO's co-operation with the interested Partners.

In undertaking such efforts, NATO Allies could therefore decide to assist the interested Partners in implementing comprehensive reforms in their security sectors through developing and implementing

NATO's own policy on co-operation in transforming national security postures. Practical forms of this co-operation could be based on what is sometimes called "three generations of security sector reform" (SSR).

In general, the first generation of SSR deals with establishing new institutions and structures and delineating the powers of the security sector actors; the second generation of SSR addresses the effectiveness and efficiency of reform activities and security sector operations at a cost which is affordable to the society.

The two initial phases of SSR are still in the making in many Partner countries and NATO has been assisting the interested Partners in implementing several programmes aimed at achieving the objectives of the two initial generations of SSR.

**The Third Generation of Security Sector Reform**

The third generation of SSR should address the ability of all security sector actors to interact and operate together to meet the 21st century challenges. It should also aim to provide national security sectors with capabilities which are needed to address these challenges. The third phase of SSR should therefore lay a particular emphasis on inter-agency co-operation and co-ordination of reforms across national security systems as well as on the development of relevant capabilities.

The third-generation SSR NATO's co-operation programmes could aim to assist the Partner countries in establishing the 21st century security sectors able to contribute to operational efforts undertaken by the international community to manage global security contingencies. Through these programmes NATO could assist the interested Partners *inter alia* in:

- developing comprehensive national security strategies to provide guidance for the development of national security and defence doctrines and capabilities;
- aligning Partner security sectors with the Euro-Atlantic norms and standards including though enhancing systems of national security decision-making;
- developing effective mechanisms of inter-agency co-operation;
- providing clarity on the respective roles of and interactions between military forces and other security sector elements;
- enhancing capabilities of all security forces including through providing advice on transformation of the individual components of security sectors;
- assisting in training security personnel to be able to operate in a multi-dimensional security environment.

**Increasing the Cultural Awareness and Cross-Cultural Understanding through Co-operation**

Another dimension which NATO could add to its Partnership programmes is the role which cultural and human factors play in ensuring common security. More and more co-operation programmes and activities with Partners should include activities aimed at increasing cross-cultural knowledge and understanding of security cultures and perceptions. In other words, NATO could lead an effort aimed at deepening cross-cultural understanding of security philosophies and perceptions in an increasingly globalising world.

Possible activities which could be launched in this area could include exchanges about the concepts and philosophies underlining the functioning of national security systems; the relationship between security cultures and managing national security sectors; the role of uniformed personnel in society; or social perceptions of security risks and challenges.

Such co-operation would not necessarily have to lead to any transfers of values. It would rather reflect the need to increase mutual understanding and knowledge of different approaches to and perceptions of security. Given the cultural diversity, it is only at a later stage of such co-operation that a global community of common values and perceptions could emerge.

**The Need to Involve Other Security Actors**

Obviously, such an ambitious and extensive co-operation agenda would need to be implemented in close co-ordination and partnership with other international organisations, academia, and NGOs dealing with various aspects of global security. Involving in their co-operation programmes as much external expertise as possible should therefore become one more policy objective which NATO and Partners could pursue in the 21st century.

**Keynote Address:**
**FUTURE VISIONS OF NATO PARTNERSHIPS AND COOPERATION PROGRAMMES**
*Dr. Graeme P. Herd, GCSP*

**Implementing the Riga Agenda: Implications for Partnerships**

What are NATO partnerships for? What do they provide for NATO that NATO cannot attain otherwise? What advantages do they bring to partners? Does the proliferation of partnerships – a veritable partnership industry – risk diluting the label of "NATO-partner"? Does NATO need to develop new, pragmatic, flexible, cost effective mechanisms and models (formal and informal) of partnership or should it concentrate on improving existing mechanisms for dialogue and cooperation? Need NATO develop a more formal hierarchy of partnerships? Is there an organizing principle and logic (the application of PfP tools to other partnerships?) that creates synergies and adds value to the range of partnerships, or do we face rather overload, overstretch, duplication and incoherence – a recipe for inaction? The Political Guidance offered by the NATO Heads of State and Government in Riga on 29 November 2006 aimed, *inter alia*, "to increase NATO's ability to provide practical advice on, and assistance in the defence and security-related aspects of reform in countries and regions where NATO is engaged" (Riga Summit Declaration).

**Possible NATO Future Pathways:**

Given that the future pathway NATO takes will shape the nature of NATO partnerships, their role and function, it is pertinent to pose the question: where is NATO heading? This is not easy to answer with any confidence, though it is possible to identify the extremes of the debate that unfold in the media, academia, policy and practitioner circles. One extreme suggests that NATO will go global, building on successful military operations in Afghanistan and, with the help of a global coalition of democracies, uncover the holy grail of international security politics – grand strategic stability. The other suggests that going out of area, especially post-9/11 will result in strategic defeat, with NATO reacting by returning to a redundant collective defence role, with its partnerships largely left to wither on the vine. Let's examine each in turn and assess their implications for partnerships.

US Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs R. Nicholas Burns stated: "Our goal at the Riga summit is to showcase a NATO that must have global missions and has partners and capabilities to achieve those missions. The US is working hard with transatlantic partners to promote shared values throughout the world." In this vision NATO responds to the logic of the international security environment – transnational security threats and sources of insecurity that are global demand a global response: "global threats cannot be tackled by regional organizations."[2] It recognizes that NATO is no-longer self-sufficient – already 18 non-NATO members are involved in NATO operations, 11 of them are in Afghanistan. As a result, NATO operational effectiveness is only as good as NATO network and NATO partnerships. Partnerships are needed to develop three main inter-related functions: a robust advanced expeditionary warfare capability; stabilization and

[2] Ivo Daalder and James Goldgeier, "Global NATO," *Foreign Affairs*, September/October 2006, pp. 105-113.

reconstruction capability in complex crisis management environments; rebuilding indigenous militaries and security forces as part of an exit strategy. There functions are the *sine qua non* of grand strategic stability.[3] This amounts to a doctrine of global intervention.

If the global NATO pathway is taken, what are the implications for NATO partnerships, in particular the status of the Contact Group that operates alongside NATO in Afghanistan? According to this vision of NATO's future, Article 10 is revised, and a range of states from Argentina, Brazil, Australia, Brazil, New Zealand, Japan and South Korea become the cornerstone of a new Global Partnership Initiative (GPI). GPI a way of rewarding states that have contributed to NATO missions with a formal partnership and a way to complete NATO's military transformation.

However, a number of red flags have already been waved by both existing NATO members and the wider international community which suggest that the reception of the GPI could be turbulent. Firstly, NATO members have asked: what of the selection criteria? Is this a partnership of the rich, of the capable, in which democracies are privileged above key players/security providers? Does this result in a Global Security Network, an Alliance of Democracies, a Security Providers Forum, a Global Security Directorate that rivals the UNSC for influence?

How does NATO avoid alienating those states that are excluded and, more generally, avoid the creation of a "the West is best versus the rest" syndrome that is divisive and undermines the defence and security sector reform (SSR) agenda? NATO as neo-imperial instrument of Western military conquest – a global political and military bloc?[4] Would not China and Russia look to PfP and conclude that so too will GPI inevitably provide an eventual stepping stone to NATO membership? Might not regional superpowers raise concerns that NATO military interventions and stabilizations supported by global partners will upset regional balances of power and so lead to regional instability?[5] How does NATO ensure that it continues to be perceived as an honest broker if it now intervenes in specific regions in partnership with states from that region?

Lastly, what are the implications of closing the gap between Allies and Partners? Might this result in a three-tiered NATO? Already NATO appears divided between those that use national caveats and understand transformation as an end in itself and those that are more willing to reduce such caveats and see transformation as a means to operationalise and then use the NATO Response Force. It is likely that GPI members who actively support NATO military operations increasingly demand access to NATO intelligence, the planning process and decision-making, so compensating for the NATO shortfall in troop numbers and effectiveness. Will this GPI auxiliary role encourage "Core NATO" to step up to the challenges of the 21st century, or in fact reduce the pressure for them to do so? What are the obligations of NATO to its global partners? If Japan is attacked by N. Korea, is NATO in a NE Asia war?

At the other end of the spectrum of future possibilities, NATO, by going out of area after 9/11, suffers strategic defeat and so goes out of the collective security business. The US and UK-led

---

[3] Julian Lyndley-French, "The Capability-Capacity Crunch: NATO's New Capacities for Intervention," *European Security,* Vol. 15, No. 3., September 2006, pp. 259-280.

[4] Stephen Castle, "France blocks NATO bid to create a global terror force," *The Independent*, 4 November 2006, p. 26.

[5] Russian State Duma Deputies stated: "NATO membership of any state that is a participant in the CIS runs counter to the highest strategic interests of those states and the aspirations of their peoples" and expressed its negative attitude to NATO expansion eastward, "believing it to run counter to interests of international security." ITAR-TASS news agency, Moscow, in Russian, 20 December 2006.

coalition of the willing in Iraq involved 16 of the 26 NATO members states and it now appears that although defeat is not an option, victory is not possible. In Afghanistan, NATO's ISAF military operation lacks the urgency, commitment and political will to win, but at least at present it is sufficient not to lose. Tactical victories, such as "Operation Medusa" which defeated Taliban elements in the Kandahar province in autumn 2006 are possible, but the political, economic and social dimensions of the hoped for end-state have not progressed as fast as neo-Taliban forces and opium production. Afghanistan emerges as a narco-terrorist failed state.[6] As a result, NATO returns to its classical and traditional passive core Article 5 collective defence role against non-existent threats on NATO borders. In the US, the inclination is to disengage, a more isolationist impulse is ascendant and structural interventions globally are delegitimised.

If the first scenario does unfold and NATO goes global then the defence and SSR agenda will be a vital component of its overall global engagement – the soft power equivalent of the hard power structural engagement. It will be critical to sustainability and long-term success of these engagements. Going global does not necessarily mean that this agenda is lost in the shuffle. The second scenario – strategic defeat - does not inevitably torpedo the partnership framework or the notion of a global partnership framework. Indeed, it may, paradoxically, provide a more secure and focused platform for pushing forward partnerships, particularly if the focus of partnerships moves from expeditionary warfare, stabilization and reconstruction, towards the SSR and defence reform agenda.

These future visions are certainly extreme, absolute in their predictions and based on a black-and-white world view. The future pathway is likely to meander between these two stark extremes. NATO will increasingly operate in a grey security environment within which new security challenges, obstacles and dilemmas will characterize the topography. The tension between the core/classical NATO missions and NATO's interaction with the rest of the world – best captured by the formulation that it is not a global NATO but a NATO responding to global threats[7] - will remain unresolved. The task for NATO is to reinterpret Article 5 for the contemporary world: what exactly is common defence in a borderless world and how might partnerships contribute to maximizing common interests in stability?

**Identifying Lessons and Best Practice?**

So, the real question is how might the defence reform agenda be promoted via partnerships? A good starting point would be to consider what made PfP effective as a mechanism. To what extent can PfP success be replicated through other partnerships? Which new mechanisms that are affordable, appropriate and acceptable need to be created? And, ultimately, what is the fabric that holds the partnerships together and provides an organizing logic which meets both partner and NATO interests?

The principle of self-differentiation in PfP has been critical to its success. It has allowed some partners to join NATO through the MAP process, and others to use the NATO partnership IPAP process to provide practical advice, and assistance in the defence and security-related aspects of reform to make their states more stable. Indeed, in the Western Balkans, states exemplify the first

---

[6] Stanislaw Koziej (a retired general and former Polish deputy minister of national defence), "The ruination of NATO in Afghanistan," *Gazeta Wyborcza* website, Warsaw, in Polish, 9 October 2006

[7] *Global NATO: Overdue or Overstretch?,* Brussels, 6 November 2006: www.forum-europe.com/download/SDA/SDA Global NATO Report Ebook.pdf

trend (Croatia, Albania and Macedonia) and the three newest PfP members (Serbia, Montenegro and Bosnia and Herzegovina) the second. At the same time, PfP provided an attractive framework through which the "neutral" and "non-aligned" could interact with NATO without membership.

PfP also provided an incremental, progressive and multilayered framework through which military and security CBMs could be implemented from the "soft end" through to more sensitive areas of concern. Official representation at NATO HQ allowed for real dialogue and cooperation and momentum for change, and NATO Parliamentary Assembly outreach provided a political channel of communication for partner states. Engagement also with security NGOs and civil society through an educational focus (NATO Science Projects), as well as effective information and communication programmes positively shaped the perceptions and expectations of NATO in partner states.

The Mediterranean Dialogue has been less successful, as the public and elite are much more suspicious of NATO's role and purpose. In the case of the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative, the Gulf Cooperation Council States appear more interested in cooperating with NATO for the deterrent impact it may have on Iran – a potentially nuclear Iran - now the main preoccupation of states in the region. But within these two partnership models, two effective mechanisms can at least be identified. Firstly, the adoption of a sub-regional cluster approach. A sub-regional forum and clusters, or bilateral approaches, can side-step divisive regional sore points. Secondly, the bottom-up approach, which is based on needs which are identified by MD and ICI states.[8]

**Functional and Regional Imperatives:**

NATO has received top-down political guidance from the Riga Summit and now works bottom-up to provide solutions that are appropriate, acceptable and affordable. The solutions must be appropriate in that they practically address the security challenges NATO and its partners face. They must be acceptable to the public and elite within partner states and also affordable in terms of how much investment (time, people and money) is needed for the partnerships to be successful. NATO can both deepen the functions that partnerships perform and widen access to its partnership frameworks by adopting the PfP principle of self-differentiation and applying it in a more focused way to restructure the EAPC, ICI, MD and Contact Group.

All partnerships can offer a common menu or portfolio of engagement, allowing partners to select the nature of the engagement according to their interests. This *a la carte* approach can be bundled into three main functions. Firstly, security sector governance that includes defence reform and interoperability as an end in itself. This builds confidence and gives the public time to understand NATO's evolving role, function and purpose. Combined with active discussions on how best to respond to global security challenges, security sector governance strengthens NATO as a political actor. Secondly, to advance the transformation agenda, including developing modalities (operational capabilities concept) that allow for integrated operations. This emphasizes the political role and nature of NATO and has practical benefits for both NATO and its partners. Thirdly, to operationalise those discussions through agreed "security solutions" – that is, maintain and strengthen the ability of some partners to cooperate with NATO in military operations, be it "Active Endeavour" in the Mediterranean, ISAF in Afghanistan or future operations with the NRF.

---

[8] Chris Donnelly, "Forging a NATO Partnership for the Greater Middle East," *NATO Review*, May 2004, pp. 26-30.

This functional differentiation maximizes capacity and expertise building between partnerships and so provides an overarching connecting fabric that runs through each of the regionally based partnerships. For example, Jordan, Tunisia, Ireland and Australia can all work alongside ISAF, while Mauritania, Egypt, Serbia and Kyrgyzstan can focus on the first tranche of activities - the defence reform and security sector governance agenda. Functional differentiation maintains focus, while still recognizing the value, specificity and utility of regional groupings: different regions face different issues – or the same issues but experience them differently, have different needs and objectives and may propose regionally sensitive solutions.

## NATO AFTER THE RIGA SUMMIT

*Willem van Eekelen*

The Riga Summit turned out to be better than expected. It confirmed the old saying that nations behave with ultimate wisdom after all other alternatives have been exhausted. Even a few weeks before the meeting, things seemed to be in disarray. It seemed that it would not live up to what had been coined a "transformation summit." Nor would it make NATO go global, because several European allies doubted this American initiative, especially at that point in time. In the end, Riga placed particular emphasis on increasing and maintaining credible forces in Afghanistan. The enlargement issue was no longer on the agenda especially following the series of ambiguous developments in Ukraine. However, the decision to extend the Partnership for Peace (PfP) initiative to Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia, despite the latter's reluctance to cooperate with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) in The Hague, was surprising. The three countries that have Membership Action Plan (MAP) status – Albania, Croatia and Macedonia – were tipped to receive invitations to join the Alliance at the next meeting which is scheduled for 2008.

The Summit refrained from adopting a new Strategic Concept, despite the fact that the 1999 text clearly needed an update. Instead, the various heads of states and governments issued a "Comprehensive Political Guidance" document in addition to the usual lengthy Summit Declaration. The Guidance document emphasized what had been agreed on previously, including the strengthening of states' abilities to meet various types of challenges "from wherever they may come," but also added "to the security of its populations, territory and forces." Moreover, it was reiterated that in order to undertake the full range of its missions, the Alliance must have the capacity to launch and sustain concurrent major joint operations and smaller-scale operations in the framework of collective defence and crisis response within and beyond Alliance territory, on its periphery and at a strategic distance (paragraph 11). The Alliance also needs forces that are structured, equipped, manned and trained for expeditionary operations in order to respond rapidly to emerging crises, within which the NATO Response Force represents a key element to effectively reinforce initial entry forces, and sustain the Alliance's commitment for the duration of operations (paragraph 12). In paragraph 13, the document confirmed the political target set out earlier by the defence ministers with regards to the proportion of their nation's land forces which are structured, prepared and equipped for deployment (40%), as well as the level of planning needed for operations at any given time (8%). By setting these percentages, the Summit provided an element of concrete guidance for defence planning, which will also serve in the context of the PfP framework. Most of the other points still need to be translated into practical measures.

### General observations

As an intergovernmental organisation, NATO continues to occupy a special place. Emerging at the start of the Cold War as a collective defence organisation, it has developed into a unique politico-military alliance over the years by establishing effective machinery for permanent political consultations among its members and a military command system capable of rapid action. It has also been able to adjust to the changing security environment through a combination of factors most important among which is the adaptability of its missions. Its PfP programme extended security

co-operation throughout the Euro-Atlantic area which now includes the former states of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). Its integrated military structure provided a role for all its allies and achieved impressive results in terms of common practices, joint operating procedures and rules of engagement. Even in operations which were not commanded by NATO as such but conducted on the basis of a coalition of the "willing and able" NATO procedures provided the fabric to facilitate joint action.

As an intergovernmental organisation, NATO faces all the impediments inherent in consensus based decision-making organisations. In this respect, it is no different from other intergovernmental organisations. It differs from other organizations, however, in light of the fact that the US is the main provider of security within the Alliance. There is also emphasis on the multilateral review of procedures which put national commitments within a comprehensive system of defence planning and an efficient bureaucratic system capable of providing solutions for crises. NATO's system of decision-making has many special characteristics: it meets regularly and combines bottom-up and top-down approaches; its Secretary General and Secretariat hold strong positions while maintaining a leadership role for the US; it is consensus based which implies that a great deal of effort is made to find a compromise between different views and interests; it is politico-military in nature with both parallel lines of authority and cross-links between the political and military components of the organisation; it contains rigorous mutual examination and review processes; it does not depend on meetings of ministers for decision-making in times of crisis as the permanent council possesses full decision making authority in between ministerial sessions; and, finally, it has a parliamentary dimension. Its characteristics can be detailed as follows:

1. Regular and frequent: Foreign ministers and defence ministers meet twice yearly in formal sessions, while Heads of Government meet at irregular intervals, normally every few years. Defence ministers meet within the Defence Planning Committee (DPC) to discuss the integrated military structure, i.e. without France. Occasional ministerial meetings are possible when the defence ministers conduct informal brainstorming type meetings. At the headquarters in Evere, the North Atlantic Council – in permanent session – meets every Wednesday morning which is preceded by a luncheon of the ambassadors the previous day. They also convene within the DPC configuration as their deputies meet weekly within the Senior Political Committee or other configurations and their staff members meet in committees ranging from the political committee, defence review committee, nuclear planning staff group, information committee, civil and military budget committees, infrastructure committees and a host of some 400 specialised committees, groups and panels often requiring the presence of experts from various participating capitals. Since 1994, NATO has developed a network of partnerships, starting with PfP, but subsequently developing into a number of different arrangements, which will be discussed below under the heading of "enlargement."
2. Bottom-up and top-down approaches: Routine matters are addressed in a bottom-up approach. The Political Committee regularly reviews developments in all parts of the world based on inputs by the different member states and reports to the NAC. The Defence Review Committee follows a defence planning cycle based on ministerial guidance (which it drafts), as well as the NATO force goals which also examines the input of member countries. The process of setting targets which is an added tool for evaluating performance could be described as "mutual arm twisting" or, in modern jargon, as "benchmarking" and "peer pressure." In other words, because

of the competition factor everybody examines everybody else and, as a result, everybody does somewhat better than originally intended. This process could only occur up to a point, because ultimately decisions on the size of the defence budgets and the composition of the armed forces remain national prerogatives. At the height of the Cold War, NATO countries, following ministerial guidance, agreed to raise defence budgets by 3% annually, but in fact only a few countries were willing to fully implement this decision.

3. A strong secretariat and US leadership: The Secretary General of NATO chairs the North Atlantic Council and DPC both in ministerial and permanent sessions. He prepares the sessions, sets the agenda and introduces the individual items. On occasion, he is mandated to undertake important missions, such as negotiating a new relationship with Russia. Important committee meetings are chaired by the assistant secretary generals. They present summaries, prepare minutes and draft policy papers. The Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs chairs the drafting committee at the ministerial sessions (consisting of the deputy permanent representatives and senior policy officials from various capitals). The honorary chairman of the ministerial session has little other function than offering the formal dinner.

   All incumbents of the post of Secretary General have managed a constructive relationship with the US, without becoming their mouthpiece. To the contrary, they have, through frequent visits to Washington, been able to explain emerging European views to the US administration and often exerted a soothing and moderating influence on sensitive issues. Obviously, the Secretary General and his staff pay a great deal of attention to American views and often rely on input from Washington. The NATO Situation Centre very much depends on US intelligence, as NATO possesses no intelligence gathering capability of its own. In the military chain of command, this reliance is even greater as both Major NATO Commanders are Americans who hold US command positions.

   The degree to which Washington exercises its leadership varies considerably, but it is omnipresent. The US representative in the Council or in its committees does not necessarily speak first, but his words carry considerable weight and often set the tone for the ultimate decision. The large financial contribution of the US and its preponderant military contribution and political clout in the world add great weight to these views. In some cases, the US lobbied actively for certain decisions it felt necessary. Examples are the acquisition of AWACS as a NATO asset in the 1970s, the deployment of cruise missiles in the 1980s and NATO enlargement in the 1990s.

   The last reorganisation of the military command structure separated the operational and functional responsibilities at the highest level. The two Major NATO Commands were replaced by two Strategic Commands: Allied Command Operations (ACO) in Mons led by SACEUR and Allied Command Transformation (ACT) in Norfolk, US. Both strategic commanders and the commander of one of the two Joint Force Commands (JFC) in Naples were American with US commands. During the Cold War, this arrangement constituted a powerful link with the military might of the US and its nuclear arsenal and enhanced the credibility of NATO's deterrent and defence posture. Currently, it is deemed important to maintain one strategic command on US territory.

4. Consensus based: Decisions are rarely taken at the outset. The only recent example is the decision in principle to invoke Article V on 12 September, 2001, the day after the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon. Usually several rounds of discussion

follow each other, allow for a reporting-instructing traffic of communications between the permanent representatives and their capitals. Important issues are first explored informally at a Tuesday luncheon, followed by a meeting (without minutes) of the ambassadors plus one assistant in the meeting room next to the Secretary General's Office. Subsequently, the International Staff prepares a memorandum or a policy paper which then follows a more formal course, either through the committee structure or directly into the Council.

Consensus grows during the succession of discussion rounds. Permanent Representatives state their positions, report on the views of others, suggest possible middle ground and ask for some flexibility in their instructions. If still in doubt, they agree to a compromise subject for a reservation which could be lifted after further consultation with the home country. Over the years, the custom of not vetoing a decision when in a minority of one has strengthened. There have been exceptions, however, such as repeated French objections and the Greek-Turkish controversies. Other countries have occasionally resorted to adding a dissenting footnote to communiques, without blocking their adoption, mainly in cases where their parliaments would find it difficult to follow the agreed line.

5. A politico-military organisation: The main purpose of NATO is collective defence against any aggression which affects the territorial integrity of its members. Soon after its creation in 1949, an integrated military structure was created to plan, organise and if necessary command the necessary collective response. Consequently, much hard work took place on the military side with considerable success in terms of joint planning, standing operating procedures and rules of engagement. At NATO's Headquarters in Evere, however, most of the work undertaken is of a political nature. In theory, a Military Committee with its own International Military Staff renders independent military advice to the NAC. In practice, most of this advice already has a political colouring, because military representatives receive their instructions from the national Chiefs of Defence, who are subject to the ministerial responsibility of their political masters at home. A good argument could be made for streamlining the organisation at Evere by merging the International Staff and the International Military Staff and transforming the Military Committee into a senior committee under the NAC. Today, the relationship between NAC and MC remains ambiguous, as is the relationship between MC and the Major NATO Commanders. The Chairman of the Military Committee has a tendency to see himself as superior to the MNC's when he communicates the instructions of the NAC to them, but in the final analysis both are subjected to the political control exercised by the NATO Council.

   The organisation is at its most cumbersome during the planning phase of the defence planning cycle. The Defence Review Committee is attended by representatives of the IS, IMS and the MNC's but their respective roles should be clarified.

6. Delegated power of the Permanent Council: As a collective defence organisation, NATO has always been aware of the need for rapid decision-making during a crisis and mandated the Permanent Council to take all necessary decisions in that regard. Permanent Representatives are in constant communication with their capitals through a secure voice network, but their status is different from their colleagues in the European Union (EU). With the supranational methods of the EU, decisions can be taken only by the Ministerial Council, albeit in different formats. For instance, decisions to be taken in the Agriculture Council can figure as an "A" point on the agenda of the Internal Market Council, but they will not be presented to the Committee of Permanent Representatives (COREPER) for formal approval. The only flexibility in this structure

is in the form of provisions for a delegated authority for the Committee for Foreign Policy and Security (COPS) in exercising its crisis management duties.

7. A parliamentary dimension: The NATO Parliamentary Assembly is not based on a clause in the Washington Treaty of 1949, but has gradually transformed into an body of real prominence thanks to excellent reports and interesting debates, which have often drawn attention from the press and figured in national debates. The NPA does not exercise parliamentary control in the same way that national parliaments control budgets and policy, but its work is highly important as a consensus-building mechanism among politicians. Working together on reports and resolutions greatly enhances mutual understanding and provides a valuable basis for the positions that are developed in national debates at home. Detailed knowledge of the arguments advanced by colleagues from allies and partner countries is a prerequisite for informed and responsible debate. The fact that, apart from the OSCE Assembly, the NPA is the only forum where legislators from Europe meet with their American counterparts enhances its significance.

   Annually, the members of the Standing Committee meet with the North Atlantic Council for an afternoon session. The Secretary General responds in writing to the resolutions which have been adopted by the Assembly. The NPA has also been instrumental in raising support for major activities undertaken by NATO, often before the NAC had formally endorsed them. The enlargement process is a case in point. A major drawback with regards to parliamentary control over the security sector is the unevenness of national practice. In some capitals, the parliament has very little influence on foreign affairs and defence. In France, for instance, it is the reserved domain of the President of the Republic. In the UK, the Prime Minister has considerable freedom of manoeuvre. In both cases, equipment decisions hardly figure in parliamentary debates. This is also one of the reasons for the reluctance to give the European Parliament more say in these matters; if national parliamentarians have little authority, why should MEP's get more?

   The Assembly's role in developing relations with Central and Eastern European parliaments was recognised in the NATO-Russia Founding Act and the NATO-Ukraine Charter which were both signed in 1997. These documents called for expanded dialogue and co-operation between the North Atlantic Assembly and the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation and the Ukrainian Verkhovna Rada (Parliament) respectively.

**The Enlargement Agenda**

After the fall of the Berlin Wall, international assemblies advocated the enlargement of their respective organisations and they did so more rapidly than their governments had anticipated. The NATO enlargement process was relatively slow in taking off. Secretary General Manfred Worner was personally in favour of admitting new members and envisaged the inclusion of Visegrad countries, but he also thought it would be a lengthy process following the PfP program which was initiated in 1994. Very few statesmen in Western Europe paid more than lip service to the idea of NATO enlargement. The only clear exception was the German Defence Minister Volker Ruhe, who advocated the enlargement of NATO as early as 1992 in his Alastair Buchan lecture for the International Institute of Strategic Studies in London.

In 1995, the Alliance conducted a study on the potential NATO enlargement to examine the "why and how" of future admissions. It concluded that at the end of the Cold War and the disappearance of the Warsaw Pact, there was both a need and a clear opportunity to build improved security in the whole Euro-Atlantic area, without creating new dividing lines. Under this scenario,

the enlargement process would contribute to the enhanced stability and security of all countries in the Euro-Atlantic area by encouraging and supporting democratic reforms, including the establishment of civilian and democratic control over military forces, fostering patterns and habits of cooperation, consultation and consensus-building among members of the Alliance, and promoting good-neighbourly relations. It would increase transparency in defence planning and military budgeting, thereby reinforcing confidence among states and the overall tendency toward closer integration and cooperation in Europe. The study also concluded that enlargement would strengthen the Alliance's ability to contribute to European and international security.[9]

A breakthrough in the consultation process came with President Clinton's speech in Detroit during his re-election campaign in 1996 where he named Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic as future members. At the NATO summit in Madrid, Romania and Slovenia also were mentioned. Romania was strongly advocated by France, but the debate was settled by the US Congress in a statement which accepted the three countries that were initially mentioned by Clinton.

Debates by parliament members produced a fairly wide spectrum of opinion. Some members believed that it was their duty to include the new democracies, while others wanted to project stability eastwards. Members who opposed the enlargement process did not see the need to destabilize the Alliance, especially in light of the concern that Russia might perceive enlargement as a move to increase American influence eastward. On the other hand, an extension of US guarantees to a wider Europe could hardly be questioned by Europeans who themselves based their freedoms on those very guarantees. Nevertheless, the decision was clearly political. It was intended to show these countries that they belonged to the Western world. However, the military arguments were unconvincing: none of the three "candidate" countries had undertaken serious reforms. Moreover, the fact that Hungary did not have any borders with any other NATO member clearly showed that potential military threats were not taken seriously. In fact, NATO had moved away from the traditional threat analysis to a new jargon of 'risks and responsibilities.'

The Washington Summit of 1999 welcomed the three new members, but did not issue any new invitations. The NATO Parliamentary Assembly had advocated the admission of Slovenia to demonstrate that the door indeed remained open for other candidates. The NPA adopted a report submitted by its President Senator Bill Roth of Delaware to this effect but without success. Since then, the momentum for further enlargement has increased allowing for seven candidates: the Baltic countries, Slovenia, Romania, Bulgaria and Slovakia provided that its elections in September 2002 did not produce a Meciar government.

At first, some doubted the wisdom of including the Baltic countries in the next round, given the fact that it threatened to rekindle opposition against the new President Putin. A re-introduction of strategic arguments in the internal Russian debate might divert the already scarce resources from the necessary economic reforms. However, these arguments were countered by pointing to the smooth entry of Poland into the Alliance without much impact on East-West relations. Putin was wise enough not to forsake his prestige by preventing the admission of the Baltic countries. In the final analysis, Putin could do little to prevent it without disturbing the newly emerging atmosphere of co-operation in the region.

---

[9] See NATO Handbook 2006, p. 185-7

Another important factor that came into play was the constructive role that Russia played in the Afghan crisis, which might have caused hesitation in the West in terms actions that threatened to antagonise Russia and subsequently lose her valuable support in the fight against the Taliban. This dilemma was resolved by the Blair initiative to create a NATO-Russia Council at 20 in which Moscow would move beyond the Joint Partnership Council (where it was confronted with positions previously agreed by the 19) and obtain equal status on a number of subjects. The chances of Romania and Bulgaria, which had been slipping in the years after the Madrid summit, were revived again with the introduction of serious military reforms and their active participation in peace support operations. Moreover, heightened tension in the Middle East enhanced the strategic position of these countries.

The NAC was intentionally slow in discussing candidates by name because no member state wanted to finalize the process of selection before the Prague Summit in November 2002. To reduce the disappointment that might have ensued after the Washington Summit particularly for those who were not yet successfully included, a Membership Action Plan (MAP) was launched listing actions which would have to be taken with a list of annual progress reports. Part of the conditions implied that candidates would have to be the providers and not only the recipients of security. In the final analysis, admission would remain a political decision.

The NATO Parliamentary Assembly did not wait for governments to draw in new participants. The NPA involved delegations from PfP countries in its activities either as associates or observers and was effectively applying the notion of 'security through participation.' Spring sessions of the Assembly were held in candidate countries and their parliamentarians were invited to act as rapporteurs for the committee reports. The Rose-Roth seminars - of which more than 50 were held – were organised to familiarise the new democracies with the current security problems. Topics covered regional themes, stability, ethnic conflict, arms control and, more recently terrorism. Finally, training seminars for young parliamentarians and their staff members provided useful information and managed to remove misconceptions about the role of NATO in the new security environment.

On the issue of enlargement, there were two schools: One focussing on the criteria and progress made while the other focused on mentioning the names of the countries more likely to be included. At the Berlin plenary in November 2000 the latter group, which was led by general rapporteur Markus Meckel and advocated the entry of the Baltic states, Slovakia and Slovenia lost narrowly to the other group. Subsequently, the German delegation decided to included Romania and Bulgaria in light of their recent progress. Moreover, those countries were also favoured by the southern tier of member countries. However, the UK seemed more reluctant. In Washington, the momentum seemed to veer towards a 'big bang' in spite of some reservations in the Pentagon about seven countries coming in at the same time and potentially overburdening the process of military adaptation.

The plenary meeting of the 2002 spring session took place in Sofia. On the day of the meeting, the ministerial NAC created a Council of Twenty in which Russia gained equal status to the other members on a range of subjects. Regardless of whether this development was designed to soften Russian opposition to the Baltic countries joining NATO, the inclusion of the seven candidate countries now seemed almost certain. Nevertheless, the NPA was not prepared to make an announcement in that regard prior to the Prague Summit. A draft resolution presented by Peter Viggers, Chairman of the Political Committee, rather meekly recommended the admission of those countries that were deemed ready for membership. Subsequently, a German–Italian amendment passed stating the seven countries by name in a preamble paragraph which also detailed their

progress. Those were: Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia. An amendment by the present author was defeated. The amendment recommended the inclusion of the seven countries on the basis of progress made in reforming their societies and military sectors with the aim of vigorously pursuing these reforms in the months ahead. The argument advanced by the British and US delegations was that they did not want to anticipate the governmental decision in November, nor run the risk of negatively affecting the efforts of the candidate countries. These delegations generally had a tendency to be 'governmental' in their voting behaviour, which had a constraining effect on the debate and the possibility for parliamentarians to introduce new ideas.

At the Prague Summit in November 2002 the decision was taken to invite Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia to begin accession talks. In terms of NATO-EU relations, it was important that the same countries were also involved in negotiations with the EU, which culminated in their membership in May 2004, except for Bulgaria and Romania, which are expected to join in 2007 or 2008.

The outcome of the Istanbul Summit of June 2004 could be encapsulated in the phrase "We want to do more with everybody, but not necessarily the same thing."[10] To summarise:

- The NATO – Russia Council (NRC) expressed solidarity in standing against the terrorist threat and welcomed progress on a number of concrete military issues. In terms of political dialogue, however, ministers only asserted their desire to broaden it. In fact, Moscow resisted discussions on Chechnya and maintained that position at the informal ministerial meeting in Sofia in April 2006. There, the same applied to discussing Belarus, which Minister Lavrov dismissed with the argument that developments in that country were an internal matter which did not threaten the stability of the Euro-Atlantic area. Nevertheless, the military agenda included some important areas. More specifically, Russia offered to participate in the following: maritime operations in the Mediterranean in the framework of Operation Active Endeavour; a command post exercise on theatre missile defence was held in Colorado Springs in March 2004, and the second phase of the interoperability study – termed the flagship project of the NRC – was initiated; Russia hosted a civil emergency planning and response exercise in Kaliningrad; Russia established a Military Liaison Branch office at SHAPE and the NATO Military Liaison Mission in Moscow was enhanced; an NRC Cooperative Airspace Initiative Feasibility Study continued to operate; the Ad Hoc Working Group on Defence Reform was working on political-military guidance towards enhanced interoperability. Finally, in Istanbul it was agreed "to continue to consider practical ways to address operational, military and political-military aspects of the Generic Concept of Joint NATO – Russia Peacekeeping operations." In spite of these positive points, the political climate deteriorated. In the run-up to the Riga Summit, the Russian position hardened on the potential membership of Georgia in NATO and the Intensified Accession Dialogue between NATO and Georgia. Moscow threatened to renounce the CFE treaty if such an initiative was taken. Bilateral relations between Moscow and Tbilisi worsened when Russia blocked Georgian wine imports.
- NATO's relations with Ukraine are at a different level. Specifically, Ukraine has a Distinctive Partnership with the Alliance. Instead of a Council, there is a NATO-Ukraine Commission. In

[10] See Istanbul Summit Reader's Guide, NATO 2004, ISTRG_ENG1204.

Istanbul, the Ukraine Government "reiterated firm commitment to the Alliance's open door policy and underscored the strategic nature of the NATO – Ukraine relationship." At the time of the Istanbul Summit, there was considerable concern about the presidential election campaign, Ukraine's human rights record and upholding of democratic values. Subsequently, Ukraine entered into intensified dialogue with NATO with the hope that the Riga Summit would initiate an action plan in the form of MAP. Opinion in NATO is divided on this issue, partly because of the expected negative reactions in Russia on the one hand and the limited domestic support within Ukraine for NATO membership on the other. Much will depend on the policies of the new government which are still being developed. On the military level, Ukraine provided important support to KFOR and ISAF and also made a significant contribution in Iraq as part of the Polish-led division. NATO has signed memoranda of understanding on Host Nation Support for NATO Operations and on Strategic Airlift.

- Albania, Croatia and Macedonia are already involved in dialogue and, like Ukraine, are also hoping to obtain MAP status at the Riga Summit. However, in Croatia, public support for NATO membership appears to be low, while Albanian measures against organised crime leave much to be desired. Georgia wanted the ID status, which it obtained at Riga, but earlier there had also been talk about the country immediately jumping to the next stage and receiving MAP status. During the ministerial meeting in Sofia, most countries wanted strict maintenance of the ICTY conditionality (especially Germany, Poland, Spain and the US) but Norway was willing to take a more flexible position. During these informal discussions, the point was made that a comprehensive strategy should be adopted in the Balkans.
- The Istanbul Summit approved a document on "a more ambitious and expanded framework for Mediterranean Dialogue" and launched the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative (ICI) for the broader Middle East. NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue, which commenced in 1994 should be elevated to a genuine partnership and, while allowing for the possibility of self-differentiation, aim at enhancing political dialogue, achieving interoperability, developing defence reform (including democratic control of armed forces and transparency in defence planning and budgeting) and contributing to the fight against terrorism. In addition to consultations at the working and ambassadorial levels in the formats of 26+1 and 26+7, *ad hoc* ministerial and summit meetings should be included. The ICI built on this document and aimed to "enhance security and regional stability through a new transatlantic engagement with the region." NATO would engage the countries concerned on a 26+1 basis and made clear that the initiative was not meant to lead to NATO/EAPC/PfP membership, provide security guarantees, or be used to create a political debate over issues more appropriately handled in other arenas.[11]

**Suggested guidelines for action**

Most member countries want to give positive signals to candidate countries, which are making serious efforts to democratise and initiate reforms. Ultimately, further enlargement is likely, although the experience with EU accession is showing increased enlargement fatigue. NATO Secretary General de Hoop Scheffer has said "When they are ready, NATO has to be ready."[12] Therefore,

---

[11] Paragraph 3.e. of the official document on the ICI approved at the Istanbul Summit on 28 June 2004.

[12] Press Conference in Sofia, 27 April 2006, www.nato.int/docu/update/2006/04-april/e0427d.htm

positive decisions should be based on clear performance criteria. That might seem unfair in relation to past admissions, but it is the only way to maintain public support. The foregoing summary has indicated that this game is played on many chessboards at the same time. To an outside observer, the pattern seems to be fairly confusing and lacking consistency. Some correlation with the EU policies of accession and its new neighbourhood policies (which do not automatically include a promise of membership) also seems necessary.

The debate on further enlargement and intermediate steps should clarify what the various candidates can expect in response to their efforts. The present membership of NATO should be guided by answers to some basic questions: Are candidates willing and able to bear the responsibilities of membership (or their intermediate status)? Is their membership in the interest of NATO as a whole? Would their membership enhance security and stability in Europe? Is it wise to mention specific dates for accession when there are still many concerns? And, crucially, is there large domestic support for NATO membership?

**A global approach?**

For decades NATO was hamstrung by its assumed incapacity of going "out of area." During the Cold War, several factors mitigated against such action, primarily the risk of drawing third world countries into the East – West controversy. We owe it to Manfred Worner for declaring the out of area debate "out of date," but it took until 1995 before Germany could clear up its constitutional problems with the despatch of its forces beyond the NATO treaty area. Today, NATO has not only intervened in the Balkans, but also successfully staffed the ISAF Headquarters in Afghanistan, provided assistance to earthquake stricken Pakistan and help to the African Union. The question that has been raised, however, especially by the Americans, is whether NATO should go global and enter into more concrete cooperative arrangements with countries willing to engage in international peace enforcement operations and/or with the countries subject to stabilisation and peace building activities. Australia and Japan figure in the first category, the new governments in Iraq and Afghanistan in the second. Currently, one American suggestion seems to focus on a group of "global security providers," which would draw in countries like Finland and Sweden, but also others with effective military capabilities and a disposition to use them in the cause of peace support, and turn it into a more effective forum than the present Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC). The suggestion obviously has been too controversial to be decided upon at Riga. While admitting that EAPC has limited effectiveness, its comprehensive character continues to be attractive. PfP has sufficient possibilities for differentiation in its individual programmes, so that every country is able to determine the most suitable pattern. On the other hand, it might be attractive to establish more concrete links with partners outside the Euro-Atlantic area. A major question is to what extent the current leadership position of the US in NATO is seen as an asset for future out-of-area operations. The US military are reluctant to serve under foreign commanders and conversely anti-American sentiment has increased, particularly in the Middle East.

**NATO-EU Relations[13]**

Over the past 15 years, NATO and the EU have had their ups and downs, usually in opposite

[13] This section is taken from "From words to deeds. The continuing debate on European security" by Willem van Eekelen, CEPS/DCAF, 2006

proportions. After the demise of the Soviet Union, the future of NATO was in doubt and the EU was in ascendancy, until the sobering experience of Bosnia, which could only be resolved by American intervention. The same experience repeated itself in Kosovo. Afghanistan started as a unilateral action of the US, but the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) came under the UN and was led by NATO. In 2005, the US changed course and wanted to merge the ISAF with its own Taliban chasing operation Enduring Freedom. Several allies found that difficult because of the different nature of the two operations and hesitated to put them both under an American commander while US forces were being reduced and replaced by others. American leadership, if Washington still wants to exert it, does not come naturally to the Europeans anymore, certainly not when there is no corresponding force contribution. In Iraq, the EU has not been involved, but NATO has managed to play a minor role in training the new security forces. At the same time, the EU has demonstrated step-by-step that it has been able to take over NATO activities in the Balkans, starting with the intention of the Seville European Council of July 2002 to assume responsibilities in Macedonia.[14]

In fact, on our own continent there has been 'more Europe' without harming the Alliance. The 2004 NATO ministerial session in Istanbul settled the transfer of SFOR in Bosnia to EUFOR, the first sizeable European operation with some 7,000 personnel working under a UN mandate and the Berlin Plus arrangements with NATO. The problem lies more in a global role of NATO and the architectural ambitions of the EU. As previously mentioned, the US ambassador to NATO, Nicholas Burns, exploded after the UK agreed on a (small) EU headquarters calling this development "the most serious threat to the future of NATO" instead of showing appreciation for British efforts to limit the damage.[15] Since then, Washington has appeared to be more relaxed. Transparency has improved and in the relations between NATO and the EU an institutional accommodation has been found, which seems to have prevailed over political unease and ill-will. One might question the efficiency of the regular joint meetings of the NATO Council and the Political and Security Committee, because most countries sit with two ambassadors and one of them may regard it as a waste of time. In that respect, the recently instituted joint meetings at the ministerial level are more useful, as well as close contacts between the two bureaucracies. The test will come in a crisis when decisions will have to be taken on which organisation is going to act. The example of Darfur has not been edifying, where the US wanted to coordinate air transport through SHAPE and some Europeans favoured the coordination centre at the Eindhoven airbase.

Is Europe doing enough? At first glance, the obvious answer is no. With more personnel under arms than the US, the output in fighting power is too small. In that respect, the percentages mentioned at Riga for deployable forces are a step in the right direction. Ever since the end of World War II, Washington has been pushing its European allies to do more. In the Soviet era, the burden-sharing debate was painful, because European defences clearly would not have been able to withstand a massive Soviet attack. Even that debate was hard to quantify, because the percentage of GDP spent on defence was only a rough indicator of tangible capabilities and did not take the quality of training and equipment sufficiently into account. Today, such arithmetic is even more difficult as the

---

[14] Anand Menon has analysed the cumbersome start of this initiative with the UK blocking the deployment of an EU force and France subsequently trying to block the requested extension of the NATO force. See his article "From crisis to catharsis: ESDP after Iraq," *International Affairs*, Vol. 80, No. 4, 2004, pp. 611-48.

[15] See Fuller (2003), op. cit.

numbers of forces despatched by European countries are only a small proportion of total capabilities. Indeed, deployability is what is lacking.

The NATO Response Force was pushed by Washington as a challenge to the Europeans. They continued to believe in NATO as a military organisation at a time when they were developing their security and defence policy. As Philip Gordon remarked, the plan seemed to be working. Even France committed 1700 troops and senior French officers obtained command positions.[16] Conversely, France remained difficult in consultations concerning NRF deployment and limited EU-NATO meetings to Berlin Plus contingencies, thus excluding consultations on terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. The NRF is now fully operational and includes a land component with forced entry capability; a naval task force of one carrier battle group, an amphibious task group and a surface action group; an air component capable of 200 combat sorties per day; and special forces on call.

The Americans will ask to what extent NATO will go global or what coalitions of the willing are likely in the pursuit of common interests. As Neil MacFarlane has shown, recent interventions had a stronger normative component in the 1990s than in the Cold War era. MacFarlane noted a reduction in the frequency of unilateral intervention by the great powers and their growing reluctance to intervene without justification in terms of widely shared normative principles. That assessment might be weaker after the Iraq war, but MacFarlane also pointed out that historically speaking the 'absolutisation' of sovereignty and the interpretation of the principle of non-intervention that developed during the Cold War had been atypical.[17]

With peace in Europe, we have to decide what to do with it. Is our society so averse to taking risks that it will be reluctant to send forces to dangerous places? And if not, are we moving to where the Americans want to be going? The response to that question would change the nature of an Alliance built up during 50 years of collective defence. Today, in each crisis, member states have to determine whether to join the action or not. Joining peace-support operations is never an automatic process, but is inherently selective. In this respect, the call for a new transatlantic bargain, always discussed when relations are in trouble, has become more difficult to respond to. The historic bargains of the past – never formalised and never perfect – brought a US commitment to provide its European and Asian partners with security and access to American markets in return for a reliable partnership and the acceptance of US leadership within an agreed political-economic system.[18] More specifically, in Europe, the American nuclear guarantee was set against a credible conventional effort by the Europeans. What would a new bargain consist of in terms of mutual obligations in a joint effort to solve common problems? Lord Hannay made sense in proposing the initiation of a quiet dialogue to identify the gaps and weaknesses in existing US – EU relations and how best to plug them.[19] When policy options are considered, as much analytical common ground as possible should be established as well as ways to reconcile them.

Currently, there is competition between NATO and the EU in relation to conducting non-Art.V

---

[16] In Nicole Gnesotto (Ed.) *EU Security and Defence Policy, The first five years (1999 – 2004)*. EU Institute for Security Studies, Paris, pp.215-219

[17] SW. Neil MacFarlane, *Intervention in Contemporary World Politics,* Adelphi Paper 350, IISS, 2002.

[18] G. John Ikenberry, *America's Imperial ambition. The Lures of Preemption.* Foreign Affairs, Sept/Oct. 2002, pp. 44-60.

[19] David Hannay, *A new dialogue can bind America to Europe.* Financial Times, 27 April 2005

(i.e. peace-support) missions. Kosovo remains the only NATO operation inside Europe. US forces are being reduced and moved to the new member states. In Afghanistan, forging a link between the ISAF NATO-run headquarters and the US-led operation Enduring Freedom finally proved possible. All this raises the question: under what conditions are our nations prepared to envisage military action in this 'unbrave' new world, regardless of the geographical dimension? And how could we arrive at a division of labour when both NATO and the EU are willing to engage in non-Art.V missions? We have come a long way from the maxim that the EU would act only when NATO as a whole is not engaged. Today, there is even talk of 'de-conflicting' the two.

In transatlantic relations, the EU's willingness to assume larger responsibilities, outside Europe, would make it a more credible partner for the US, although it remains to be seen whether "our past saviour and increasingly confusing partner and friend"[20] would recognise this sufficiently. In any case, they cannot maintain the contradictory position of supporting European integration and, at the same time, opposing a more independent position. Clearly, the EU will not become a 'peer competitor' of the US in any politico-military sense. The purpose of European security and defence policy is not to oppose the US, but to enhance Europe's influence through an asset that might increase European autonomy. At best, it will operate as a correction mechanism in international power relationships, and even that might be too far-fetched.

We will all have to draw lessons from Afghanistan and Iraq and reassess the difficult task of post-conflict stabilisation. The new focus of the EU on battle groups will provide the means for early action, but work remains to be done on how groups will operate together if an operation requires more than one, how joint operations with combined weapons will be organised and how many peace-support operations could be sustained at the same time. The battle groups do not fully answer demands for the creation of an EU force, but – in the words of the IISS *Strategic Survey 2004/05* – have "the virtue of furnishing relatively discrete units that can be assembled individually."[21] That does not do justice to the willingness of almost all EU members to bring at least part of their forces up to standard and submit them to certification. It is true that their size is limited and that the EU has not worked out how different battle groups should operate if more than one is needed for an operation. This is related to the question of who should provide the reserves necessary in case of escalation or a prolonged operation. The Helsinki Headline Goals or the NATO Response Force could be called upon. The question of reserves is similarly topical with regards to support of UN operations, where ideally the Europeans (and NATO) should make joint contributions.[22]

For the time being, the issue of an EU headquarters seems to be on the back burner as the "Berlin Plus" arrangements (applied to the operations *Concordia* and *Althea)* and the compromise of September-December 2003 (on an EU cell in SHAPE and liaison arrangements) seem to work adequately. The same probably applies to the 'permanent structured cooperation.' The current emphasis is on practical cooperation, such as the French initiative to pool together sea and air transport. Pooling will also be important to avoid an unnecessary duplication of investment. In a

---

[20] These words are taken from Chris Patten, *Not Quite the Diplomat,* 2005, op.cit., p.27.

[21] See International Institute of Strategic Studies (2005), op. cit., p. 139.

[22] The NATO Review of 2005, No 6 (now only available on the website) contained an interesting debate between Peter Viggo Jacobsen versus David Lightburn on *Should NATO support UN peacekeeping operations?* There was no fundamental disagreement, but Lightburn did object to a general commitment to all 18 ongoing UN missions.

way, this is the opposite of task-specialisation, which may make it more attractive for countries fearful of becoming overly dependent on the capabilities of others. The units put into a pool of, say, aircraft or helicopters, would have common bases, but could be used for national purposes as well. Simultaneously, transport needs should be assessed realistically and not be solely concentrated on air transport. During the Iraq War, 95% of US transport was carried out by sea. In the next few years, European requirements should be linked to the transport needs of battle groups, which are only useful if they can intervene quickly. The same will be true for the NATO Response Force, although its transport is supposed to be assisted by American assets.

On the US side, the Iraq experience may lead towards a better appreciation of the values of multilateralism. The persistent use of the term 'coalition forces' already indicates that Washington wants to create the impression of a multilateral operation. The best scenario would be a UNSC resolution after the Iraqi elections and the formation of a government, mandating a stabilisation force to which European countries could more easily contribute. The continuing high level of violence and suicide bombings has made such a force very unattractive. Nevertheless, failure to restore stability and democracy in Iraq would have far-reaching consequences, not only in the region, but also for transatlantic relations. In any case, success will require much more consultation, in both the EU and in NATO, and in closer EU–US contacts on our policy objectives. Unfortunately, the EU stumbled just at the moment that the Bush administration was beginning to acknowledge its existence and even its virtues.

**Military problems**

The concept of transformation needs further elucidation in light of the military experiences in Afghanistan and Iraq, where soldiers on foot remained indispensable. Network Enabled Capabilities (NEC) certainly make sense. However, to many Europeans, NEC primarily means that all available resources have to be used in a coherent manner. The most concrete areas for improvement of European capabilities seem to be special forces, helicopters and Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) for reconnaissance and ultimately also as weapon-carriers.

The fact that the NATO Response Force has a clear rotation schedule is clear but the financial aspects are still to be worked out. At the Riga Summit, there was agreement on sharing air transport costs. However, in other areas, NATO continues to lag behind the EU. A method for financing common costs was formulated through the Athena mechanism. Participation in the NRF has, therefore, become a "reverse lottery" with uncertain financial consequences, which will only be exacerbated when it proves difficult to find successors to the current force contributors. Ideally, the EU should offer a substantial budgetary contribution to civilian projects in the Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Afghanistan.

**Notes:**

1. See *NATO Handbook 2006,* p.185-7
2. See *Istanbul Summit Reader's Guide,* NATO, 2004, ISTRG.ENG 1204
3. Paragraph 3 e of the Official document approved on 28 June 2004
4. Press conference in Sofia, 27 April 2006
5. See my *From Words to Deeds, the continuing debate on European security.* CEPS/ DCAF, 2006
6. For the cumbersome start of this initiative see Anand Menon, *From Crisis to Catharsis: ESDP after Iraq in International Affairs*, Vol. 80, No. 4, 2004, pp. 611-48.
7. See Thomas Fuller, *Summit Talk of European Military Ties upsets US,* IHT 17 October 2003
8. In Nicole Gnesotto (Ed.) *EU Security and Defence Policy, the First Five Years (1999-2004)* EU Institute of Security Studies, Paris, pp. 215-9
9. Neil Macfarlane *Intervention in contemporary world politics,* Adelphi paper, IISS London, 2002
10. G. John Ikenberry, *America's Imperial Ambition. The Lures of Preemption,* Foreign Affairs, Sept/Oct 2003, pp.44-60
11. Lord (David) Hannay *A new dialogue can bind America to Europe,* Financial times, 27 April 2005
12. These words are taken from Chris Patten, *Not Quite the Diplomat,* Allen Lane, London, 2005, p.27
13. See IISS 2005, p.139
14. NATO Review 2005, No. 6. *Should NATO support UN peacekeeping operations?*

## NATO'S POLICY OF PARTNERSHIPS AND THE 21ST CENTURY CHALLENGES OF DEFENCE AND SECURITY POSTURE TRANSFORMATION — UKRAINIAN EXPERIENCE

*Mr Victor Korendovych, Acting Director of Military Policy and Strategic Planning Department, Ministry of Defense of Ukraine*

Thank you very much for the floor, Mr. Chairman,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

In my speech, I would like to focus your attention on the processes that are emerging in Ukraine at the present time. The deep transformations which are taking place in the area of defence and security in Ukraine are thanks to co-operation with NATO. There is no doubt that this assistance would be useful for any country experiencing similar transformations.

Ukraine's Defence Review was implemented a couple of years ago with the help of NATO experts. It has enabled us to develop a new approach when assessing the status of the armed forces and its development. It has enhanced our capacity to define a long-term perspective. Defence Review methodology provided an impetus to introduce a new defence planning system based on the permanent and flexible review of military security policy, taking into account the real capabilities of the state.

For the time being, Ukraine's Armed Forces are equipped with long, mid and short-term defence planning documents. Current activities are outlined in the annual White Book, which defines the "defence policy of Ukraine." These documents reflect the current transformations that are taking place in this field, which are defined by clear gradual goals.

On the other hand - and it is a pleasure to note that - such success in the field of defence reform has prompted a comprehensive national security sector reform process. Security Sector Review is following on the heels of Ukraine's Defence Review. Its completion is expected by the end of this year. The results of this review should lead to substantive changes in a number of doctrinal documents in the area of national security, as witnessed in the National Security Strategy of Ukraine. Such documents will outline the state security policy for the coming years.

These documents will also outline development plans for the respective ministries and structures, such as: the Ministry of Interior, the Ministry of Emergencies, the Security Service, the Border Guard Service, the Foreign Intel Service and the MoD Intel Service of Ukraine. The main priorities are transparency and civil democratic control.

Of course, such activity is exclusively a national prerogative. However, as I have already said, the experience of Ukraine's allies still plays a very important role. The main platform of NATO-Ukraine co-operation in this sphere is a Joint Working Group on Defence Reform (JWG DR). This mechanism has already demonstrated its efficiency and continues to be a crucial one in all aspects of co-operation with NATO concerning defence and security matters.

Moreover, a number of interesting and progressive initiatives are being developed under the auspices of the Joint Working Group on Defence Reform. The latest being:

- the Programme for Professional Development of Civilian Personnel employed by Ukrainian security institutions. The programme is enjoying real success and is currently in its second phase;

- Working Group on Civil Democratic Control over the intelligence sector. The results of this activity should be available by end of this year;
- expert consultations in the fight against terrorism;
- enhancing the involvement of independent experts, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society in addressing defence and security concerns is assured through:
- the active support of a NATO-Ukraine Civil League;
- a NATO-Ukraine website, which is being introduced to highlight activities in the sphere of defence and security sector reform;
- the NATO-Ukraine Partnership Network on Civil Society Expertise Development;
- high-level joint activities, which are introducing NATO values into Ukrainian society, are being conducted. For instance, a Round Table Discussion on Civil Democratic Control of the Security Sector is scheduled to take place in Kiev in March. A number of parliamentarians from Ukraine and NATO countries have been invited to take part in these consultations;
- "Security Sector Legislation of Ukraine," which presents a collection of legislative documents in the sphere of defence and security, has been published in English and Ukrainian. It is a product of the fruitful co-operation between the NATO International Secretariat, the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF), the National Security and Defence Council of Ukraine, and the Verkhovna Rada – Ukraine's Parliament. Such publications introduce Ukraine's experience to the world community.

It is clear that the spectrum of co-operation between NATO and Ukraine is quite wide. Existing activities have an influence on the development of others and I would like to express our deep gratitude to all allies and Partner countries who offer Ukraine practical assistance in support of its reform ambitions.

Firstly, such co-operation promotes objective opinion on NATO's role and further development in the defence and security sphere. It is effective and beneficial. It helps to overcome existing stereotypes about NATO, especially among the older generation. It is difficult for this generation to quickly adapt to the new realities.

Now in reference to lessons learned during the process of defence and security sector reform:

Firstly, as I have just said, there is a need for both society's full support and transparency. Therefore, civil democratic control of the security sector is an absolutely necessary precondition for reform.

Secondly, there is a lack of interagency coordination whereby comprehensive security sector reform can turn into a chain of fragmentary local activities without a common strategic approach. Reform of the armed forces cannot be further implemented without reform of the whole security sector.

Under the conditions of permanent and substantial financial constraints – and, I am quite sure, such financial problems are almost universal, whether it be for NATO or Partner countries – it is very important to define the main priorities. Limited resources should not be used to address issues of secondary importance. Particular attention should be paid to the consolidation of efforts by all state structures. Once again, transparency of the security sector is an indispensable precondition.

Doctrinal documents in the sphere of defence and security should be consistently reviewed on a regular basis. The process of reform is permanent and continuous.

Furthermore, more serious intentions regarding potential new security threats should be defined. The introduction of new doctrines and technologies requires not only resources, but also courage.

The meticulous study of foreign experiences helps to avoid unnecessary mistakes. In this regard, Ukraine's active co-operation with NATO was a catalyst for comprehensive reform of the defence sector, which has been well supported by Alliance experts.

Finally, from the outset, appropriate attention should be paid to the negative consequences of defence and security reform. These are: conversion of former military bases, the retraining and social protection of retired military personnel as well as the safe destruction of obsolete ammunition, equipment and material. In this regard, the introduction of a new personnel management system in the armed forces has particular importance.

Dear colleagues,

The abovementioned examples clearly demonstrate how, among others, the Alliance can amplify its own efforts to help Partner countries in their defence and security sector reform endeavours in light of the Riga Summit. At the same time, certainly, the final result ultimately depends on a real wish for transformation. There is no single recipe. Rather, there are common values and final goals.

We would be glad to know if any or some of Ukraine's lessons learned could help other countries, if they so decide to embark on a similar reform process.

We are also proud that NATO's co-operation with Ukraine in the sphere of defence and security reform represents the most active example of co-operation in this area and we look forward to forthcoming transformations.

Thank you very much for your attention.

## EXPERIENCE OF AZERBAIJAN IN DEFENCE AND SECURITY SECTOR REFORM: THE ROLE OF PFP AND IPAP

*Dr. Javanshir Mammadov, Counsellor, Mission of Azerbaijan to NATO*

Within the process of Euro-Atlantic integration, Azerbaijan's partnership with the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) is based on two major, mutually supporting building blocks: Firstly. using the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council/Partnership for Peace (EAPC/PfP) plans and programmes to reform and modernise the defence and security system. This is an important ingredient for the overall democratization process. Secondly, using the reform process to develop national security capabilities and interoperability with Alliance and Partner countries to a level which allows for increases in Azerbaijan's contribution to regional and international security, including participation in multinational crisis management operations.

The development of practical cooperation with Alliance and Partner countries in the sphere of Security Sector Reform (SSR), military interoperability and peace-support operations, anti-terrorism and border security – constitute the priority areas for Azerbaijan.

For transitional countries, modernization and reform of the defence and security sector represent particularly demanding tasks within the broader framework of democratisation. The objective is even more challenging in countries which are confronting the immediate security challenges of regional conflicts and terrorism.

Azerbaijan, like many other East European states, has embarked upon the difficult path of establishing democratic institutions, which includes as an important part Defence and Security Sector Reform (DSSR). The reform process in Azerbaijan's case, however, deals not only with the authoritarian legacy of the past and the lack of national experience, but also with the problems created by the unresolved Armenian-Azerbaijani Nagorno Karabakh conflict, which heavily burdens not only the national security system but also its political and social spheres.

Azerbaijan is also confronting the threats of terrorism and extremist ideology which mostly originate from the unstable neighbourhood of the Middle East. These elements bear some influence on the country's progress towards secular democratic statehood. WMD proliferation, illegal migration, the trafficking of arms and drugs and transnational organized crime also challenge the national security system.

The abovementioned factors have had an adverse effect on the country's overall democratisation process, which has not evolved as smoothly as in many other post-communist countries. Azerbaijan has experienced a very difficult transition to stable statehood. The process has been hindered by a combination of external aggression and the possibility of civil war in the early 1990s. Ensuring internal stability was viewed as an imperative to start basic reforms in the political and economic spheres. The establishment of stable government structures provided the appropriate conditions for steady economic growth which, in turn, created a sound basis for further democratic institution building and reform of the security sector.

Initially, the process of establishing defence and security institutions in Azerbaijan basically emulated the authoritarian patterns of the former Soviet security system, which was characterised

by over-centralization, bureaucratic management, poor inter-agency coordination, a lack of transparency and an unclear delineation of responsibilities.

Our national experience show that DSSR, even under tense and unfavourable conditions, is a crucial part of the democratization process in developing societies. A poorly managed defence and security sector can hinder the democratic process. In the meantime, effectively governed and capable security systems have the potential to serve as important stabilising factors for economic and social progress leading to the formation of civil society.

Azerbaijan is about to embark on the second generation of reforms. As a matter of fact, all the major elements of the constitutional and legal system required for democratic control over the country's defence and security institutions were established following the adoption of the new Constitution in 1995. Democratic and civilian control and oversight, including defence and security sector regulations, have been divided between the office of the President, the Parliament and the Cabinet of Ministers. The existing legislation does not prescribe responsibilities other than operational and administrative duties for the military.

The National Assembly, besides its exclusive legislative role in defence and military-related issues, has the power to endorse the military doctrine, defence-related actions relating to international cooperation and the use of the armed forces for performing duties not directly related to its regular assignments.

In our view, greater active parliamentary oversight of the security system is still needed. This could serve as a powerful tool to overcome old legacies, and ensure greater transparency and coordination between Azerbaijan's security agencies. Improved training for parliamentarians, especially in relation to practical applications of democratic oversight on the basis of the experiences of NATO and Partner countries, as well as employing actions upon the suggestion of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, could also be helpful.

Active engagement of the Parliament in the process of Individual Partnership Action Plan (IPAP) implementation needs to be prioritised, as with other government programmes. This could also provide for greater public monitoring and financial support for the IPAP implementation process.

Rapid economic growth over the past four years has allowed for substantial increases in the allocation of resources to the defence and security sectors. Unfortunately, the legacy of the Soviet past has, to a certain degree, affected the development of the National Defence Ministry and the Border Service as well as the process of institution building and, especially, the personnel management system.

One cannot deny the fact that the Ministry of Defence and the Border Service are dominated by military personnel. This is not a legacy of the Soviet system alone. The possibility of a renewed escalation of military confrontation in the conflict region is another major complicating factor. The overwhelming majority of active military personnel is still deployed along the stretched frontline. Therefore, budget and personnel management, which are considered vital for maintaining the frontline initially, were less subject to reform.

Meanwhile, the MoD has already developed plans to increase the civilian component within the Ministry, including the training of civilian personnel in military and security related matters using national and international PfP training centres as well as NATO's expert assistance.

When speaking about the authoritarian legacy one should also take into account the bureaucratic culture which is particularly strong among the older generation. This is yet another complicating aspect. The need to maintain internal stability creates the danger of heavy reliance on the security sector which threatens to reproduce old patterns of conduct.

Therefore, the training of mid and low-level personnel on the basis of current standards is an important tool for transforming the security sector in accordance with modern standards. The training programmes which were inspired by the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Work Plan (EAPWP) and based on short-term activities should be replaced with a human resources strategy in the framework of the IPAP, which is more tailored for long-term needs. This is the only effective way to overcome the problems of old patterns of conduct among defence and security personnel.

Another very effective tool is the strengthening of democratic and public oversight of security institutions. The rising role of the media and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) have become important mechanisms for enhancing public oversight over security institutions. The existing freedom of the media is highly appreciated by the public which is most attuned to the deficiencies of the defence and security sector. Although criticism might reflect the political allegiance of a media outlet and not necessarily reality.

In this case, once again, the appropriate training of public relations skills for information officers in defence and security structures is very important and should be supported by IPAP practices. Azerbaijan is currently developing a public information strategy which is supporting the reform process and applying the experience of NATO nations.

It is also worthwhile mentioning that the Law on Access to Information defines response mechanisms to requests for information on defence and security. In cases where a request for information is denied, a court appeal process is stipulated by the law.

The office of the Ombudsman was established following Azerbaijan's accession to the Council of Europe in 2001. Without prior notification and without any hindrance, the Ombudsman has the right to gain access to state institutions, local executive bodies, military units, prisons, temporary detention cells and relevant documentation.

The adoption of the new NATO structure for the armed forces is another significant development, which promises to reform the entire military management system. The introduction of NATO standards accompanied the establishment of a special mobile battalion and a peacekeeping battalion. The mobile battalion was already admitted to the Operational Capability Concept (OCC) pool of forces, which recently conducted its first self-evaluation.

The major objective for Azerbaijan's armed forces was defined as the enhancement of interoperability with NATO Forces, the development of its operational capabilities in a changing strategic environment and achievement of NATO Response Force (NRF) standards.

Azerbaijani armed units currently participate in peace-support and crisis management operations in Kosovo, Afghanistan and Iraq, which also contributes to the overall reform process by enhancing experience and increasing the numbers of military personnel who are trained for multinational operations.

The establishment of Azerbaijan's State Border Service should also be highlighted. The Border Service faces the very challenging task of building and restoring the basic border protection infrastructure along the extended mountainous borders and the territorial waters in the Caspian Sea. Since establishing close cooperation with NATO since 2001, Azerbaijan has obtained valuable

expert assistance from NATO Member and Partner countries. Although initially developed as a paramilitary force, the Border Service will be transformed into a law enforcement agency that conforms to the democratic principles of conduct and control.

Within all these processes, the IPAP serves as a major framework and tool for organising comprehensive cooperation with NATO and enhancing political dialogue on common security concerns and interests. Including as many aspects of democratic institution building as possible is the most suitable mechanism for effective DSSR. A comprehensive approach to the reform process within a single plan is therefore essential.

In the spring of this year, Azerbaijan will be completing its first two-year cycle of IPAP implementation. The next phase will be focused on establishing a close link between all the objectives to ensure overall reform of the security system. Azerbaijan's National Security Concept and Military Doctrine will be drafted during this period.

Based on principles defined by the abovementioned documents, the government with the MoD taking the lead, will conduct a Strategic Defence Review (SDR) determining the structures, tasks and capabilities of the armed forces and other security agencies necessary to conduct their identified missions. The ultimate goal is to achieve effectiveness and efficiency of all defence and security sector actors, taking into account the existing strategic environmental and available resources.

The forthcoming IPAP is intended to be more complementary emphasising the links between IPAP objectives and actions and national defence and security institution plans. This should also help to streamline the issue of support and funding, combining international assistance with available national resources.

In conclusion, I would like to make a few observations and proposals.

Threats and the risk of terrorism, failing states, regional conflict and WMD proliferation are particularly felt on the periphery of the Euro-Atlantic region. In these regions, international terrorism merges with extremist ideology in an attempt to derail society from the democratic process.

At present, international cooperation should be based on a comprehensive and conceptual approach which should combine combating terrorist threats with DSSR, providing training that is tailored to national needs and ensuring the availability of international expertise.

The issue of integrating activities into the overall democratic process when fighting the assymetric challenge of terrorism is problematic even for mature democracies.

A successful reform process and effective responses to modern threats and challenges, especially in transitional states, depend on the reform of both the defence and the security sectors. The reform process of both these sectors should complement one another.

NATO and international operations in Afghanistan and Iraq provide clear evidence to support this. Reform of the security sector as an effective tool against extremism has already become an important part of NATO's reconstruction operations in Afghanistan.

In the meantime, it is well-known that NATO and its PfP programme have traditionally focused on defence and the armed forces. SSR was not considered to be a priority.

In our view, SSR should become an important area of Euro-Atlantic cooperation with established mechanisms for direct inter-agency coordination, training and expert assistance among Partner countries. Several Partner nations have extensive expertise in this area.

I would like to put forward a proposal to develop a special mechanism in the form of an EAPC Centre for SSR, using the example of the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre (EADRCC) which has effectively demonstrated its practical value. The activity of this Euro-Atlantic SSR Centre could be equally supported by NATO and EAPC Member countries. Its assets would undoubtedly facilitate NATO partnerships.

Thank you.

## MANAGEMENT CHANGES IN THE DEFENCE SYSTEM — EXPERIENCES OF SERBIA

*Colonel Zeljko Gajic, Strategic Planning Department, Ministry of Defence*

Significant and speedy changes in the modern world reflect on all segments of people's life and work. Conditions are changing constantly at a very fast pace. Change constitutes one of the greatest challenges facing modern organizations. Management's ability to administer changes and the organization's capacity to respond quickly and appropriately to changes in the environment become decisive factors for the system's development.

The defence system is one of the state's most important systems. It is also one of the largest according to the number of employees and financial allocations. Reforming the security sector and the defence system is a basic precondition for society's stable development. Achieving standards in the defence field is a part of building an efficient system and active participation in collective defence systems. Reforming defence sector management is an extremely complex process that needs to be planned precisely, carefully guided and constantly monitored by responsible governmental institutions and the public. Besides the Ministry of Defence, many governmental institutions and organizations take part in the process. Foreign institutions dealing with security issues are also interested in the effects of change and the results of reform efforts. Apart from this, the emergence of new security challenges, risks and threats (terrorism and various non-state elements) as well as new (asymmetrical) types of conflicts, makes the process even more complicated. Reforms are planned and even realized under conditions of reduced budget allocations for defence needs, without additional resources for transformation costs and (sometimes) delayed or unfulfilling financial commitments by the state.

These are, more or less, the common characteristics of the transformation processes of defence systems in NATO, Partnership for Peace (PfP) and contact countries. While transformation goals might be similar (provision of necessary defence capabilities and protection of vital national and defence interests, active contributions to preserve peace and develop a favourable security environment), concrete conditions, methods and instruments might have a national seal. In the case of the Republic of Serbia, the **Serbia – NATO Defence Reform Group (DRG)** has proven, according to evaluations by senior authorities, officials and NATO representatives, to be a very successful instrument in the process of defence system reform.

### Emergence and development of the DRG

Prior to the establishment of the DRG, great changes were made to Serbia's defence system. The process of organizational changes (disbanding a large number of units, disbanding parts of operational units, downsizing, establishing MIA and MSA, etc.,) commenced prior to Serbia's PfP membership. Despite the fact that the country enjoyed intensive cooperation with NATO representatives, especially in the period when the UK (2002-2004) and the Kingdom of Norway (2004-2006) were contact countries, Serbia did not dispose of all the necessary information, experiences and mechanisms that were employed by a majority of other countries in the region. Institutional forms of cooperation between Serbia and Montenegro represented a growing problem and a lack of necessary information and standards slowed down the process.

The work on the first Strategic Defence Review, which was strongly supported by the Kingdom of Norway and NATO, made the Kingdom of Norway a NATO contact point country in mid-2005. Norway had launched an initiative to establish a joint Serbian-NATO body that was to institutionally assist the process of defence system reform. Serbia advocated such forms of assistance due to its inability to use PfP mechanisms. A long process of consultations with NATO through the Political Committee and Politico-Military Steering Committee was initiated over a period of several months. The consultations with NATO ended in December 2005 with a decision to establish the DRG. Following thorough preparations from responsible national authorities, the Serbia and Montenegro-NATO Defence Reform Group was established in February 2006. The Group's objectives, its working procedures, tasks and structure were defined and a steering body (Coordination Team) was established.

15 working tables were established during the following phases:

- December 2006 — February 2006 → preparations
- February 2006 — May 2006 → establishing working tables
- May 2006 — December 2006 → work until accession to PfP
- December 2006 — → adjusting work to the capabilities of standard PfP instruments (IPP, PARP, PAP-DIB)

**Structure and work procedures**

1. The DRG is headed by two co-chairpersons:
   — Assistant Minister of Defence for Defence Policy, Mrs. Snezana Samardzic- Markovic
   — Director of NATO Force Planning Directorate, Mr. Frank Boland
2. The Steering Committee is a coordinating body. It is composed of the following members:
   — Chief of the General Staff of the Serbian Armed Forces,
   — Assistant Minister of Defence for Defence Policy,
   — Assistant Minister of Defence for Human Resources,
   — Assistant Minister of Defence for Material Resources,
   — Chief of Strategic Planning Department and
   — Chief of Budget and Finance Department

   Executive Coordinator, Col. Mitar Kovac PhD, Chief of the Strategic Planning Department, is responsible for operationally managing the work of the working tables and the Group.
3. Initially, the Group was composed of 13 permanent and two ad hoc working tables. Three additional working tables, interpreters and an evaluation team were subsequently added to the Group.

This structure ensures efficient management of the Group's work and supports the involvement of NATO representatives and member countries at the highest level. The Coordination Team strengthens approaches to necessary resource development (human and material). The Steering Committee is responsible for formulating and implementing defence policy. Apart from representatives from the Ministry of Defence and the General Staff, national authorities, representatives from national institutions as well as foreign representatives (NATO representatives, foreign military representatives and experts from NATO countries) participate in the defence reform process.

The Group's work is implemented through the following:

1. Planning
   — Defining objectives and guidelines, working tables and methods, drafting agendas, steering the work activities of the Coordination Team and the Executive Coordinator.
   **Responsible:**
   *Group Chairperson, Coordination Team, Executive Coordinator,*
2. Organizing
   — Identifying tasks and establishing those responsible for the realization of objectives, delegating authorities for the execution and coordination of work, creating conditions for the involvement of non-MoD representatives, organising working table sessions, and plenary sessions.
   **Responsible:**
   *Executive Coordinator, working table managers*
3. Executing
   — Establishing and guiding the team's work and tasks, conducting analysis, developing projects and drafting reports.
   **Responsible:**
   *Managers and members of the working tables*
4. Control and evaluation
   — Developing success indicators, evaluating individual projects and the Group's work as a whole, monitoring the degree of realization for defined tasks and proposing corrective actions.
   **Responsible:**
   *Chairperson, Coordination Team and Evaluation Team*

Based on the decisions of the Coordination Team, managers organize working table tasks. As section/department chiefs, managers are fully aware of the working table's field of work and are equipped with the necessary expert and managerial capacities to oversee the work. In between meetings, the working table members execute assigned tasks and draft solutions. Results and views are exchanged at working table meetings and follow-up activities are agreed upon. Plenary sessions are held periodically (four–six week intervals) in the presence of the co-chairperson, Coordination Team, the working table managers and NATO and country member representatives. Representatives from participating organizations and institutions are invited to plenary sessions where completed assignments are evaluated and follow-up activities are planned.

**Characteristics of DRG Work**

A process of reform in which there are no clear or whole visions of the development of the system overall, where every project is carried out separately in which project managers try to bind key resources (human, material and time) exclusively to their projects without any coordination with other managers, does not lead to projected results. The lack of determining priorities or privileging one project over another without any realistic foundations weakens opportunities to make the optimal use of resources and creates different development dynamics for key, mutually dependant projects.

Through the use of scientifically based and, in practice, demonstrated concepts of multi-project management, priorities have been determined in accordance with the strategic objectives of the organization. A number of projects have been synchronized and resources are being used more efficiently. Senior management has the appropriate tools to monitor, direct and oversee the process of transformation of specific segments as well as the overall system.

Work in temporary, project-oriented, organizational bodies (teams, working tables, groups, etc.,) is a non-standard style of work which demands flexible methods, managers who have the capacity to develop operational visions as well as motivated team members who have to the ability to contribute to the development of the project through knowledge and experience. The direction, synchronization and control of several mutually dependent teams are impossible to manage without the awareness, assistance and support of senior management which, by its own engagement, should set an example to other managers and participants. This progressive method of work is being implemented in the work of the DRG and its basic characteristics are as follows:

- diversified team members facilitate an exchange of experiences and knowledge from different areas;
- inner capacities are activated and fresh ideas are presented;
- management receives accurate information on the state of the system and executive decisions are made more quickly;
- internal communication between certain organizational segments is improving;
- participation of members with different knowledge and experiences, representatives from government ministries and foreign representatives improves civilian–military cooperation and involves other countries and international institutions in the process of reform;
- teamwork provides opportunities for managers to select candidates who have the potential to advance;
- executives are responsible for overseeing the functioning and organization of teams which maintain fairly high levels of autonomy and responsibility;
- integral organizational approaches to planning and orchestrating change is facilitated through the effective management and coordination of work;
- some solutions can be implemented very quickly because executives are often in the position to make appropriate decisions.

However, the problems and difficulties associated with this way of work are as follows:

- executive bodies, even though their competences have been defined, (Coordination Team, executive coordinator and executives), lack direct formal competences over members of the working tables. They can express their influence solely through the chiefs of the formal organizational units;
- executives have high levels of autonomy and responsibility. Success, to a great extent, depends on the capability of the executive to transform the objectives and guidelines into plans and to successfully organize the work of the working table;
- activities are carried out together with regular work responsibilities representing additional burdens for executives and members. Success depends, to a great extent, on the level of motivation of both the executives and members;

- not all people within the system are prepared to work in this way and, on occasion, working table activities are understood as competition to formal organizational units;
- intensifying work and including foreign representatives and experts heightens the need to define work methods and determine the means to finance their participation;
- a significant number of activities which need to be coordinated require the existence of a permanent organizational unit.

**The Results**

Developing the necessary criteria and indicators to accurately determine the success of the Group's individual working tables is not an easy task. The final results are yet to be established. However, after only one year, the effects of the Group's work are visible and are reflected in the following achievements:

- despite the fact that the range of problems which are addressed by the working tables are different, all tables have defined objectives and tasks. A number of the working tables have completed their projects, which were evaluated by the Assessment Team. More importantly, a number of the working group's proposed solutions have already been implemented;
- internal communication in the Ministry of Defence, as well as cooperation between the various sectors and departments, has improved;
- representatives from various state bodies and institutions are increasing their involvement in the activities of the working tables and, as a result, the exchange of information between the ministries of the Serbian Government has improved. Efforts to achieve the necessary standards to ensure state-wide engagement in PfP have also intensified;
- the flow of information from abroad and familiarity with the experiences of other countries has increased following the involvement of foreign military representatives and experts;
- senior management receives current and accurate information on the defence system, the reform process and its results;
- Approximately 130 people from the Ministry of Defence are actively contributing to the reform process through their involvement in the Group and the working tables. Exceptional participants will be promoted to administer solutions which they have developed;
- working tables have received drafts of the following legal-normative documents: the Strategy of National Security, Strategic Defence Review, Defence System Development Plan up to 2010, Law on Defence and Law on the Armed Forces. Working groups have, therefore, been able to test planned solutions, identify limitations and make revisions to the documents;
- based on the suggestions of the working tables, plans for international cooperation in the area of defence have been harmonized.

Other state institutions are also participating in the process of system reform. These developments have provided the appropriate conditions to build contemporary, democratic institutions and ensure that certain preparations are carried out in an effort to strengthen involvement in PfP activities.

**Conclusion**

The ability of the defence system to change is dependent on its openness to internal processes and external surroundings. In complex systems, such as the defence system, the capacity to reform becomes increasingly complex and is only made possible through the application of scientifically proven practical methods.

By applying contemporary methods and dynamic mechanisms, such as multi-project management as well as implementing specific, temporary, integrative structures (teams, expert groups and working tables, etc.), it is possible to significantly speed up the process, to alleviate planning pressures, effectively oversee the process and use resources in the most optimal manner. However, success is ultimately dependent on the fulfillment of the following prerequisites:

- awareness of executives of the need for transformation and consensus regarding the relevant political forces;
- clear vision of the future development of the system which should be formulated through the set of strategic-normative documents and made operational through the adoption of plans and programs in which activities are connected to existing resources;
- involvement of other state institutions and international organizations;
- civilian structures which are responsible for overseeing the defence system should be actively involved in the reform process and the public should be reliably informed about the objectives, plans, consequences and possible negative effects of the process.

Defence sector reform is not necessarily characterized by uniform approaches, shared visions or global consensus. Very often, countries undergoing such transformations suffer from a lack of trained professional military personnel, particularly among civilians, who are insufficiently equipped to assume responsibility or direct the process.

The objectives and composition of the working tables correspond, to a great extent, to the principles of the PfP instruments, which aim to strengthen defence institutions in accordance with the Partnership Action Plan Defence Institution Building (PAP-DIB) guidelines, better known as the Ten Commandments. By applying multi-project management methods, NATO and partner countries can successfully cooperate in their efforts to reform and restructure such complex systems. The results to date and the positive remarks of state officials and NATO representatives reaffirm NATO's capacity to help transform and improve contemporary defence systems through new ways of cooperation such as the PfP framework, the Mediterranean Dialogue and the Istanbul Initiative for Cooperation.

## VISIONS OF THE FUTURE

*Mr Thierry Legendre, Policy Adviser, Policy Planning Unit, Private Office of the NATO Secretary General*

Discussions on the future of NATO's partnerships should focus less on whether such unions should develop in an evolutionary or revolutionary fashion. The discussion is pseudo-philosophical (one could claim that the French Revolution is still evolving and that the evolution of information technology is revolutionary for society!). The time is ripe to implement the Riga initiatives and focus on concrete and specific proposals. We should be imaginative and come up with creative ideas and also look at practical solutions.

Another dispute has been whether the term "global" should be used when we speak about Alliance partnerships. Having partnerships of one kind or another with countries from all parts of the world may seem, with the exception of sub-Sahara Africa and South America, somewhat artificial. Furthermore, animosity towards the term "global partnership" is probably linked to the fear of NATO becoming a "globocop." However this development is neither likely nor is it suitable.

Two dimensions have to be considered: the bilateral and the multilateral. The guiding principles for NATO's co-operation with its partners are those of self-differentiation and inclusiveness. Furthermore, a partnership should be one of mutual benefit. This moves us in two directions regarding the bilateral dimension:

Firstly, towards an increased focus on training, capabilities and partner contributions to the Alliance's military operations, without forgetting countries where capabilities and/or democratic reform are lagging behind. Co-operation with countries that can be labelled "partenaires deficitaires," obeys the principle of inclusiveness and serves the Alliance's own interest in avoiding failed states. Countries with a democratic deficit could participate in political dialogue and cooperate in softer practical areas (budgeting, mine clearance, border control etc.). Critical dialogue at 26+1 would also be an option.

In short, the group of countries with which NATO cooperates and maintains a dialogue has become larger and far more heterogeneous and will grow further. Thus, there is a need to develop a more differentiated approach towards partners and to create partnership arrangements which are flexible and enable the Alliance to develop its relations pragmatically with non-member states according to its strategic interests and without artificial regional groupings or barriers. Such a system that could be called "conditionality a la carte" should open up the PfP tool box to all partners accordingly with the Riga declaration on a case-by-case basis. However, the NAC could potentially authorise one year packages instead of case-by-case decisions. The spectrum of co-operation could range from dialogue to interoperability and operations through defence and security sector reform and building up military capabilities in an incremental fashion. Hence, one guiding principle should be that future partnerships enhance flexibility and receptiveness for each and every partner. Putting the individualised approach at the forefront is in line with one of the basic foundations on which PfP was built. In this way, there would also be a benefit for the Alliance, both in terms of democratic development and in terms of increased partner participation in the fight against terrorism, proliferation of WMDs and force contributions to operations in what could be described as "a la carte conditionality."

Finally, there is a need to decouple the direct link between enlargement and partnership that has prevailed so that partnership becomes a fully fledged dynamic in its own right and not, first and foremost, a driver for enlargement. Whether they aspire to membership or not, nations should be able to move closer to NATO's core business in a way that is proportional to their own values and their willingness to contribute. However, a clear distinction between partner and ally should be maintained. Thus, there should not be any extension of NATO's existing security guarantees.

Regarding the multilateral dimension, discussion within EAPC needs to be more results oriented and focused. The Riga declaration mentions more flexible formats and the 26+n format has subsequently been suggested. Some nations are, however, concerned about the principle of inclusiveness and whether it would be violated by this format. The following should be observed:

- If we chose more limited topics in EAPC (or EAPC+MD, ICI, CC), many nations would by self-differentiation exclude themselves if they didn't have to attend as others with a specific interest would attend. Even the X+n format could be tried.
- The principle of inclusiveness doesn't mean that we should do "everything with everybody."
- EAPC is a consultative body and the time for experimentation is ripe.
- Specifically the "concentric forum" format (by which countries with a direct interest or some form of participation in a given activity would be seated in an inner circle and the rest of EAPC members in an external circle with limited intervention rights) could be tried soon.

Regarding the question of resources, political will should be the main concern. Very few public organisations have resources prior to launching activities or projects: priorities have to be made.

**Conclusion**:

There is a tasking from Riga and the time is ripe to be creative. Together, we can develop a global partnership based on a transatlantic core within a network of networks allowing for individualised approaches for all partners.

## CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

*John Colston*

### Background

The PfP Conference on Defence Policy and Strategy under the sponsorship of the PMSC took place on 19-20 February in Montreux, Switzerland. This informal conference was co-organised by IS/DPP and the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF) working on a mandate from the Swiss Ministry of Defence.

94 participants from 42 countries including 20 NATO countries, 15 Partner countries, 2 Mediterranean Dialogue countries (Algeria and Jordan), 1 ICI country – Kuwait, and 4 Contact Countries (Australia, Japan, New Zealand, and the Republic of Korea) were represented. In addition, representatives of the European Union attended the conference.

I would like to underline the hospitality and support provided to NATO by the Swiss co-organisers for which I am grateful. This report summarises the major considerations arising from the meeting, and identifies major themes which may merit further consideration amongst nations.

### The Objectives

The conference focused on defence policy aspects of the future of NATO's Partnerships including ways in which NATO could continue to develop defence co-operation with its Partners. The conference's programme was designed to support the implementation of the decisions taken by the NATO Heads of State and Government in Riga on 29 November 2006 which aim, *inter alia*, "to increase NATO's ability to provide practical advice on, and assistance in the defence and security-related aspects of reform in countries and regions where NATO is engaged" (Riga Summit Declaration).

The event also aimed to add to discussions at the 2007 PfP Planning Symposium by focusing more on the defence policy dimension of NATO's Partnerships. An informal food-for-thought paper to stimulate discussions at the meeting had been circulated prior to the event.[23]

### The Issues Discussed

The panel discussions were inspired by a keynote speech from Mr. Graeme Herd, Geneva Centre for Security Policy (GCSP), Joint Course Director, International Training Course in Security Policy and a dinner speech by Mr. Willem van Eekelen, former Minister of Defence of the Netherlands, and former Secretary General of the Western European Union (WEU).

The two opening speeches identified themes which were reflected in all three panel discussions. Both speakers emphasised the need to transform the Alliance and its Partnerships better to meet 21st century security challenges and risks.

---

23 EAPC/PFP(PMSC)N(2007)0006

Session 1:

The topic of the first session was "Defence Policy-Related Aspects of NATO's Partnerships after the Riga Summit – Challenges and Opportunities". The main considerations of and views presented in the panel included the following:

- The multi-dimensional security challenges which NATO and its Partners face continue to grow. The Comprehensive Political Guidance published at Riga recognises the complexity of the 21st century security environment but NATO and Partners should and could do more better to prepare the Euro-Atlantic security community for non-conventional challenges which may emerge within the next 30 years.

- In view of the strategic environment, NATO's Partnerships are indispensable. At the same time, a new approach to developing these partnerships in the 21st century may be needed. NATO may need to return to the origins of the PfP by re-focusing its Partnerships towards practical and pragmatic co-operation which delivers measurable results.

- On the other hand, we may need to be more political in an era where our political and military engagements are more and more becoming a matter of choice. NATO also needs more feedback and assessment frameworks and mechanisms under the PfP to be able to know better what progress is being achieved and where the areas of concern lie.

- NATO needs to define its own role in Security Sector Reform (SSR). Operational requirements suggest that NATO is often faced with a need to deal with SSR, although clear political guidance on such involvement has yet to be developed. In reality, it is also often impossible to make a clear distinction between defence reform and SSR.

- Similarly, NATO and its Partners need to continue to reform their military forces and capabilities to ensure ever greater interoperability of their forces to enable them to operate on the battlefield of the 21st century. The OCC and the NRF offer excellent potential to support these efforts. The NRF can also become a powerful transformation tool through which Partners could be more closely involved in the process of military transformation which NATO is implementing.

- NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue has the potential to develop further into a more effective framework reflecting and incorporating PfP experiences and "lessons-learned".

- NATO should devote more resources and energy to explain its roles and missions to MD and ICI countries. In this respect, bridge-building strategies need to be developed to help to address frequently held misconceptions about NATO and its tasks.

- Greater involvement of the MD countries in NATO's operational efforts, including the OAE, need to be addressed.

Session 2:

The topic of the second session was "NATO's Policy of Partnerships and the 21st Century Challenges of Defence and Security Posture Transformation". The main considerations of and views presented in the panel included the following:

- Three possible lines of advance for NATO's Partnerships could be: to allow all NATO's Partners to participate in all Partnership activities on a regular basis subject to normal preparation and qualification processes[24] ; to expand and operationalise the roles of NATO defence and security sector reform experts[25] ; and to renew efforts to deepen NATO-EU cooperation.

- NATO-Ukraine co-operation in implementing defence and security sector reforms reflects NATO's ability to assist a Partner nation in implementing comprehensive transformations of its security posture. These experiences could be reflected in other Partnerships.

- Human resources development programmes should be the priority direction for PfP programmes. More programmes should also be opened to media and NGOs in Partner countries.

- SSR contributes to democratisation and economic progress and should be regarded as an integral part of society development. There is also a close link between counter-terrorism strategies and SSR.

- An "EAPC Defence and Security Sector Reform Co-ordination Centre" could be established to provide a framework for and co-ordinate co-operation between NATO, Allies, Partners, and other international actors in addressing national security posture requirements and non-conventional security challenges. NATO, Allies, and Partners could contribute resources to support the establishment, and activities to be launched by the Centre. The Centre could be opened to all Allies and Partners and other international organisations.

- The Defence Reform Group which NATO established with Serbia is an example of successful co-operation which contributes to democratic development of the country.

- PfP Trust Funds to support Defence Institution Building could be established to help Partners finance their reforms. Successful examples of such programmes already exist in Ukraine and elsewhere.

Session 3:

The topic of the third session was "Defence Policy and Strategy of the Alliance and NATO's Partnerships: Visions of the Future". The main considerations of the panel included the following:

---

[24] As an example, all of the MD, the ICI and contact countries should be allowed to take part in PfP exercises and activities and in the annual reviews of work programmes.

[25] NATO should be ready to send them to all Partner countries including those where NATO conducts operations. Such efforts could engage external support from other international and national actors.

- Comprehensive crisis management will continue to include the full spectrum of operations from prevention through military intervention to nation-building. Capabilities of the Alliance and its Partners beyond pure military operations are available and should be brought in.

- NATO will remain the leading standard-setting agency for transformation and multinational military operations, at least in the Euro-Atlantic area. Interoperability is NATO's core competence.

- NATO's Partnerships have served in the past as a platform to prepare partners for membership. While this will remain an objective for some, PfP and other partnerships are likely to be more diversified in terms of objectives and motivation.

- We need to have a critical look at whether the Partnerships as they are now meet the requirements and our expectations. As an example, NATO and the EAPC need to assess if the Euro-Atlantic Work Programmes address the right capabilities and reflect the right concepts to prepare Allies and Partners to meet new threats and risks. Similarily, new Force Goals and Partnership Goals may need to be developed to address new requirements as we modernise our conventional forces to better meet non-conventional threats.

- Permament IS liaison with other international organisations may need to be established. NATO also needs to develop a mechanism to ensure coherence with the EU's use of civilian capabilities.

- Self-differentiaton and inclusiveness are and should remain key to the succesful development of NATO's Partnerships in the future. Launching one-year packages of co-operation offered to non-PfP members drawing on PfP programmes could be explored.

- Discussions in a "26+n format" may help reinvigorate NATO's Partnerships. This could include informal consultations on specific issues between the selected number of Allies and the selected number of Partners.

**Conclusions**

There appear to be five major findings which I draw from discussions at the conference, all of which could contribute to further developing NATO's Partnerships including defence and security co-operation programmes between NATO and its Partners.

First, defence and security co-operation between NATO and its Partners continues to be a very important part of Euro-Atlantic security fabric. At the same time, the future of NATO's Partnerships is uncertain and new policies need to be developed. The need to develop such new approaches to address complex requirements of a transformed security environment could become the key principle to lead the development of NATO's Partnerships and co-operation programmes in the future.

Second, NATO's co-operation programmes need to continue to deepen and widen and policies on NATO's Partnerships may need to reflect the need to be flexible and open-minded in addressing co-operation opportunities. We also continue to need both practical co-operation and the political

context in which we develop our Partnerships. The principle of Partners' ownership of co-operation programmes will continue to be critical to their ultimate success.

Third, NATO needs to develop its own concept of defence and security sector reform which would provide guidance on and define NATO's specific contribution to "SSR debate". In this context, the concept of a possible "EAPC National Security Transformation Centre" which could be established under the EAPC merits further consideration.

Fourth, continued attention needs to be paid to the need to co-operate with other international organisations and actors with an interest in security and defence.

Fifth, NATO should do more to promote its fundamental objectives among societies of the Partner countries, to ensure better understanding of the Alliance's policies and objectives. In developing our co-operation programmes we may also need to pay more attention to cultural factors and specific local situations which may influence the successful pursuit of our co-operation with Partners.

*Научное издание*
*Scientific edition*

**John Colston, Philipp Fluri (Eds.)**

# PFP Conference on Defence Policy and Strategy, Montreux, Switzerland February 2007

# Defence Co-operation between NATO and Its Partners: Visions of the Future

Технический редактор — С.Н. Лобода
Компьютерная верстка — А.Н. Крайнюк
Корректор — О.В. Бобырь

Сдано в набор 28.08.2007 г. Подписано в печать 00.09.2007 г.
Формат 60x84/8. Бумага офсетная.
Гарнитура Times. Печать Riso.
Усл. печ. л. 6,51. Тираж 500 экз. Заказ № 000. Цена договорная.

**ООО «Книжковий світ»**
Государственное свидетельство: серия ДК № 199 от 27.09.2000 г.
91016, г. Луганск, площадь Героев Великой Отечественной войны, 5.
Тел./факс 58-04-95

**ЧП Сувальдо В. Р.**
91022, г. Луганск, ул. Лермонтова, 1-б.
Тел. 53-25-56, 53-33-60, факс 53-12-56, 53-40-81